

University of Twente

Bachelor Thesis

Positive Clinical Psychology and Technology

**The role of dispositional jealousy and sociosexual orientation in judgements of men who
perpetrate sexual aggression against a female intimate partner**

Kara Tönsmeier

2103869

June 30, 2021

1st Supervisor: Dr. Pelin Gül

2nd Supervisor: Kars Otten

Abstract

Previous studies investigated the influence of several factors on judgements of sexual aggression, however, the role of individual-level psychological factors such as dispositional jealousy and sociosexual orientation remains unclear. The current cross-sectional correlational study investigated how dispositional jealousy and sociosexual orientation are related to judgements of male-perpetrated sexual aggression against a female intimate partner. Participants (N = 99) were randomly assigned to a scenario displaying either jealousy-related (in response to an infidelity case) or non-jealousy-related (acquisition of casual sexual intercourse) sexual aggression before completing measures relating to the judgement of the perpetrator. Thereafter, participants' sociosexual orientation and dispositional jealousy were measured with the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory and the Multidimensional Jealousy Scale. It was hypothesized that high levels of dispositional jealousy and a restricted sociosexual orientation are related to lenient judgements of the perpetrator when sexual aggression is used to deter threats of infidelity. Further, it was predicted that sexually unrestricted individuals show lenient judgements of the perpetrator when sexual aggression is used to acquire a new mate and that this effect is pronounced in male participants. The results of Pearson correlations indicated that when it comes to judgements of a jealousy-related sexual aggression scenario, neither dispositional jealousy nor sociosexual orientation correlated with judgements of the perpetrator. Considering the non-jealousy related scenario, a significant negative correlation between sociosexual orientation and judgements of the perpetrator was found, indicating that unrestricted individuals judged the perpetrator strictly. This effect was pronounced in male participants. Accordingly, all hypotheses needed to be rejected. Limitations of the current study need to be considered, such as the homogenous sample and the small number of male participants resulting in limited statistical power. Overall, the study contributed to the existing body of research by specifically investigating the influence of individual-level psychological factors on judgements of sexual aggression.

Keywords: Dispositional jealousy, sociosexual orientation, intimate partner violence, perpetrator-blaming, violence-supportive attitudes

Home. A word, a place, commonly associated with feelings of peace and security. Nevertheless, for many women, their home is characterized by violence, humiliation, and fear of one's intimate partner. Across all cultural, ethnic, religious, and socioeconomic groups, women are confronted with sexual violence within their intimate relationship (Dartnall & Jewkes, 2013). In general, sexual violence is defined as "[...] any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic, or otherwise directed, against a person's sexuality using coercion, by any person regardless of their relationship to the victim, in any setting, including but not limited to home and work." (WHO, 2002, p. 149). In the majority of cases, perpetrators are men and familiar with the victim, for instance, an intimate partner (Dartnall & Jewkes, 2013). Estimated prevalence rates are alarming and according to the WHO, the lifetime prevalence of becoming a victim of either sexual and/or physical intimate partner violence for women is 30% (García-Moreno et al., 2013).

Although it is indisputable that sexual aggression against women has to be regarded as a hideous crime, the victim and not the perpetrator is repeatedly held responsible (van der Grubben & Grubb, 2014). Victims are frequently blamed, and negative perceptions, as well as misconceptions about sexual aggression, are prevalent in society (Anderson & Lyons, 2005; Dartnall & Jewkes, 2013). The effects of these blame judgements are detrimental, as the exoneration of the perpetrator and the often-accompanying acceptance of rape myths aggravate the victim's recovery process as well as effective law enforcement (Krahé et al., 2008). Accordingly, victims are less likely to report incidents to authorities and are at risk to suffer from health consequences as well as psychological damage such as post-traumatic stress disorder (Anderson & Lyons, 2005; Ward, 1995). This emphasizes the substantial importance of identifying factors underlying the judgements of men who perpetrate sexual aggression against women in order to overcome gender-based violence and female oppression.

Judgements about sexual aggression and attributions of blame are influenced by a variety of factors, including observer characteristics and situational factors such as victim and perpetrator, as well as assault characteristics (Gravelin et al., 2019; van der Bruggen & Grubb, 2014). With regard to observer characteristics, past research has indicated that the observer's gender influenced judgements of sexual aggression. Especially, men were more likely to blame the victim and to exonerate the perpetrator whereas women tended to attribute more blame to the perpetrator (Bieneck & Krahé, 2011; Gerber et al., 2004). Interestingly, both men and women were more inclined to blame victims, and less likely to blame the perpetrator, when victim and perpetrator are familiar with each other or are involved in a

romantic relationship (Bieneck & Krahé, 2011; Krahé et al., 2007; Simonson & Subich, 1999). Increased acquaintance seems to be associated with less psychological damage for the victim and higher levels of perpetrator misunderstanding (Frese et al. 2004). Nevertheless, previous research investigated that higher perpetrator-blaming particularly occurred in cases where the perpetrator used physical force and the victims showed resistance (Branscombe & Weir, 1992; Krahé et al., 2007).

Furthermore, the observer's cultural background seems to be significantly relevant as it relates to the adherence to traditional gender norms and consequently influences an individual's evaluation of sexual aggression (Grubb & Turner, 2012). In addition to gender and cultural background, social and cultural beliefs of the observer such as rape myth endorsement, political attitudes, belief in a just world, perceived victim similarity, and prior victimization have been examined (see Gravelin et al., 2019, for a review). Regarding situational factors, it has been consistently demonstrated that victim characteristics such as perceived attractiveness, clothing, acquaintance, and a promiscuous sexual history are linked to increased victim-blaming (Whatley, 1996; see Gravelin et al., 2019, for a review).

Although multiple factors influencing judgements of men who perpetrate sexual aggression against women have been identified, limited research on the role of individual-level psychological factors – motives and affective states – has been conducted. Previous studies have established evidence that individual psychological factors such as dispositional jealousy and sociosexual orientation predict support for ideological forms of mate-guarding such as female honour norms or ideologies controlling female sexuality (Gul & Kupfer, 2021; Wilson & Daly, 1992). However, it remains unclear whether these individual-level psychological factors influence judgements of more direct forms of mate-guarding such as male-perpetrated aggression against women. Hence, the present research aims to investigate the extent to which dispositional jealousy and sociosexual orientation influence the judgements of men who perpetrate sexual aggression against women.

Dispositional Jealousy and Judgements of Sexual Aggression against a Female Intimate Partner

The emotion sexual jealousy is evoked by a perceived threat to a relationship, leading to the arousal of behaviours antagonizing the threat (Daly et al., 1982). This research specifically focuses on an individual's general tendency to be sexually jealous (i.e., dispositional, or chronic jealousy) instead of state jealousy induced by a specific situation. According to Daly et al. (1982) "Jealousy is *sexual* if the valued relationship is sexual." (p.12). Although both men and women experience jealousy, the functions of jealousy differ in

men and women. Contrary to women, men are confronted with paternity uncertainty and are at risk for cuckoldry, since fertilization occurs in females (Shackelford et al., 2005). Therefore, male sexual jealousy is hypothesized to be developed as an adaptive strategy to solve paternity uncertainty and to prevent female infidelity as well as cuckoldry (Buss et al., 1992; Daly et al., 1982). In contrast, “[...] female sexual jealousy is an adaption to the threat of abandonment.” (Hughes et al., 2004, p. 5). Unlike men, women are not at risk for cuckoldry, however, they are confronted with potential abandonment by a partner and concomitant withdrawal of male investment and resources necessary for reproductive success (Hughes et al., 2004). Daly et al. (1982) suggested that female sexual jealousy is less intense because it is less focused on infidelity and more centred on resource preservation. Nevertheless, to prevent relationship threats, both men and women show mate-guarding behaviour, albeit for different adaptive problems (Buss, 1988).

