TEEN PERCEPTIONS OF ADOLESCENT DATING VIOLENCE

by

Katheryn E. Morrison

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES

(Human Development, Learning, and Culture)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

(Vancouver)

August 2021

The following individuals certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies for acceptance, the thesis entitled:

Teen perceptions of adolescent dating violence

Submitted by   Katheryn E. Morrison   in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

the degree of   Master of Arts

in   Human Development, Learning, and Culture

Examining Committee:

Dr. Shelley Hymel, Human Development, Learning, and Culture, UBC
Supervisor

Dr. Elizabeth Saewyc, School of Nursing, UBC
Supervisory Committee Member

Dr. Wendy Craig, Department of Psychology, Queen's University
Supervisory Committee Member

Dr. Jennifer D. Shapka, Human Development, Learning, and Culture, UBC
Supervisory Committee Member

Abstract

Previous research has demonstrated that adolescent victims of dating violence most often reach out to a peer or friend to disclose their victimization, more so than any other form of support. Despite this, little research has explored how adolescents perceive a peer's disclosure of dating violence. Acknowledging this gap, the present study examined the reactions adolescents have toward peer disclosures of dating violence, and whether the type of dating violence disclosed would impact these reactions. Specifically, this study investigated how perceptions of blame, interpretations of the incident as violence, and intentions to respond differed if an adolescent disclosed an experience of physical, psychological, sexual, cyber-psychological, or cyber-sexual dating violence. This was the first study to quantitatively explore differences in perceptions of in-person versus cyber forms of dating violence, and was unique in exploring adolescent perceptions, as previous quantitative research features solely adult samples. As part of a national research project, a sample of 670 high school adolescents across Canada were randomly assigned to complete a questionnaire which included a hypothetical vignette of a dating violence scenario. Results indicated that the type of dating violence experienced and the age and gender of participants all played a role in blame, understandings of violence, and intentions to respond. The findings of the current study demonstrate how intervention and prevention programs can best serve youth by addressing the specific contexts and issues unique to each type of dating violence.

Lay Summary

The key goal of the current study was to assess how adolescents would perceive a peer disclosure of dating violence, and whether perceptions of blame and intentions to respond would differ if the dating violence was physical, psychological, sexual, cyber-psychological, or cyber-sexual in nature. This study was important in understanding how cyber forms of dating violence are viewed in comparison to in-person forms. In addition, this study was one of the first to explore teens' attitudes toward their peers disclosing experiences with dating violence, as most research has only considered adult perspectives. Results showed that the type of dating violence experienced, as well as the age and gender of participants all played a role in blame and intentions to respond. These findings underscore the need for universal prevention efforts to recognize the complex factors that impact peer responses to dating violence.

.

Preface

Data for the current study were collected as part of a national project conducted by researchers within PREVNET, a national organization of researchers across Canada with the aim of Promoting Relationships and Eliminating Violence in children and youth. The study was requested by the Public Health Agency of Canada. Data were collected from high school students in Ontario, Quebec, and Manitoba, Canada in 2019-2020. I was responsible for creating the hypothetical dating violence vignettes used in the current study, creating and adapting the measures on perceptions of blame, understandings of violence, and intentions to respond, as well as running subsequent analyses.

This study was approved by the Behavioral Research Ethics Board (BREB) of the University of British Columbia (UBC), approval number H18-03448. BREB long title: Preventing and addressing gender-based violence: The health perspective. BREB short title: Teen dating violence project. As this was a national project originating from Queen's University in Ontario, research ethics approval was also obtained from Queen's (approval reference GPSYC-895-18).

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

I would first and foremost like to express my gratitude to my Supervisor, Dr. Shelley Hymel, for her support, guidance, and mentorship throughout my graduate studies.

I would also like to express my appreciation to my committee members, Dr. Elizabeth Saewyc, Dr. Wendy Craig, and Dr. Jennifer D. Shapka.

I would like to thank the Public Health Agency of Canada and PREVNet, specifically Dr. Wendy Craig and Kelly Petrunka for the opportunity and support to work on the Teen Dating Violence project. I am also thankful to Dr. Melanie Dirks and Dr. Brett Holfeld and their teams for allowing me access to the data collected.

I am also very thankful for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for awarding me the Canada Graduate Scholarship for my Master's, in addition to the Lando Foundation and Faculty of Education for their funding support throughout my Master's.

I am also thankful to the SEED Research lab for all of their support and encouragement (in particular Jess, Lindsay, Angela, Randip, and Matt). In addition, I would like to thank my parents, Jim and Wanda, my sisters, Krystal and Kelly, as well as my friends (specifically Breanne, Jenn, and Amanda) for their continuous love and encouragement that helped keep me going throughout the past few years!

I would like to express my appreciation for my cat, Yammy, who has spent many sleepless nights helping me study throughout both my undergraduate and graduate degrees! This is my Master's as much as yours!

Finally, I want to thank Anna for her love and support throughout my time at UBC. I am forever grateful for all that you have done for me!

Chapter 1: Introduction

Approximately one-third of teens will experience some form of dating violence during their adolescence (Exner-Cortens et al., in press; Leen et al., 2013). Of these youth, approximately 43% will seek help from and disclose their victimization to a friend or peer, more than any other form of support, including school staff and family members (Bundock et al., 2020). While it is clear that adolescents most often reach out to peers for support, relatively little is known about how peers perceive and react to disclosures of dating violence. Understanding this is crucial, as victims of dating violence (both adolescents and adults) report that receiving a reaction to their disclosure that is unhelpful or blames them for their victimization significantly impacts their overall well-being, recovery, and whether they choose to stay in their abusive relationship (Jackson et al., 2000; Klein, 2004; Moe, 2007; Rose & Campbell, 2000).