Concerning judgements of aggression, prior research showed that sexual jealousy is used to justify violence. A study by Puente and Cohen (2003) compared different acceptance levels of different forms of aggression. The results indicated that individuals were more inclined to accept intimate partner violence when a male perpetrator acted out of jealousy. Individuals tended to judge the perpetrator more tolerantly when the incident was provoked by jealousy and did not consider it as a crime when a jealous man sexually assaulted his wife (Puente & Cohen, 2003).

With regards to an individuals’ level of dispositional jealousy, previous research demonstrated a relationship between dispositional jealousy and mate-guarding. Shackelford et al. (2005) suggested that mate-guarding behaviour can be regarded as a manifestation of jealousy. Some mate-guarding behaviours are appreciated by the recipient as it signals the partner’s devotion, for instance holding hands or receiving gifts. However, mate-guarding may also be expressed more directly through the use of violence towards the partner (Shackelford et al., 2005). Notably, a relation between sexual jealousy and mate-guarding was evident, and sexual jealousy can be considered as a motivator of mate-guarding which subsequently elicits mate-guarding behaviours including intimate partner violence which serves as punishment of partners who are unfaithful (Burch & Gallup, 2020; Buss et al., 1992; Daly et al., 1982; Emerson Dobash & Dobash, 2010). In addition to these direct forms of mate-guarding, individuals may also be controlled by ideologies (e.g., Sidanius & Pratto, 2001). Previous research proposed that the support of ideologies that control female sexuality function as indirect mate-guarding tactics (Daly & Wilson, 1992; Gul & Kupfer, 2021). Correspondingly, Gul and Kupfer (2021) showed that sexually jealous individuals were

supportive of ideological mate-guarding by giving support for social norms that control female sexuality (e.g., female honour norms). Social norms that indirectly restrict female sexuality and promote female fidelity are present in our society and possibly function as indirect ideological mate-guarding. For example, by telling women that it is unfaithful to cheat, or by accepting males who punish their unfaithful wives, social norms are established and anchored in our society. Accordingly, it is assumed that acceptance of partner aggression is a manifestation of ideological mate-guarding and can be triggered by feelings of jealousy in response to perceived threats of infidelity. Therefore, this research proposes that lenient judgements of male-perpetrated sexual aggression are manifestations of ideological mate-guarding, motivated by feelings of dispositional jealousy in response to a perceived threat of infidelity.

Sociosexual Orientation and Judgements of Sexual Aggression against a Female Intimate Partner

The term sociosexual orientation describes an individual's predisposition to engage in sexual activities outside a committed partnership (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). According to the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI), sociosexuality can be measured on a continuum ranging from restricted sociosexuality to unrestricted sociosexuality (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). Restricted individuals are monogamously oriented and engage in sexual activities solely within committed relationships, whereas individuals possessing an unrestricted sexual orientation are willing to have sexual intercourse outside committed relationships and frequently change partners after a short period (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). Generally, men have a higher tendency to be unrestricted than women (Yost & Zurbriggen, 2006).

Previous research proposed that female infidelity, as well as female promiscuity, are more costly for restricted men who are oriented towards long-term monogamous relationships (Gul & Kupfer, 2021). In line with this, it was found that monogamous individuals were more likely to support ideological forms of mate-guarding that control women's sexual behaviour (Gul & Kupfer, 2021). Reversely, for unrestricted men with a promiscuous short-term mating strategy, the support of ideological forms of mate-guarding is unfavourable as these would minimize opportunities of finding new sexual partners. Further, a relation between a restricted sociosexual orientation and sexual jealousy has been established by past research. A study by Rydell et al. (2004) demonstrated that individuals in committed relationships tended to experience greater jealousy when confronted with threatening information than individuals in less committed relationships. Thus, as restricted individuals are more concerned of mate-guarding and give more support of ideological forms of mate-guarding (e.g., supporting social

norms that restrict women's sexual behaviour; Gul & Kupfer, 2021), it is assumed that restricted individuals may be less disapproving of men who perpetrate aggression against their partner, especially if the aggression is used to deter threats to infidelity.

In contrast to Gul and Kupfer (2021), other research proposed that *unrestricted* sociosexuality in men is potentially problematic with regards to attitudes and personality characteristics (Reise & Wright, 1996; Walker et al., 2000). In men, an unrestricted sociosexual orientation was associated with "[...] harmful sexual attitudes, behaviours, and personality characteristics" (Yost & Zurbriggen, 2006, p. 164). Walker et al. (2000) demonstrated that an unrestricted sociosexual orientation in men was related to stronger attitudes towards sexism and traditional masculinity. In contrast, restricted sociosexuality in men was associated with more liberal, feminist attitudes, sex-role egalitarianism, and desire to overcome traditional masculinity. A study conducted by Yost and Zurbriggen (2006) generated evidence that an unrestricted sociosexual orientation related to male perpetration of sexual aggression within relationships. This relation was especially strong for men who adhered to stereotypical roles and supported coercive statements. Further, the results revealed that unrestricted men were prone to support ideological beliefs such as victim-blaming and rape myths which are, in turn, related to sexual aggression (Yost & Zurbriggen, 2006). Additionally, Yost and Zurbriggen (2006) suggested that because unrestricted men are likely to endorse a traditional masculine gender role, they, in turn, expect women to endorse a traditional feminine role and to be restricted in their sexuality. The current research aims to extend the literature by proposing that unrestricted individuals and especially men judge sexual aggression used to gain a new sexual partner more tolerantly as it possibly underlines the role of a traditional man, as well as sexual prowess and dominance.

Given these opposing rationales and findings regarding the role of sociosexuality, it is essential to investigate the potential influence of sociosexual orientation on judgements of male-perpetrated sexual aggression. One potential reason accounting for the opposing findings regarding the role of sociosexual orientation is that different research was conducted using different types of measures of aggression against women or that the exact motive behind the aggression was not specified. Sexually restricted individuals may be more likely to support norms and make more tolerant judgments of aggressive conduct that functions to control an existing intimate partner's sexuality as a form of mate-guarding. However, a restricted sociosexuality may not be related to tolerant judgments of male perpetrated partner aggression if the aggression is not related to jealousy or mate-guarding. In contrast, one may expect that sexually unrestricted individuals would have more tolerant judgements of male

aggression and sexual coercion when it is used to gain access to new sexual partners. As an unrestricted sociosexual orientation is considered to be especially problematic for men, male participants are expected to judge the perpetrator more leniently than women when aggression was used to acquire sexual intercourse. Overall, the question arises whether sociosexual orientation manifests differently in the judgements of sexual aggression when aggression is used to deter threats of infidelity versus when it is used to acquire sexual intercourse.

The Present Study

Previous research has shown that judgements of violence against women are related to the chance of actual perpetration of sexual aggression towards women. Thus, understanding the origins of violence-supportive attitudes is of crucial importance to overcome gender-based violence. Several factors influencing the judgements have been examined, however, little is known about whether individual-level psychological factors such as dispositional jealousy and sociosexual orientation influence judgements of men perpetrating sexual aggression against a female intimate partner.

The overarching research question investigated in this study is formulated as follows: *“To what extent do dispositional jealousy and sociosexual orientation influence judgements of men who perpetrate sexual aggression against a female intimate partner?”* Furthermore, it will be examined whether sociosexual orientation manifests differently based on the antecedent reason of aggression. It is predicted that a restricted sociosexual orientation relates to more lenient judgements of sexual aggression when it is used to deter a partner’s infidelity. Whereas an unrestricted sociosexual orientation would relate to more lenient judgements when sexual aggression is used to acquire additional sexual partners.

Four hypotheses are tested in order to provide an answer to the research question:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Individuals indicating higher levels of dispositional jealousy will display more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate sexual aggression against a female intimate partner, but only when the perpetrator used sexual aggression to deter threats of infidelity (not when the perpetrator used sexual aggression to acquire a new sexual partner).

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Individuals with a *restricted* sociosexual orientation will show more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate sexual aggression against a female intimate partner, but only when the perpetrator used sexual aggression to deter threats of infidelity (not when the perpetrator used sexual aggression to acquire a new sexual partner).

Hypothesis 3 (H3): Individuals with an *unrestricted* sociosexual orientation will show more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate sexual aggression against a female intimate partner, but only when the perpetrator used sexual aggression to acquire a new sexual partner (not when the perpetrator used sexual aggression to deter threats of infidelity).

Hypothesis 4 (H4): The relationship between an *unrestricted* sociosexual orientation and more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate sexual aggression in order to acquire sexual intercourse will be pronounced in male participants.

Methods

Participants

A convenience sample of 111 participants was recruited via the test subject system SONA of the University of Twente and social media including WhatsApp, Instagram, and Facebook. Students participating via SONA were compensated with 0.25 credits. The data collection proceeded over 4 weeks. Eligibility criteria required participants to be 18 years old or older and to be proficient in English. Exclusion criteria encompassed missing responses to the majority of items, not passing at least one of the attention checks, or not meeting the eligibility criteria. In total, 12 participants were excluded due to failing at least one of the attention checks, and a final sample of 99 participants between 18 and 71 years of age ($M = 25.24$, $SD = 10.33$) was left. 72 female, 27 male participants took part in the study. The further demographic characteristics of the participants are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic characteristics of the participants (N=99)

Variable		Frequency	Percent	Mean	SD
Nationality	Dutch	13	13.1	-	-
	German	77	77.8	-	-
	Other	9	9.1	-	-
Ethnicity	White	94	94.9	-	-
	Mixed race	1	1.0	-	-
	Other	4	4.0	-	-
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	89	89.9	-	-
	Bisexual	9	9.1	-	-
	Other	1	1.0	-	-
Relationship Status	Single	41	41.4	-	-
	Closed Relationship	44	44.4	-	-
	Open Relationship	2	2.0	-	-

	Engaged	1	1.0	-	-
	Married	11	11.1	-	-
Religiosity ^a	-	-	-	3.12	1.59
Political Orientation ^b	-	-	-	3.18	1.01
Occupation	Student	72	72.7	-	-
	Employee with wage	23	23.2	-	-
	Self-employed	2	2.0	-	-
	Pensioner	1	1.0	-	-
	Other occupation	1	1.0	-	-
Level of Education	VMBO/Realschule/ Hauptschule/Middleschool	1	1.0	-	-
	HAVO/VWO/Gymnasium/ Highschool	68	68.7	-	-
	Academic Bachelor	21	21.2	-	-
	Academic Master	9	9.1	-	-

^a Religiosity is measured on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very religious)

^b Political Orientation is measured on 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very left-wing) to 7 (very right-wing)

Design and Procedure

The current study used a cross-sectional correlational survey design implemented in Qualtrics. Before the study was published, ethical approval was obtained from the ethics committee of the Faculty of Behavioural, Management, and Social Sciences at the University of Twente. Prior to commencing the study, a description of the study and an informed consent form were provided (see Appendix A). Furthermore, a trigger warning was included which indicated that some elements of the study concern private matters and might evoke negative feelings or distress. After the participants gave consent, they provided demographic information. Subsequently, participants were randomly assigned to either a jealousy-related or a non-jealousy-related sexual aggression scenario. Thereafter, participants responded to questions measuring their judgement of the perpetrator, sociosexual orientation, and dispositional jealousy. In order to avoid possible bias, it was decided to not display these questions until the participants read the scenario and dependent measures. It was assumed that participant's judgement of the perpetrator could be influenced if they would have completed the scales measuring sociosexual orientation and dispositional jealousy before reading the

scenario. After filling out the questionnaires, all participants were debriefed and thanked for participation (see Appendix B). Throughout the survey, attention checks were incorporated to ensure that the participant was paying attention (e.g., “To show that you are reading this statement, please select two as a response to this question”).

Manipulations

Sexual Aggression Scenarios

Two short textual scenarios displaying sexual aggression were developed for this study. The scenarios were adopted and adjusted from previous research (Gul & Schuster, 2020). Participants were assigned to read either a jealousy-related scenario or a non-jealousy-related scenario. The scenarios displayed a one-time sexual aggression incident concerning two heterosexual individuals involved in an intimate relationship. The displayed sexually aggressive action was the same in both scenarios, but the antecedent reasons differed. In the jealousy-related scenario, a male named Tom perpetrates sexual aggression against his pregnant wife Karen after he finds out that Karen cheated on him and is having a baby with another man. After a verbal argument, he forces her to have sexual intercourse with him. In the non-jealousy-related scenario, a male named Tom perpetrates sexual aggression against his neighbour Karen. After being rejected by Karen, Tom feels challenged by her defences and forces her to have sexual intercourse with him. Both scenarios can be found in Appendix D.

Manipulation Checks for Scenarios

To assess whether the two scenarios were perceived differently based on the antecedent reason of the aggression (jealousy- or non-jealousy-related sexual aggression), manipulation checks were incorporated. By means of two items, participants were asked to indicate to what extent the incident was provoked by jealousy (“To what extent do you think Karen’s behaviour is considered cheating?” and “To what extent do you think Tom’s behaviour was provoked by jealousy?”). Responses were rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). The two items showed a moderate positive correlation ($r(96) = .56$) and were combined into a scale by averaging the items. For this two-item scale, a Spearman-Brown coefficient was calculated and indicated $r_{sb} = .72$. It was assumed that participants who were assigned to the jealousy-related scenario would show higher scores than participants assigned to the non-jealousy-related scenario.