This study explored the reactions adolescents have toward peer disclosures of dating violence, and whether the type of dating violence disclosed impacted these reactions. Specifically, using hypothetical vignettes, this between-subjects experimental study investigated how perceptions of blame, interpretations of the incident as violence, and intentions to respond differed if an adolescent disclosed an experience of physical, sexual, psychological, cyber-psychological, or cyber-sexual dating violence. This was the first study to explore differences in perceptions of in-person versus cyber forms of dating violence, and was unique in exploring adolescent perceptions, as previous research features solely adult samples.

1.1 Defining Dating Violence. In order to discuss perspectives on adolescent dating violence, a definition of dating violence is required. Dating violence is defined broadly as an act of intentional violence, or threat of violence, by a partner in a dating relationship, and generally takes the form of physical, psychological, and/or sexual violence (Breiding et al., 2015; Wekerle

& Wolfe, 1999), as well as the more recently recognized cyber forms of dating violence (Zweig et al., 2014). Dating violence types often overlap with each other, and being the victim of one form of dating violence increases the likelihood of being a victim of another form of dating violence (Leen et al., 2013).

Following Breiding et al. (2015), *physical dating violence* is defined as an intentional physical act to harm one's dating partner and can also include threats of physical harm. Examples include scratching, slapping/hitting, throwing objects at a partner, using a weapon on a partner, and physically restraining or preventing a partner from leaving a room. *Psychological dating violence* (sometimes referred to as emotional and/or verbal violence within the research literature) is defined as using words or actions against a dating partner meant to gain control and/or harm their emotional or mental wellbeing. Examples include using insults/put downs, yelling, exercising control over partner's clothing choices or with whom they spend time, excessively monitoring a partner's whereabouts, and using emotionally manipulative tactics to make a partner feel guilty or upset. *Sexual dating violence* refers to any non-consensual bodily contact for a sexual purpose (or the attempt to do so) with a dating partner, including unwanted kissing/touching, sexual coercion, threatening or manipulating a partner into sex, and rape or attempted rape (Basile et al., 2006; Breiding et al., 2015).

In addition to these three traditionally recognized and in-person forms of dating violence, the last 15 years have seen the emergence of a new form of dating violence – *cyber dating violence* – which is broadly defined as "the control, harassment, stalking, and abuse of one's dating partner via technology and social media" (Zweig et al., 2014, p. 1306). Specifically, cyber dating violence includes *cyber-psychological dating violence*, defined as using technology to access a partner's social media accounts or text messages, or to monitor a partner's activities

(Draucker & Martsolf, 2010; Zweig et al., 2013). Cyber dating violence also includes *cyber-sexual dating violence,* which involves sexually explicit photos or text messages being sent without consent (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010; Zweig et al., 2013). One factor that distinguishes cyber dating violence from the other traditionally recognized (and in-person) forms is that perpetrators have the continuous ability to contact, monitor, and abuse their victims through their phone and social media (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010). Further, the violence victims experience may be longer lasting, as perpetrators may continuously text, call, or email their victims, as well as post humiliating or private photos and content on various online platforms (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010).

Although there are similarities and differences between the traditionally recognized and cyber forms of dating violence, because the emergence of cyber dating violence is so recent in the research literature, it is still unclear whether cyber dating violence is a distinct form of dating violence or whether it is a new medium through which traditional forms of dating violence can be perpetrated. For the purpose of this thesis, cyber-psychological and cyber-sexual dating violence are treated as separate and distinct forms of dating violence, rather than a continuum of traditional forms of dating violence.

It is also important to note the varying terminology used in research regarding adolescent dating violence, such as *teen dating violence*, *dating abuse*, *intimate partner violence*, and *adolescent interpersonal relationship violence*. Often these terms are used interchangeably with little to no differences in applied meaning. For the purposes of this paper, the term *adolescent dating violence* is used to describe any form of violence within a romantic relationship (current or past) between adolescents.

1.2 Adolescent General Attitudes toward Dating Violence. While the majority of victim blame studies have focused on adult samples, research on general attitudes toward dating violence has also included adolescent perspectives, considering both general and explicit attitudes that either support, or are tolerant of, dating violence. Specifically, researchers have investigated how individuals feel overall toward the use of violence within romantic relationships, and have considered factors such as the use of manipulation and control of one's partner, minimization of violence, relationship expectations, and issues around consent (Muñoz-Rivas et al., 2011; Price et al., 1999; Slep et al., 2001). As described below, research with adolescent participants has found that the type of violence, gender, age, and previous experience with dating violence all influence one's general attitude toward dating violence.

Generally, research has found that adolescents are not very accepting of dating violence overall (Price et al., 1999; Reeves & Orpinas, 2012; Sears & Byers, 2010; Ybarra & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2019). However, there is also evidence to suggest that adolescents view some violent actions as tolerable or justified in dating relationships, particularly in certain contexts, such as when harm is not obvious, or when "joking around" (Reeves & Orpinas, 2012; Sears et al., 2006; Slep et al., 2001). Comparing types of dating violence, adolescent participants report the highest acceptance of psychological dating violence, followed by physical dating violence, and are least accepting of sexual dating violence (Price et al., 1999).