Measures

Judgements of the Incident, Perpetrator, and Victim

The participants answered 18 questions about the incident and those involved (see Appendix E). The items were selected based on other studies (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008; Krahé et al., 2007). A 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much) was utilised to measure the participant's judgements. Two questions concerned the perception of the victim (e.g., "How much did Karen deserve what happened"), twelve questions examined the perception and judgement of the perpetrator (e.g., "How acceptable was Tom's reaction?" or "How intentional was Tom's behaviour?"), two questions measured the perceived seriousness of the incident (e.g., "How serious was the incident?"), and two questions related to the punishment of the perpetrator (e.g., "How strongly do you think Tom ought to be held criminally liable for the incident?").

Since the scale measuring judgements was composed of items used in different prior studies, an exploratory factor analysis utilizing principal axis factoring and an oblimin (oblique) rotation of the 18 items was conducted on data gathered from 99 participants who either read a jealousy- or non-jealousy-related sexual aggression scenario. The analysis suggested a five-factor solution explaining 66.35% of the variance. Based on the factor solution, five scales were created, namely leniency towards the perpetrator (8 items; loadings ranged from .34 to .68), sympathy towards the perpetrator (4 items; loadings ranged from -.86 to -.30), perceived control of the perpetrator (2 items; loadings are .62 to .75), tolerance of aggressiveness (2 factors; loadings are .62 and .81), and absence of punishment of the perpetrator (2 factors; loadings are -.96 and -.31). The pattern matrix can be found in Appendix F. Reliability analyses (Cronbach's alpha) showed good reliability for the scale leniency towards the perpetrator ($\alpha=.80$) and acceptable reliability for the scale measuring sympathy towards the perpetrator ($\alpha=.73$). For the two-item scales, Spearman-Brown coefficients were calculated and indicated $r_{sb}=.70$ for the scale of perceived control, $r_{sb}=.65$ for tolerance of aggressiveness, and $r_{sb}=.62$ absence of punishment of the perpetrator.

A global judgement scale was also obtained by averaging the means of the 18 items. A Cronbach's alpha of $\alpha=.86$ indicated good reliability. Higher scores on the global judgement scale as well as on the subscales represent more lenient judgements of the perpetrator.

Sociosexual Orientation

Participants completed the Revised Sociosexual Orientation Inventory which is comprised of nine items that measure an individual's tendency to engage in uncommitted sexual relationships (Penke & Asendorpf, 2008) (see Appendix G). Three facets of sociosexuality are examined and rated on a 9-point Likert scale (Penke & Asendorpf, 2008). Past behavioural experiences were measured through the first three items (e.g., "With how

many different partners have you had sex within the past 12 months?") and responses were rated on a 9-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (0) to 9 (20 or more). The three subsequent items concerned the participant's attitude towards uncommitted sex (e.g., "Sex without love is OK.") and are rated from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree). The final three items measured the participant's sociosexual desires (e.g., "In everyday life, how often do you have spontaneous fantasies about having sex with someone you have just met?") and are rated on a scale ranging from 1 (never) to 9 (at least once a day). Due to an error during data collection, one item measuring sociosexual desire ("How often do you have fantasies about having sex with someone you are not in a committed romantic relationship with?") was removed from the analyses. Consequently, eight instead of nine items formed the average global sociosexual orientation score, indicating acceptable reliability ($\alpha=.79$). A high score indicates an unrestricted sociosexual orientation whereas a low score represents a restricted sociosexual orientation.

Dispositional Jealousy

Individual differences in the tendency to be sexually jealous were measured utilizing 16 items from the Multidimensional Jealousy Scale examining cognitive and emotional jealousy (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989) (see Appendix H). Prior to responding to the items, participants were instructed to think of a current or past romantic partner. With regards to the cognitive jealousy scale, participants were asked to indicate the frequency of certain thoughts about the romantic partner (e.g., "I suspect that X is secretly seeing some member of the opposite sex." The items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (all the time) to 7 (never). Concerning the emotional jealousy scale, the participants were asked to specify their potential emotional reaction to several situations on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very pleased) to 7 (very upset). For example, one item stated, "X is flirting with someone of the opposite sex.". A global jealousy score was obtained by averaging the means of all items which indicated good reliability ($\alpha=.81$). Higher scores indicated higher levels of dispositional jealousy.

Data Analysis

All analyses were carried out using IBM SPSS Statistics, version 25. Before testing the hypotheses, the characteristics of the sample were analysed by computing descriptive statistics. Furthermore, a preliminary analysis was made to check whether the two scenarios were perceived differently in terms of the antecedent reason of the sexual aggression. Thus, to evaluate the effect of the scenario on the manipulation check scale, an independent sample t-

test was conducted. The scale manipulation check was used as the dependent variable, while the type of scenario was used as the independent variable. Moreover, descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) of the study variables per scenario condition were calculated. To examine whether the means on the judgement variables were significantly different between the two scenarios, an independent sample t-test was conducted. The judgement variables were used as dependent variables, while the type of scenario was used as the independent variable.

To test the hypotheses of the current study, Pearson correlations were calculated. Hence, to examine hypothesis one correlations between dispositional jealousy and judgement global as well as with the underlying judgement variables were examined in both scenario conditions. Correlations between sociosexual orientation and judgement global as well as the underlying judgement variables were calculated in both scenario conditions to examine hypotheses two and three. To test hypothesis four, Pearson correlations were conducted separately for male and female participants to check whether the effect is pronounced in male participants in the non-jealousy condition. The effect size of the correlation analyses was considered to be large if r was higher than .50, moderate if r was around .30, and low if the r value varied around .10. The hypotheses were confirmed if the results displayed a significance level of $p < .05$.

Results

Preliminary Analysis

Manipulation Check

As intended, the results of the independent sample t-test indicated that participants who read the jealousy-related scenario ($M = 5.79$, $SD = .93$, $N = 49$) scored higher on the manipulation check items than participants who read the non-jealousy-related scenario ($M = 1.96$, $SD = 1.19$, $N = 49$), $t(96) = 17.75$, $p < .001$, two-tailed. Thus, participants who read the jealousy-related scenario perceived the incident as being provoked by jealousy.

Descriptive Statistics

Means and standard deviations were calculated for the variables global judgement, leniency towards the perpetrator, sympathy towards the perpetrator, perceived control, tolerance of aggressiveness, absence of punishment of the perpetrator, sociosexual orientation, and dispositional jealousy (see table 2). The calculations were conducted for each condition separately.

Table 2

Means and standard deviations of study variables per jealousy-related and non-jealousy-related scenario

Variable	Jealousy scenario			Non-jealousy scenario		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Judgement Global ^a	49	1.81	.63	48	1.35	.39
Leniency towards the perpetrator	49	1.64	.75	49	1.16	.28
Sympathy towards the perpetrator	49	2.59	1.01	49	1.73	.72
Perceived control	49	3.30	1.87	50	2.43	1.45
Tolerance of aggressiveness	49	1.40	.69	50	1.41	.68
Absence of punishment of the perpetrator	49	1.90	1.17	49	1.58	.94
SOI ^b	48	3.61	1.32	49	3.76	1.25
Dispositional Jealousy ^c	48	3.60	.77	47	3.48	.77

^a The scale measuring judgements utilized a 7-point Likert scale

^b SOI = Sociosexual orientation inventory (measured on a 9-point Likert scale)

^c Dispositional Jealousy = Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (measured on a 7-point Likert scale)

Inferential Statistics

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare whether the means of the judgement variables are significantly different in the two groups (jealousy and non-jealousy condition). Individuals in the jealousy scenario condition ($M = 1.81$, $SD = .63$, $N = 49$) compared to individuals in the non-jealousy scenario condition ($M = 1.35$, $SD = .39$, $N = 48$) demonstrated significantly higher scores on judgements global, $t(95) = 4.33$, $p < .001$. Further, there was a significant difference in the scores for leniency towards the perpetrator between participants who read the jealousy scenario ($M = 1.64$, $SD = .75$) and participants who read the non-jealousy scenario ($M = 1.16$, $SD = .28$), $t(96) = 4.52$, $p < .001$. Regarding the variable sympathy towards the perpetrator, a significant difference between the jealousy ($M =$

2.59, $SD = 1.01$) and non-jealousy scenario ($M = 1.73$, $SD = .72$), $t(96) = 4.83$, $p < .001$ was displayed. Participants in the jealousy scenario condition ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 1.87$) scored significantly higher on perceived control than participants in the non-jealousy scenario condition ($M = 2.43$, $SD = 1.45$), $t(97) = 2.58$, $p = .011$. There was no significant difference in tolerance of aggressiveness, $t(97) = -.09$, $p = .931$, despite participants in the jealousy condition ($M = 1.40$, $SD = .69$) scored slightly lower than participants in the non-jealousy condition ($M = 1.41$, $SD = .68$). Further, there was no significant difference in absence of punishment of the perpetrator, $t(96) = 1.47$, $p = .144$, despite participants demonstrated higher scores in the jealousy scenario condition ($M = 1.90$, $SD = 1.17$) compared to participants in the non-jealousy scenario condition ($M = 1.58$, $SD = .94$).

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis one claimed that *"Individuals indicating higher levels of dispositional jealousy will display more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate sexual aggression against a female intimate partner, but only when the perpetrator used sexual aggression to deter threats of infidelity (not when the perpetrator used sexual aggression to acquire a new sexual partner)"*. Correlations and significance levels of the jealousy condition and non-jealousy condition are represented in table 3. The results indicated no significant correlation between dispositional jealousy and judgement global, neither in the jealousy condition ($r(46) = -.03$, $p = .868$) nor in the non-jealousy condition ($r(46) = .09$, $p = .569$). Regarding the subscales of judgement, dispositional jealousy did not correlate significantly with leniency towards the perpetrator ($r(46) = .12$, $p = .416$), sympathy towards the perpetrator ($r(46) = -.03$, $p = .823$), perceived control ($r(46) = -.11$, $p = .467$), tolerance of aggressiveness ($r(46) = -.12$, $p = .411$), and absence of punishment of the perpetrator ($r(46) = -.12$, $p = .437$) in the jealousy condition. Thus, hypothesis one was rejected.

Concerning the second hypothesis (*"Individuals with a restricted sociosexual orientation will show more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate sexual aggression against a female intimate partner, but only when the perpetrator used sexual aggression to deter threats of infidelity (not when the perpetrator used sexual aggression to acquire a new sexual partner)"*), no significant correlation between sociosexual orientation and judgement global was found in the jealousy condition ($r(46) = -.16$, $p = .265$). Sociosexual orientation did not correlate significantly with leniency towards the perpetrator ($r(46) = -.16$, $p = .265$), sympathy towards the perpetrator ($r(46) = -.03$, $p = .818$), perceived control ($r(46) = -.18$, $p = .227$), tolerance of aggressiveness ($r(46) = -.09$, $p = .558$), and absence of punishment of the

perpetrator ($r(46) = -.06$, $p = .698$) in the jealousy condition. Unexpectedly, a significant negative correlation between sociosexual orientation and the global judgement scale was found in the non-jealousy condition ($r(46) = -.35$, $p = .013$). Accordingly, the second hypothesis was rejected.

For hypothesis three (“Individuals with an *unrestricted* sociosexual orientation will show more lenient judgements of men who perpetrate sexual aggression against a female intimate partner, but only when the perpetrator used sexual aggression to acquire a new sexual partner (not when the perpetrator used sexual aggression to deter threats of infidelity”)), the correlational analysis showed a significant negative correlation between sociosexual orientation and judgement global in the non-jealousy condition ($r(46) = -.35$, $p = .013$). Further, a significant negative correlation was found between sociosexual orientation and sympathy towards the perpetrator ($r(47) = -.29$, $p = .046$) as well as between sociosexual orientation and perceived control ($r(47) = -.44$, $p = .001$). Sociosexual Orientation did not correlate significantly with leniency towards the perpetrator ($r(47) = .28$, $p = .055$), tolerance of aggressiveness ($r(47) = .11$, $p = .439$), and absence of punishment of the perpetrator ($r(47) = -.19$, $p = .201$). In contrast to the hypothesis, a more unrestricted sociosexual orientation was related to more strict judgements of the perpetrator in the non-jealousy condition. Reversely, restricted individuals judged the perpetrator more leniently in the non-jealousy condition. Concludingly, the third hypothesis was rejected. Correlations and significance levels of the non-jealousy condition are displayed in table 3.

Table 3

Correlations between study variables per jealousy and non-jealousy condition

Condition	Variable	1.	2.	3.
Jealousy Condition	1. Judgement Global	1		
	2. SOI	-.16 (.265)	1	
	3. Dispositional Jealousy	-.03 (.868)	.12 (.430)	1
Non-jealousy Condition	1. Judgement Global	1		
	2. SOI	-.35* (.013)	1	
	3. Dispositional Jealousy	.09 (.569)	.09 (.538)	1

Note. * correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed), p-values are reported in parentheses

According to hypothesis four, the relationship between an unrestricted sociosexual orientation and lenient judgements of sexual aggression in the non-jealousy condition will be pronounced in male participants. Correlations and significance levels for male and female participants in the non-jealousy condition are displayed in table 4. The results indicated a pronounced non-significant negative correlation between sociosexual orientation and judgement global in the non-jealousy condition ($r(10) = -.47, p = .094$). Further, the analysis showed a significant negative correlation between perceived control and sociosexual orientation in male participants ($r(10) = -.64, p = .013$). Sociosexual orientation did not correlate with leniency towards the perpetrator ($r(10) = -.06, p = .851$), sympathy towards the perpetrator ($r(10) = -.34, p = .240$), tolerance of aggressiveness ($r(10) = .03, p = .908$), and absence of punishment ($r(10) = -.39, p = .167$). Generally, these results were in the opposite direction as sexually unrestricted men were stricter in their judgements of the perpetrator who used sexual aggression to acquire sexual intercourse, whereas sexually restricted men judged the perpetrator more leniently. Therefore, hypothesis four is rejected. A significant negative correlation between sociosexual orientation and judgement global was evident in female participants ($r(32) = -.36, p = .037$). Additionally, significant negative correlations between sympathy towards the perpetrator and sexual orientation ($r(33) = -.37, p = .031$), as well as between perceived control and sexual orientation were found ($r(33) = -.43, p = .009$). Sociosexual orientation did not correlate significantly with leniency towards the perpetrator ($r(33) = -.29, p = .087$), tolerance of aggressiveness ($r(33) = .11, p = .520$), and absence of punishment of the perpetrator ($r(32) = -.09, p = .618$).