When considering participant characteristics, gender, age, and previous experience with dating violence have all been found to influence attitudes toward dating violence. First, adolescent males tend to be more accepting of dating and sexual violence than adolescent females (Courtain & Glowacz, 2021; Geiger et al., 2004; Price et al., 1999; Slep et al., 2001; Ybarra & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2019). In addition, adolescents tend to perceive female

violence toward male dating partners as more acceptable than male violence toward female

partners (Courtain & Glowacz, 2021; Muñoz-Rivas, 2011; Price et al., 1999; Slep et al., 2001).

Age has also been found to influence general attitudes toward dating violence, with younger

adolescents generally being more tolerant and accepting of dating violence than older students

(Courtain & Glowacz, 2021; Geiger et al., 2004; Price et al., 1999). Finally, previous experience

with dating violence (whether as a perpetrator or victim) has been found to influence the

acceptance of dating violence (Courtain & Glowacz, 2021; Price et al., 1999; Ybarra &

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2019).

Although important, research on the perceived acceptability of dating violence provides a

limited picture of the problem. Studies measuring the acceptability of dating violence find that,

when explicitly asked, the majority of young people do not condone or accept dating violence

(Price et al., 1999; Reeves & Orpinas, 2012; Sears & Byers, 2010; Ybarra & Langhinrichsen-

Rohling, 2019). However, a different picture emerges when an individual is asked about their

perceptions of a victim of dating violence, such as their responsibility or the severity of the

violence they experienced (Davies et al., 2001, 2006; Rogers & Davies, 2007). Research on

victim blaming, which has considered both contextual and individual factors that influence one's

perceptions of dating violence, provides a more nuanced approach to the issue, and is reviewed

below.

1.3 Victim Blaming. Within the context of dating violence and sexual assault, victim

blaming occurs when a victim is blamed for their assault and the perpetrator is exonerated of

responsibility to some degree (Suarez & Gadalla, 2010). Extending beyond the explicit blame

and perceived responsibility of victim and perpetrator, victim blaming research has also

considered a spectator or witness' perceptions as a function of a variety of factors, including the

severity of the assault, amount of trauma the victim experienced, event ambiguity, the perpetrator's intent to harm, as well as sympathy toward and trustworthiness of both victim and perpetrator (Davies et al., 2001, 2006; Rogers & Davies, 2007). The impact that victim blaming can have on a victim's well-being and recovery is significant, as research has found that negative reactions or a lack of support after assault relates to poor health outcomes in victims, such as posttraumatic stress symptoms, depression, and self-blame (Edwards et al., 2015; Moe, 2007; Orchowski et al., 2013; Ullman & Peter-Hagane, 2014). Although research on victim blaming to date has been largely, if not exclusively, conducted with adults, findings from such research on both adult sexual assault and adult dating violence provides a useful backdrop for the current study.

1.4 Victim Blaming in the Context of Adult Sexual Assault. Studies of adult perceptions of sexual assault have utilized an experimental approach in which hypothetical vignettes are used to assess differences in victim blaming across conditions. In a 2014 review of victim blame and sexual assault research using vignettes with adult samples, van der Bruggen and Grubb identified a multitude of factors that influence perceptions of blame, including observer characteristics (e.g., gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation), as well as event characteristics (e.g., level of resistance, victim intoxication level, victim-perpetrator relationship). Considering observer characteristics, adult male participants consistently hold significantly more victim blaming attitudes across multiple victim characteristics, are more accepting of rape, and are more likely to minimize the seriousness of sexual assault, compared to adult female participants (van der Bruggen & Grubb, 2014). Further, men also blame the perpetrator significantly less than women when the perpetrator is also a man (van der Bruggen & Grubb, 2014).

Considering event characteristics, research with adults has shown that victims are blamed more when they do not attempt to resist being sexually assaulted, and that the amount and type of resistance (e.g., physical or verbal) impacts perceptions of blame for both victim and perpetrator (Black & Gold, 2008; Davies et al., 2008; van der Bruggen & Grubb, 2014). For example, one study found that an adult victim who resists verbally *and* physically is blamed less for their assault compared to a victim who only expresses verbal resistance (Black & Gold, 2008). Further research has found that participants are better able to identify a situation involving sexual assault as such when the victim verbalizes their non-consent (i.e., using "no"), compared to situations without such an explicit non-consensual verbalization (Sawyer et al., 1998). In regard to the relationship between victim and perpetrator, research with adults has shown that participants blame victims the most when the sexual assault occurs in married couples, followed by dates and acquaintances, and least when between strangers (van der Bruggen & Grubb, 2014).

To date, studies investigating victim blaming and sexual assault using experimental methodology with vignettes have assessed attitudes of *adults* but not adolescent participants. Further, researchers have not assessed victim blaming attitudes when the victim and perpetrator are both adolescents in a romantic relationship. Rather, studies have considered perpetrators who are much older family members (i.e., an uncle) or other adults that are well known to the victim and their family (Davies et al., 2009, 2011; Davies & Rogers, 2009; Maynard & Wiederman, 1997; Rogers & Davies, 2007).

In summary, research on victim blaming and sexual assault has focused solely on adult samples. Despite this oversight, some of the findings within this literature may be generalizable to adolescent participants. Similar to the general attitudes research with adolescent participants, adult research has found that male participants are more likely to hold negative attitudes toward

victims of sexual assault, and that the type of violence experienced impacts attitudes and blame. One purpose of the current study was to explore whether these findings with adult participants generalize to adolescent samples.