It is important to note that the sample did not allow a reliable test of hypothesis four as the number of male participants was low. Therefore, results were interpreted based on the effect size.

Table 4

Correlations between study variables for male and female participants in the non-jealousy condition

	Variable	1.	2.	3.
Male	1. Judgement Global	1		
	2. SOI	-.47 (.094)	1	
	3. Dispositional Jealousy	.09 (.760)	.29 (.324)	1
Female	1. Judgement Global	1		
	2. SOI	-.36* (.037)	1	

3. Dispositional Jealousy	.08 (.671)	.02 (.933)	1
---------------------------	------------	------------	---

Note. * correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed), p-values are reported in parentheses

Discussion

To overcome gender-based violence, it is essential to specifically investigate and understand the potential origins of violence-supportive attitudes. Thus, the purpose of the current study was to investigate the role of dispositional jealousy and sociosexual orientation in judgements of men who perpetrate sexual aggression against a female intimate partner. Furthermore, it was explored whether sociosexual orientation manifests differently in the judgements of sexual aggression used to deter threats to infidelity versus judgements of sexual aggression used to acquire a new sexual partner.

The results indicated that neither dispositional jealousy nor sociosexual orientation correlated with judgements of the perpetrator in the jealousy condition. With regards to the non-jealousy condition, findings contrasting to the predictions were found. An unrestricted sociosexual orientation correlated with stricter instead of more lenient judgements of the perpetrator. Furthermore, this correlation was found to be more pronounced among male participants.

Theoretical Implications

The results of the current study showed no support for the hypotheses and were partially inconsistent with previous research. The analyses indicated no correlation between dispositional jealousy and judgements of the perpetrator neither in the jealousy condition nor in the non-jealousy condition. Previous studies generated evidence that sexual jealousy triggers mate-guarding and sexual violence (Burch & Gallup, 2020) and that dispositional jealous individuals are likely to support ideological forms of mate-guarding (Gul & Kupfer, 2021). Based on this it was assumed that lenient judgements of sexual aggression are manifestations of ideological mate-guarding, motivated by feelings of dispositional jealousy in response to a perceived threat of infidelity. Thus, dispositional jealous individuals were hypothesized to judge the incident and perpetrator more leniently. The current study could not confirm this expectation.

When interpreting and comparing the results of the current study to prior research, it must be noted that this study displayed a novel focus on the influence of participants' own dispositional jealousy on judgements of sexual aggression. Because of the use of different types of measurements and forms of aggression, findings might deviate. Research that

identified sexual jealousy as a motivator of mate-guarding and sexual aggression focused on the actual perpetration of sexual aggression or intimate partner violence and did not examine the effect of participant's dispositional jealousy on judgements of sexual aggression (Burch & Gallup, 2020; Emerson Dobash & Dobash, 2010). The study by Gul and Kupfer (2021) investigated that participant's dispositional jealousy predicts support of ideological forms of mate-guarding. Although they examined the influence of the participants' level of dispositional jealousy on ideological mate-guarding, they did not measure the effect of dispositional jealousy on judgements of aggression. It is possible that dispositional jealousy triggers ideological forms of mate-guarding that restrict female sexuality. However, the results of the current study could not confirm that lenient judgements of the perpetrator are manifestations of ideological mate-guarding which are in turn supported by dispositional jealous individuals.

Next and with regards to the second hypothesis, no correlation between sociosexual orientation and judgements of the perpetrator was evident in the jealousy condition. Prior research proposed a relationship between restricted sociosexual orientation and the support of ideological forms of mate-guarding such as supporting norms that restrict female sexuality (Gul & Kupfer, 2021). These prior findings led to the assumption that as infidelity is more costly for restricted individuals, they are more concerned about mate-guarding and therefore, more tolerant when sexual aggression is used to deter threats of infidelity. Nevertheless, according to the current study, restricted sociosexual orientation did not predict lenient judgements of a male who perpetrated sexual aggression due to mate-guarding motives. Differences regarding the focus and scenarios might explain the unexpected findings. First, the study by Gul and Kupfer (2021) focused on indirect ideological forms of mate-guarding (i.e., support of female honour norms) and did not include any forms of aggression or judgements of aggression. Although a restricted sociosexual orientation predicted support of ideological forms of mate-guarding (Gul & Kupfer, 2021), the current study showed that restricted sociosexuality did not play a role in judgements of male perpetrated sexual aggression in response to threats of female infidelity. Thus, it is questionable whether lenient judgements of sexual aggression are manifestations of ideological mate-guarding tactics.

Second, Gul and Kupfer (2021) utilized a scenario during which the participants had to imagine observing one's romantic partner flirting and being intimate with another person. In contrast, participants in the current study had to judge a man who perpetrated the most severe form of sexual aggression, namely rape against his female intimate partner. Thus, a major difference concerns the inclusion of aggression in the utilized scenario. Further, in the study

of Gul and Kupfer (2021) individuals had to think of their own partner, whereas participants in the current study judged the behaviour of someone else. It may be that participants judge their own behaviour differently than the behaviour of others (Pronin, 2008). The participants in the current study did not imagine their own partner and therefore mate-guarding might be less triggered irrespective of their sociosexual orientation. As a possible result, they judged the aggressive behaviour of someone else more strictly irrespective of their sociosexual orientation.

Results contrary to the predictions were found for the non-jealousy condition. Yost and Zurbriggen (2006) proposed that an unrestricted sociosexuality may be problematic especially for males and that an unrestricted sociosexuality was associated with victim-blaming, belief in rape myths, and perpetration of sexual aggression. It was hypothesized that unrestricted individuals judge the perpetrator more leniently when sexual aggression was used to acquire sexual intercourse and that this effect is pronounced in male participants. In contrast to the hypothesis, the results revealed that unrestricted individuals judged the perpetrator more strictly. This correlation was more pronounced in male participants than in female participants. Thus, the results of the current study did not support Yost and Zurbriggen's (2006) observation. A possible explanation for this finding could be that prior research found an association between restricted sociosexuality and social conservatism (e.g., Pinsof & Haselton, 2016; Weeden & Kurzban, 2003). Therefore, one can assume a potential relation between unrestricted sociosexuality and liberalism. Unrestricted individuals may be less conservative and less likely to support traditional gender roles. Therefore, they might show less tolerance of sexual aggression against a female intimate partner and judge the perpetrator strictly.

Additional Findings

An additional finding of the current study regards the differences in the mean scores of the judgement variables between the two scenarios. The results indicated that participants who read the jealousy scenario scored significantly higher on the scales judgement global, leniency towards the perpetrator, sympathy towards the perpetrator, and perceived control compared to participants who read the non-jealousy scenario. Thus, participants in the jealousy condition judged the perpetrator and incident more leniently than participants in the non-jealousy condition. The results regarding these significant mean differences between the two scenario conditions are in line with Puente & Cohen's (2003) findings. Puente and Cohen (2003) demonstrated that in comparison to other reasons of aggression, intimate partner

violence is more likely to be accepted when a male perpetrator acted out of jealousy. This finding can be confirmed by the results of the current study.

Strengths, Limitations, and Recommendations for Future Research

Several strengths of the current study are apparent. One major strength is that the study was largely based on previously used scales and items that were proved to be reliable and valid measurements in past studies (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008; Krahé et al., 2007; Penke & Asendorpf, 2008; Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989). Therefore, concerns that the results could be influenced by low reliability and validity are unwarranted. Furthermore, the incorporated attention check items ensured the participant's attention throughout the survey to obtain high-quality data. Another strength related to the use of two different conditions. Because of opposing findings in previous research, the current study specifically compared the effect of sociosexual orientation in two different conditions, jealousy- and non-jealousy-related aggression, to examine whether sociosexual orientation manifests differently.

Despite the strengths, various limitations of the study are essential to consider. The first limitation pertains to the methodology of the study. As the study exclusively used self-reported questionnaires with predefined answer categories the results are potentially influenced by social desirability bias. Especially, survey items that measure sensitive topics such as sexual activities or antisocial attitudes are likely to be affected by social desirability bias and possibly distort the results (Krumpal, 2011). Furthermore, utilizing scenarios involves drawbacks as scenarios are possibly perceived differently than real-life situations and therefore, ecological validity might be lacking (Davies et al., 2011; Ward, 1995). As responses might differ in reality it remains rather uncertain whether the findings can be generalized to real-life settings. To account for the above-mentioned limitations, future research should reconsider the use of predefined answer categories only. Qualitative studies as well as the incorporation of open-ended questions could provide more in-depth insights into how individual-level factors influence judgements of sexual aggression and would also allow further detection of other potential variables. Furthermore, the use of qualitative studies also improves ecological validity (van der Grubben & Grubb, 2014).

Furthermore, displaying the scales measuring dispositional jealousy and sociosexual orientation after the participants read the scenario has limitations as answers were possibly biased by reading the scenario. To examine and account for possible bias future research should present the measures in a randomized order.

Another limitation is that the current research exclusively examined one type of sexual aggression, namely rape. Other more subtle forms of sexual aggression, as well as other forms

of partner aggression, were not considered. Future research should include various forms of sexual aggression and partner aggression to assess whether dispositional jealousy and sociosexual orientation manifest differently when it comes to judgements of different forms of aggression. Hence, other, and more subtle forms of sexual aggression such as sexual assault and other forms of partner aggression including physical and psychological aggression should be explored.

A further and major limitation relates to the sample. The sample was rather homogenous and included mostly white educated females which limits ecological validity and thus the generalizability to the larger population is reduced. The sample indicated a mean age of 25 years and consisted mainly of female students. One could argue that younger and higher educated females are more liberal, less likely to accept stereotypes, and more inclined to support rape victims (Idisis et al., 2007; Ward, 1995). Furthermore, approximately 91 per cent of the individuals in the sample were either from Germany or from the Netherlands. Prior research has established that the observer's culture is a relevant factor influencing judgements of aggression as culture relates to gender norms and beliefs including rape-myth acceptance and culture of honour (see van der Grubben & Grubb, 2014 for a review). Therefore, results especially with regards to judgements of sexual aggression in response to perceived threats of infidelity might be different if the sample would have represented more cultural diversity. To account for these limitations, future research should replicate the findings with a more representative sample.

The generally small sample size reduced statistical power and the ability to detect small effects. This is important to note since Gul and Kupfer (2021) showed that the effects of individual-level psychological factors such as jealousy and sociosexual orientation were small, and therefore future research should account for this by recruiting a powerful sample that suffices to detect small effects. Moreover, the small number of male participants (27 males vs. 72 females) did not allow for a reliable test of hypothesis four. Consequently, interpretations were made based on effect sizes since the small number of male participants possibly limited the statistical power and p-values were potentially unbalanced. Thus, in order to validate that there is no effect of dispositional jealousy and to replicate the findings relating to sociosexual orientation, future research should recruit a sufficiently powerful sample including a larger number of participants and more heterogeneity.

Lastly, the timing of the current study is important to consider as it was published in the midst of the global COVID-19 pandemic and the accompanying measures restricted social contacts. Therefore, responses on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory may have been

influenced. Especially items measuring past behaviour are likely to be affected as the COVID-19 restrictions allowed for fewer opportunities to engage in casual sexual intercourse with different intimate partners (Hille et al., 2021). Hence, especially with regards to sociosexual orientation, future research should replicate the findings after the COVID-19 pandemic.

Conclusion

Whilst this study did not confirm that sociosexuality and dispositional jealousy play a role in judgements of men who perpetrate sexual aggression against a female partner in order to deter threats of infidelity, it did partially substantiate an effect of sociosexual orientation on judgements of men who perpetrate sexual aggression against a female intimate partner to acquire sexual intercourse. A relationship between an unrestricted sociosexual orientation and strict judgements of the perpetrator was found. These first insights contribute to a more differentiated understanding of violence-supportive attitudes and therefore, contribute to the existing body of research. However, the current study displayed methodological and statistical limitations that need to be addressed by future research. To replicate the findings and to further clarify the role of dispositional jealousy and sociosexual orientation, future research should recruit a more powerful and heterogeneous sample. Further, different forms of sexual aggression, as well as partner aggression, should be investigated to gather a more holistic understanding of how individual-level factors influence judgements of gender-based aggression. It is essential to further investigate and to understand the origins of violence-supportive attitudes in order to prevent violence and overcome female oppression.

References

- Anderson, I., & Lyons, A. (2005). The effect of victims' social support on attributions of blame in female and male rape. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35(7), 1400-1417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02176.x>
- Bieneck, S., & Krahé, B. (2011). Blaming the victim and exonerating the perpetrator in cases of rape and robbery: Is there a double standard? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(9), 1785-1797. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510372945>
- Branscombe, N. R., & Weir, J. A. (1992). Resistance as stereotype-inconsistency: Consequences for judgments of rape victims. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 11(1), 80-102. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1992.11.1.80>
- Burch, R. L., & Gallup, G. G. (2020). Abusive men are driven by paternal uncertainty. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, 14(2), 197-209. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ebs0000163>
- Buss, D. M. (1988). From vigilance to violence: Tactics of mate retention in American undergraduates. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 9(5), 291-317. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095\(88\)90010-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095(88)90010-6)
- 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>
- Capezza, N. M., & Arriaga, X. B. (2008). 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>
- 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)
- Dartnall, E., & Jewkes, R. (2013). Sexual violence against women: The scope of the problem. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics & Gynaecology*, 27(1), 3-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2012.08.002>
- Davies, M., Austen, K., & Rogers, P. (2011). Sexual preference, gender, and blame attributions in adolescent sexual assault. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 151(5), 592-607. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2010.522617>
- Emerson Dobash, R., & Dobash, R. P. (2010). What were they thinking? Men who murder an intimate partner. *Violence Against Women*, 17(1), 111-134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801210391219>
- Frese, B., Moya, M., & Megías, J. L. (2004). Social perception of rape: How rape myth