      1.5 Victim Blaming in the Context of Adult Dating Violence. Similar to the research on victim blaming and sexual assault, adult research has also documented gender differences in victim blaming in regard to dating violence. Adult male participants have been consistently found to be more accepting of dating violence, assign less blame to the perpetrator, and are less likely to label dating violence as abuse, compared to adult female participants, although sometimes this gender difference is modest (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008; Carlson, 1999; Cauffman et al., 2000; Dardis et al., 2017; Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Rhatigan et al., 2011; Witte et al., 2006). Additionally, women perceive victims of dating violence as less responsible for their abuse and regard the perpetrators actions to be more negative than men (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008; Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Rhatigan et al., 2011l; Sylaska & Walters, 2014). Further, adult perceptions of event seriousness and/or abusiveness are highest when the victim is a woman, especially when the perpetrator is a man (compared to a male victim and/or female perpetrator) (Carlson, 1999; Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Seelau & Seelau, 2005; Sylaska & Walters, 2014). These perceptions of increased severity of the violence may be attributable to respondents' perceptions of differences in size and strength between victim and perpetrator which are typically highest with a male perpetrator and female victim, compared to female perpetrators and/or male victims (Hamby & Jackson, 2010). Further, female victims of physical dating violence are perceived to have sustained more serious injuries than male victims for the same assault, and male participants view any injury as less serious than female participants, regardless of victim or perpetrator gender (Seelau & Seelau, 2005).

Regarding responses to violence, in one 2005 study that considered participant intervention after reading a vignette depicting a physically violent domestic dispute, women were more likely than men to use systemic interventions such as contacting police or domestic violence services (Seelau & Seelau, 2005). In contrast, men were more likely to attempt to talk to the couple in the physical altercation or do nothing (Seelau & Seelau, 2005).

Studies have also shown that an adult victim's actions preceding an incidence of dating violence can serve to legitimize that violence (Pavlou & Knowles, 2001; Rhatigan et al., 2011; Taylor & Sorenson, 2005; Witte et al., 2006). For example, one 2005 study compared perceptions of fault and responsibility across physical, sexual, and psychological dating violence in an adult community sample in California (Taylor & Sorenson, 2005). Across conditions, when vignettes depicted the victim as "provoking" the perpetrator, including conditions in which the perpetrator accused the victim of being disrespectful or of cheating on the perpetrator, participants viewed the victim as more at fault and responsible for the violence than in conditions where there was no provocation (Taylor & Sorenson, 2005). Similarly, studies have also found that adults blame the victim more and blame the perpetrator less when the victim was verbally aggressive prior to their assault (Rhatigan et al., 2011; Witte et al., 2006). For example, Witte et al. (2006) demonstrated that, in conditions in which a victim used verbal aggression prior to being physically assaulted by their romantic partner, 15% of adult participants rated the victim and their perpetrator as equally to blame for the physical abuse, and almost 30% rated the victim as more to blame for their abuse than the perpetrator.

Research specifically considering victim blaming attitudes across dating violence types is limited even in studies of adults. From this limited literature, it is shown that severe acts of physical violence (e.g., beating and punching), especially those causing injuries, are seen as more

abusive and violent than less severe physical acts (i.e., shoving) (Carlson, 1999). Further, all acts of physical violence (regardless of severity) are perceived as more abusive and violent than only threats of such violence (Carlson, 1999). Additionally, conflicts that involve physical and sexual violence are perceived as more severe and abusive than those involving psychological aggression (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008; Dardis et al., 2017). When considering fault, adults are less likely to ascribe fault to the victim experiencing physical or sexual dating violence, compared to psychological violence (Taylor & Sorenson, 2005).

Perceptions of physical violence as more severe than psychological violence may be attributable to the high likelihood of visible injuries from physical violence, as an absence of physical injuries may suggest that psychological violence is not as bad as physical violence (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008; Price et al., 1999). Despite such perceptions, it is important to note that, although a victim of psychological violence may not show any visible injuries, research has shown that victims of psychological violence face many negative consequences that have detrimental impacts on their well-being (Exner-Cortens et al., 2013; Foshee et al., 2013).

To summarize, research on victim blaming in the context of adult dating violence has generally found that adult male participants hold more victim blaming attitudes overall, that provocation by victims serves to justify a perpetrator's violence, and that blame toward a victim is generally less in situations with physical and sexual dating violence, compared to psychological dating violence. One of the goals of the current study was to assess whether these perceptions are also evident among adolescent participants.

1.6 Victim Blaming in the Context of Adolescent Dating Violence. Only two quantitative studies to date have investigated victim blaming in the context of *adolescent* dating violence, both of which assessed perceptions only in adult samples. The first is a 2004 study that

compared adult perceptions of different types of dating violence that occurred between adolescent romantic partners. Specifically, Taylor and Sorenson (2004) used an experimental design to assess adult reactions to vignettes depicting physical, sexual or psychological dating violence perpetrated within adolescent relationships, asking whether the violence depicted was right or wrong, illegal, and in need of police intervention. Vignettes were approximately 80 words in length and described a violent situation between a male perpetrator and female victim which included multiple examples of each violence type. When the vignette depicted a physically violent situation, the perpetrator either slapped, punched with a fist, or beat up the victim. In the sexually violent situation, the perpetrator either pressured or forced the victim to have sex with him. In the psychological condition, the perpetrator either belittled and insulted the victim, controlled who she could contact, or destroyed her government identification cards. Further, some vignettes also included the use or threat of weapons such as "an available object," guns, or knives.

Although 97% of participants in the Taylor and Sorenson (2004) study viewed all types of violence depicted as wrong, adult participants were more likely to perceive physical and sexual violence (and threats of such violence) as illegal or in need of some form of police or legal intervention, compared to psychological aggression (i.e., insults and belittling). Severity of the violence also mattered, as participants tended to favour legal and police intervention more as the severity of violence increased. For example, participants were more likely to perceive the behavior as illegal and warranting police intervention when vignettes depicted physical dating violence with a knife or a gun, less so when the perpetrator used "an available object," and least when there was no mention of a weapon. Further, participants viewed severe sexual violence

(i.e., rape) between adolescents as most in need of legal sanctions, compared to all other forms of violence.

Although Taylor and Sorenson's (2004) study assessed differences across the three traditionally recognized forms of dating violence, the study is not without limitations. Unfortunately, Taylor and Sorenson did not assess victim-blaming per se, and only measured participant perceptions of whether or not the act was perceived as right or wrong, illegal, or in need of intervention (police or legal). There was also a ceiling effect, as the majority of participants perceived all acts of dating violence as wrong. Victim blame extends far beyond whether an act is right or wrong, illegal, or in need of intervention. Qualitative studies have shown that even when acts of dating violence are viewed as wrong, people may still tolerate, accept, or justify such violence, as well as blame the victim for "causing" the violence or bringing it on themselves (Bowen et al., 2013; Throngpiwan & McElmurry, 2009). Further, the questions used in the Taylor and Sorenson (2004) study focused more on the perpetrator's actions, whereas victim blaming also focuses heavily on the perception of the victim's responsibility in the act of violence, in addition to the culpability of the perpetrator. Simply asking about the morality and legality of one's behavior does not allow for an in-depth assessment of the construct of victim blaming.

Another limitation of Taylor and Sorenson's (2004) study is that it only included adult participants. As noted, although adult perspectives of dating violence are important, the most common source of support adolescents disclose violence to are their peers (Bundock, Chan, & Hewitt, 2018). Thus, obtaining peer perspectives of dating violence, the focus of the current study, is crucial in order to better support adolescent victims of dating violence.

A second study to assess victim blaming and adult perceptions of dating violence in adolescent dating relationships is an unpublished, 2016 dissertation that explored perceptions of physical dating violence in a hypothetical, heterosexual adolescent couple, and manipulated vignettes in terms of the severity of the physical violence depicted (Kiley, 2016). All vignettes depicted a female victim with a male perpetrator. After reading each vignette, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they believed that the victim caused the behavior, acted foolishly or carelessly, and deserved what happened to her. Responses to these items were combined to create a single blame score and the overall sample mean was compared (t-test) against a null hypothesis (a score of zero). Results were considered significant, and the author concluded that participants overall engaged in victim blaming for adolescent females experiencing physical dating violence by male partners. Unfortunately, as this study did not compare different types of dating violence, used a victim blame measure that assessed only a very limited part of the construct of victim blaming, and determined significant differences after comparing sample mean scores to zero, it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions about the meaningfulness of the findings.

Overall, research exploring perceptions of victim blaming in the context of adolescent dating violence is scarce and, to the author's knowledge, no study to date has explored such perceptions among youth, despite evidence that adolescents are most likely to disclose dating violence victimization to peers (Bundock et al., 2018). Given evidence that negative reactions to such disclosures result in adverse impacts on victims' well-being (Jackson et al., 2000), it is necessary to understand how *adolescents* are reacting and responding to dating violence in order to better understand and help their adolescent peers.

1.7 The Current Study. Although previous research on general attitudes and victim blaming within the context of dating violence has informed the current study, important gaps in the literatures exist. First, as noted previously, research to date has exclusively focused on perceptions and reactions of adult participants. The inattention to adolescent perspectives of teen dating violence ignores the most common social support for youth experiencing dating violence - peers.

Second, most research focuses on a single type of dating violence or compares two types of dating violence. Although a good start in understanding how individuals perceive and react to incidents of dating violence, researchers must also consider how each form of dating violence experienced may impact the respondent's perception of the severity of the event, the victim, or perpetrator. Little research has compared perceptions across physical, sexual, and psychological forms of dating violence, and none has considered these three in conjunction with the more recently recognized cyber forms of dating violence.

Third, research on victim blaming and dating violence has often focused on explicit and more general aspects of blame, failing to capture more nuanced understandings of dating violence as seen in sexual assault and victim blame research. Extending beyond explicit questions such as, *who is responsible* or *how wrong is this action*, the current study asked participants about the severity of the event, the amount of trauma experienced, as well as the responsibility of victim and perpetrator, allowing for a deeper understanding of individual's perceptions of dating violence (Davies et al., 2001, 2006; Rogers & Davies, 2007).

Addressing the shortcomings of previous research, the current study explored secondary student responses to peer disclosures of dating violence. Using a between-subjects experimental design in which participants responded to vignettes about different types of dating violence

experienced by adolescent peers, the current study explored adolescents' perceptions of blame, their understandings of the situation as violence, and their intentions to respond across different types of dating violence. Specifically, this study quantitatively assessed high school students' victim blaming attitudes toward adolescent dating violence, and examined relative differences across five types of dating violence - physical, sexual, psychological, cyber-psychological, cyber-sexual.