- acceptance modulates the influence of situational factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(2), 143-161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260503260245>
- García-Moreno, C., Pallitto, C., Devries, K., Stöckl, H., Watts, C., & Abrahams, N. (2013). *Global and regional estimates of violence against women: Prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence*. World Health Organization.
- Gerber, G. L., Cronin, J. M., & Steigman, H. J. (2004). Attributions of blame in sexual assault to perpetrators and victims of both genders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(10), 2149-2165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02694.x>
- Gravelin, C. R., Biernat, M., & Bucher, C. E. (2019). Blaming the victim of acquaintance rape: Individual, situational, and sociocultural factors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02422>
- Grubb, A., & Turner, E. (2012). Attribution of blame in rape cases: A review of the impact of rape myth acceptance, gender role conformity and substance use on victim blaming. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(5), 443-452. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.06.002>
- 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>
- Gul, P., & Kupfer, T. (2021, January 5). 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>
- Hille, Z., Oezdemir, U., Beier, K., & Hatzler, L. (2021). The disruptive impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on sexual behavior of a German-speaking population. *Sexologies*, 30(1), 23-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sexol.2020.12.013>
- Hughes, S. M., Harrison, M. A., & Gallup, G. G. (2004). Sex differences in mating strategies: Mate guarding, infidelity and multiple concurrent sex partners. *Sexualities, Evolution & Gender*, 6(1), 3-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616660410001733588>
- Idisis, Y., Ben-David, S., & Ben-Nachum, E. (2007). Attribution of blame to rape victims among therapists and non-therapists. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 25(1), 103-120. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.721>
- 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>
- Krahé, B., Temkin, J., Bieneck, S., & Berger, A. (2008). Prospective lawyers' rape stereotypes and schematic decision making about rape cases. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 14(5), 461-479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160801932380>
- Krumpal, I. (2011). Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: A literature review. *Quality & Quantity*, 47(4), 2025-2047. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-011-9640-9>
- 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), 1113-1135. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.5.1113>
- Pfeiffer, S. M., & Wong, P. T. (1989). Multidimensional jealousy scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 6, 181-195. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t16039-000>
- Pinsof, D., & Haselton, M. (2016). The political divide over same-sex marriage. *Psychological Science*, 27(4), 435-442. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615621719>
- Pronin, E. (2008). How we see ourselves and how we see others. *Science*, 320(5880), 1177-1880. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1154199>
- 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>
- Reise, S. P., & Wright, T. M. (1996). Personality traits, cluster B personality disorders, and Sociosexuality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 30(1), 128-136. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1996.0009>
- 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>
- 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>
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (2001). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge University Press.
- 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), 870-883. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.6.870>
- Simonson, K., & Subich, L. M. (1999). Rape perceptions as a function of gender-role traditionality and victim-perpetrator association. *Sex Roles*, 40, 617-634. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e413782005-208>
- Van der Bruggen, M., & Grubb, A. (2014). A review of the literature relating to rape victim blaming: An analysis of the impact of observer and victim characteristics on attribution of blame in rape cases. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 19(5), 523-531. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.07.008>
- Walker, D. F., Tokar, D. M., & Fischer, A. R. (2000). What are eight popular masculinity-related instruments measuring? Underlying dimensions and their relations to sociosexuality. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 1(2), 98-108. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.1.2.98>
- Ward, C. A. (1995). *Attitudes toward rape: Feminist and social psychological perspectives*. SAGE.
- 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>
- Whatley, M. A. (1996). Victim characteristics influencing attributions of responsibility to rape victims: A meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 1(2), 81-95. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1359-1789\(95\)00011-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/1359-1789(95)00011-9)
- World Health Organization. (2002). *World report on violence and health*. World Health Organization.
- 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. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 43(2), 163-173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490609552311>

Appendix A

Description and Consent Form

PROJECT TITLE: Emotions and Judgements 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 judgements 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

Debriefing

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, 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.

Thanks again for your participation.

Appendix C

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

Widowed

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

1. Not at all religious	2	3	4. Somewhat religious	5	6	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)?

1. Very left-wing	2	3	4. center	5	6	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

VMBO/Realschule/Hauptschule/Middleschool

HAVO/VWO/Gymnasium/Highschool

Academic Bachelor

Academic Master

PhD or higher degree

Appendix D

Scenarios

Jealousy-related scenario

Tom and Karen (a heterosexual couple) have been happily married for five years. Recently, they found out that Karen is pregnant with their first child. Over the last few months, when Tom is away at work, Karen has been visiting her neighbour 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. He also starts doubting his paternity and asks whether she is pregnant from another man? Getting annoyed with Tom's persistence, Karen admits to sleeping with their neighbour. She then says "I don't want you; I want to be with him. He is an amazing lover, and he is the father of my child". In his rage upon hearing these words, Tom pushes Karen onto the sofa, swiftly moves on top of her and starts to remove her clothes. She tries to fight him off, but he holds down her arms and pushes her down with his own weight. She struggles and vehemently protests but cannot stop him from sexual intercourse with her.

Non-jealousy-related scenario

When Tom moves into a new apartment, he becomes friends with one of his neighbours, Karen. Over time, Tom and Karen start to meet more regularly, and Tom begins to develop romantic feelings for Karen. When he is alone, he often finds himself imagining what it would be like to have an intimate relationship with Karen.

One day, he invites Karen to his place for dinner. They cook together and enjoy a bottle of wine. After they spend a nice evening together, Karen feels tired and wants to go back to her apartment. But Tom does not want the evening to end, and he asks her if she can stay a little longer and gently touches her knee. Tom moves closer to her and keeps touching her. He tells her about his fantasies and how he feels about her, and that he sensed a mutual attraction and believes that Karen is feeling similarly. However, Karen clarifies that he must have misunderstood her, that she likes him as a friend, not romantically. As Tom was hoping for a different reaction, he doesn't seem to believe Karen. So, he looks at her, keeps touching her, and tries to kiss her. As Karen refuses his kiss, he starts touching her harder and says, "I know you want it too". Feeling challenged by Karen's defences, Tom pushes her onto the sofa, swiftly moves on top of her and starts to remove her clothes. She tries to fight him off, but he holds down her arms and pushes her down with his own weight. She struggles and vehemently protests but cannot stop him from having sexual intercourse with her.

Judgement Questions

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

[illegible]

Appendix F
Pattern Matrix Judgement Items

Item	Factor				
	1	2	3	4	5
J9: How acceptable was Tom's reaction?	.683				
J18: How responsible is Karen for what happened?	.630				
J19: How much did Karen deserve what happened?	.577				
J8: How understandable do you find Tom's behaviour?	.551				
J1: How positive were Tom's actions?	.518				
recJ2: How negative were Tom's actions?	.463				
recJ3: How wrong was Tom's behaviour?	.459				
recJ12: How serious was the incident?	.303				
J11: Would you want to have Tom as a work colleague?		-.862			
J10: Would you like to be friends with Tom?		-.832			
J7: How much do you sympathize with Tom?	.341	-.489			
J5: How much does Tom love Karen?		-.365			
recJ4: How intentional was Tom's behaviour?			.753		
recJ6: How much do you think Tom had control over his behaviour?			.624		
recJ14: Was Tom's behaviour aggressive?				.811	
recJ13: How aggressive was the incident?				.620	
recJ17: How strongly do you think Tom ought to be held criminally liable for the incident?					-.958
recJ15: Do you think Tom should be punished?					-.313

Appendix G

Revised Sociosexual Orientation Inventory

Please respond honestly to the following questions about your tendency to have casual, uncommitted sexual relationships.

[illegible]

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

	1.Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	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.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
To show that you are reading this statement, please select six as a response to this question.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