Consistent with previous general attitudes research with adolescents, it was hypothesized that:

1. Older adolescents would perceive all dating violence situations to be more violent than younger adolescents.

Consistent with previous adult research, the current study expected the following findings:

1. Physical and sexual types of violence would be considered more violent than psychological violence, for both face-to-face and cyber forms.

2. Male participants would assign more blame and responsibility to the victim, and less toward the perpetrator, compared to female participants, irrespective of the type of dating violence depicted.

Extending previous research, the current study explored perceptions of victim blame and understanding of the situation as violence for the cyber-psychological and cyber-sexual scenarios in comparison to all other violence scenarios. Of interest was whether cyber forms of dating violence are viewed differently than their traditional counterpart (i.e., cyber-psychological compared to psychological, and cyber-sexual compared to sexual). As there is not a consensus on the research regarding whether cyber forms of dating violence are distinct types of dating violence rather than a continuum of traditional forms, this study can potentially help give

direction to this argument. However, as there is no previous experimental vignette research exploring victim blaming attitudes toward cyber forms of dating violence, these analyses were exploratory.

This thesis focuses solely on female victims and male perpetrators of dating violence within an adolescent heterosexual relationship dyad. Although dating violence can occur within all forms of relationships regardless of age, gender, or sexual orientation, due to the time constraints and limited sample size, male victims, female perpetrators, and same-gendered relationship violence were not explored.

Chapter 2: Methodology

Data for the current study were collected as part of a national project conducted by researchers within PREVNET, a national organization of researchers across Canada with the aim of Promoting Relationships and Eliminating Violence in children and youth. The study was requested and supported by the Public Health Agency of Canada. Data were collected from high school students within Ontario, Quebec, and Manitoba, Canada in 2019-2020. Data collection from British Columbia for this national project was not possible due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and secondary use of data already collected for this national study has been approved by the participating researchers, and by the UBC Behavioral Research Ethics Board.

2.1 Participants

The initial sample for the study was 730 participants from school districts in Kingston, Montreal, and Winnipeg, Canada. However, two participants were removed from the sample due to not answering honestly (as determined by selecting a single answer across items in multiple sections). In addition, a further 16 participants were not included in subsequent analyses as they did not identify as either male or female (8 participants identified as non-binary, and a further 8 chose not to answer), as there were insufficient numbers to consider gender groups beyond male and female. Another 42 participants were removed who fell outside the 14- to 17-year-old age range considered in the current study (19 participants were under the age of 14, and 23 were over the age of 17). Thus, the final sample included 670 participants, of which 64.8% identified as female ($n = 434$), and 35.2% identified as male ($n = 236$). In order to explore age differences, participants were divided into two groups, with 53% ($n = 355$) of participants ranging in age from 14-15 years and 47% ($n = 315$) ranging in age from 16-17 years.

Approximately 81% ($n = 547$) of participants identified as heterosexual, 8% ($n = 52$) identified as bisexual, 3% ($n = 17$) identified as gay or lesbian, 4% as questioning ($n = 26$), 1% preferred not to answer ($n = 9$), and 3% ($n = 19$) identified as "something else". The sample was ethnically diverse, with 42% ($n = 279$) self-identifying as White/European, 11% ($n = 73$) as Southeast Asian, 10% ($n = 66$) as Mixed, 7% ($n = 44$) as African or Caribbean, 6% ($n = 37$) as South Asian, 3% ($n = 23$) as First Nations, 3% ($n = 20$), as East Asian, 2% ($n = 14$) as Métis, 2% ($n = 14$) as Middle Eastern, with 13% ($n = 90$) not answering or were unsure of their ethnic background, and 1% ($n = 10$) identifying as something else. Participants were also asked whether a friend or family member had ever disclosed to them an experience of dating violence, to which 54% ($n = 360$) indicated yes, 44% ($n = 294$) indicated no, and 2% ($n = 16$) chose not to answer. When asked about personal experience with physical and or sexual abuse, 90% ($n = 602$) indicated they had not, approximately 8% ($n = 54$) indicated that they had been a victim, and 2% ($n = 14$) chose not to answer.

2.2 Design

The study involved a 5 (type of dating violence [physical, psychological, sexual, cyber-psychological, cyber-sexual]) X 2 (participant gender) X 2 (participant age group [14-15-year-olds, 16-17-year-olds]) quasi-experimental design.

2.3 Procedure

The survey was conducted entirely online using survey software (Qualtrics) and was completed during regular class time in participating secondary schools. The study took approximately 30-40 minutes to complete. Parental consent was obtained by first sending parents information about the research. Parents that approved their children's participation in the study filled out a consent form and sent it to their child's school. Only those students who received

parental consent were included in the study. Informed assent was obtained from all participating students who had parental consent. Students were informed that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

Prior to participating, participants were also advised about the nature of the study, and that the survey would ask them questions about their attitudes, knowledge, and experiences with teen dating violence, as well as obtaining demographic information about them (survey sections used in the current study are described below and included in Appendices A to D). All surveys were identical with the exception of the vignette depicting the dating violence scenario. For the dating violence vignette section, participants were randomly assigned to one of five possible conditions, and each participant read only a single hypothetical vignette depicting a dating violence scenario between two students at the participant's school, and that the participant was asked to imagine that a peer had disclosed the experience them. In the vignette, the victim was always a female student, and the perpetrator was always a male student. All vignettes (described in detail below, and also included in Appendix B) were identical with the exception of the type of violence the victim reported experiencing. After reading the vignette, participants answered manipulation check questions regarding aspects of the vignette they had just read, followed by questions about their perceptions of and reactions to the incident.

After completing the survey, participants read through a debriefing page that informed them about the nature of the study. This page included online support resources for participants that may have felt discomfort by participating in the study. In addition, information was provided to participants if they had any questions for the researchers, and information on how to contact the researchers or the Behavioral Research Ethics Board affiliated with the study.

2.4 Measures

As part of a large national project on teen dating violence, participants in the study completed a survey that included measures of (a) demographics, (b) general attitudes toward dating and sexual violence, (c) general acceptability of dating violence, (d) questions regarding a hypothetical dating violence incident that was disclosed to them, including perceived victim and perpetrator blame, perception of the incident as violence, and intentions to act, (e) their own experiences with dating violence, (f) depression, (g) alcohol use, and (h) rape myths. The current study focuses on only the demographics section and the questions concerning the dating violence vignettes. The measures that were used in the current study are described below.

2.4.1 Demographic Information. Participants were asked to provide information on their age, gender, ethnicity, current relationship status, and sexual orientation (see Appendix A). Participants were also asked to indicate whether they had been a victim of physical and/or sexual dating violence (past or present), or if a close friend or family member had ever disclosed to them experiencing some form of dating violence (physical, sexual, verbal, psychological, emotional, or stalking). If participants had a friend or family member that had disclosed previous victimization, participants were asked to indicate how many people had disclosed to them.

Previous research suggests that being a victim of dating violence impacts perceptions of blame in dating violence scenarios, although the research is mixed regarding the direction of this relationship (Beyers et al., 2000; Dardis et al., 2017; Futerman, 2014; Rhatigan et al., 2011). Further, studies have also found that having a friend or family member disclose an experience of sexual violence reduces victim blaming attitudes toward both that specific friend or family member (Perilloux et al., 2014), or an unknown victim (Morrison & Pedersen, 2020). In order to determine the impact of personal victimization or the victimization of a close friend or family

member on perceptions of dating violence, the survey used in the current study included questions about participant experiences with disclosures of violence (albeit dating violence instead of sexual)[1].

     2.4.2 Dating Violence Vignettes. The vignettes used in the study were created by the author for the purposes of this research, each depicting a hypothetical dating violence scenario between two students (see Appendix B). The vignettes were similar in length and were written as similarly as possible, with an identical introduction, context and conclusion, but differed in the type of dating violence depicted (physical, psychological, sexual, cyber-psychological, or cyber-sexual). The term "dating violence" was not explicitly mentioned in any of the vignettes. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the five vignette conditions, and only read a single vignette within the survey.

     In each vignette, the victim was always a female student ("Anna"), and the perpetrator was always a male student ("Liam"). The vignettes depict a scenario where a student, Anna, comes to speak with the participant, a peer she has come to know over the past year, after the last class of the day. Anna informs the participant of a "confusing" experience she had with her boyfriend, Liam, and is unsure of what to do, and asks the participant what they think about the situation. Each vignette was approximately 300 words in length in order to give participants enough background information on the situation.

     2.4.3 Blame Questionnaire. The 10-item blame questionnaire, adapted from Davies et al. (2006) assessed participants' attributions of blame toward the victim and perpetrator in the

---

[1] Analyses regarding the impact of prior disclosure of violence were conducted for all blame, violence, and action items. Approximately 54% ($n = 360$) of participants had experienced a disclosure of dating violence from a close friend or family member, 44% ($n = 294$) had not, and 2% ($n = 16$) did not answer. Independent sample t tests were conducted with an adjusted alpha of .005 for blame and violence items, and .008 for action responses. All analyses except one were nonsignificant. Individuals who had experienced disclosure were less likely to expect school administration to take the incident seriously.

vignette (see Appendix C). The blame questionnaire includes two subscales to assess blame and responsibility of both the victim and perpetrator, with responses to all questions made on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*pro-victim*) to 7 (*anti-victim*).

The *Reaction toward the Victim* subscale assessed participants' perceptions of the violence in terms of severity, the victim's responsibility, and the level of trauma and negative impact that is likely to be experienced by the victim. Examples include, "How responsible do you think Anna was for what happened to her in the band room?" and, "How likely do you think that what happened to Anna will negatively affect her future romantic relationships?" Previous research with the *Reaction toward the Victim* Subscale has documented strong internal consistency for the subscale ($\alpha = .88$ and $\alpha = .92$; Davies et al, 2006; Morrison & Pedersen, 2020, respectively).

The *Reaction toward the Perpetrator* subscale measured participants' overall perceptions of the perpetrator, perpetrator responsibility for the violence, and whether the perpetrator should receive any punishment as a result of their actions. Questions included, "Should Liam be punished for what he did to Anna?" and, "Liam did not mean to hurt Anna, he just got carried away. How much do you agree?" Previous research with the *Reaction toward the Perpetrator Subscale* has reported adequate internal consistency ($\alpha = .75$ and $\alpha = .72$; Davies et al., 2006; Morrison & Pedersen, 2020, respectively).

An additional item was included to assess the explicit perception of the situation as dating violence. Specifically, participants were asked, "Liam committed an act of dating abuse/violence. How much do you agree with this statement?"

As the current study reduced the number of items used from the original scale, the internal consistency of the adapted victim and perpetrator subscales were first assessed. In the

current sample, Cronbach's alpha indicated low internal consistency for both subscales, with $\alpha =$ *.548* for the victim subscale, and $\alpha = .599$ for the perpetrator subscale. The current study's low internal consistency of the blame subscales compared to prior research may be due to the combination of multiple forms of dating violence considered, or to the reduction in items included. As this scale has been utilized in past research that considered solely sexual violence, the combination of multiple types dating violence may have created considerable variation and likely impacted consistency.

Given the low reliability of both subscales, the intercorrelations among the 10 items of the scale were examined using a one-tailed, Pearson Correlation. As shown in Table 2.1 below, item intercorrelations were low to moderate at best, ranging from .01 to .49, although 80% of correlations were considered small as they fell under the 0.3 level (Cohen, 1988). Accordingly, a factor analysis was conducted to determine whether the blame scale items factored together in ways consistent with previous research.

Table 2. 1 **Pearson's Correlation Among Blame Scale Items**

Intercorrelations Among Blame Scale Items (N = 604)

	BI2	BI3[a]	BI4[a]	BI5	BI6[a]	BI7[a]	BI8	BI9	BI10
BI1[a] School Admin Seriousness	-.179**	.182**	.440**	-.051	.180**	.195**	-.024	.066	-.074*
BI2 Anna Responsibility		.222**	-.018	.309**	-.010	.002	.164**	.150**	.455**
BI3[a] Liam Responsibility			.272**	.133**	.154**	.186**	.152**	.207**	.280**
BI4[a] Liam Punishment				.022	.329**	.306**	.179**	.315**	.099**
BI5 Anna Enjoyment					.184**	.072*	.233**	.202**	.411**
BI6[a] Anna Upset						.354**	.090*	.170**	.132**
BI7[a] Anna Negative Impact							.169**	.268**	.091*
BI 8 Liam Behavior								.489**	.270**
BI 9 Liam Intentions									.260**

Note. BI = Blame Item, [a] = Reversed Scored, * $p < .05$ level, ** $p < .001$ level.

A principal components analysis (PCA) was conducted on the 10 items included in the blame scale. The suitability of PCA was assessed prior to analysis. Inspection of the correlation matrix showed that 9 out of 10 variables had at least one correlation coefficient greater than 0.3. One item on the perpetrator's responsibility did not demonstrate any correlations greater than 0.3, and as a result was dropped from the PCA and a new PCA was conducted with the 9 remaining items. Results of this analysis indicated an overall Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of 0.696, with individual KMO measures between .613 and .764, classifications of 'mediocre' to 'middling' according to Kaiser (1974). Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant ($p < .001$), indicating the data could likely be factored. Results of the PCA revealed three components with eigenvalues greater than one, which respectively explained 27.605%,

20.423%, and 11.419% of the total variance. Visual inspection of the scree plot also indicated

that three components should be retained (Cattell, 1966).

When attempting to interpret the three factors, there were issues with one factor in

particular (see Table 2.2). Although the second and third factors focused exclusively on either

victim or perpetrator items, the first and largest factor was problematic as it contained multiple

constructs within a single factor, such as items pertaining to both the victim and the perpetrator,

in addition to an item about school administration. Further, although the correlation matrix

indicated that each item did have at least one other item that had a correlation above .3, no

correlations were above .5, and most items had only one or two correlations above the .3 level,

with the majority at the .2 level or below. The low internal consistency of the original subscales,

the low to modest correlations among items, and the absence of factors that grouped together

conceptually all suggested that the 10-items from the blame scale were relatively independent of

one another and would be best analysed separately as single-item measures. Accordingly,

variations in perceptions of blame and responsibility across different types of dating violence

were assessed using a series of 10 analyses of variance (ANOVA), one for each item.

Table 2. 2   Principal Components Analysis on Blame Scale Items

Rotated Structure Matrix for PCA with Varimax Rotation of a Three Component Scale (N = 605)

Blame Items	Rotated Components Coefficients			
	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Communalities
4[a]: Should Liam be punished for what he did to Anna?	**.727**	-.052	.272	.605
6[a]: How upset do you think Anna is by this event?	**.703**	.261	-.078	.568
1[a]: If Anna reported what happened in the band room to the school administration, how seriously do you think they would take it?	**.676**	-.244	-.046	.519
7[a]: How likely do you think that what happened to Anna will negatively affect her future romantic relationships?	**.614**	.067	.218	.429
10: How much do you think Anna's behavior was to blame for what happened in the band room?	.063	**.773**	.198	.640
5: How much do you think Anna actually enjoyed the attention she received from Liam?	.100	**.735**	.076	.556
2: How responsible do you think Anna was for what happened to her in the band room?	-.148	**.734**	.094	.569
8: Liam would not have behaved this way if he didn't like Anna so much. How much do you agree?	.019	.176	**.841**	.739
9: Liam did not mean to hurt Anna, he just got carried away. How much do you agree?	.221	.146	**.810**	.726

Note. Major loadings for each item are bolded. [a] = Reversed Scored.

2.4.4 Participant Intention to Respond Questions. Participants were asked about whether and how they would respond to the dating violence scenario (see Appendix D). Specifically, participants were asked how likely they would be to engage in a list of various actions in response to the dating violence scenario, with responses indicated on a 5-point, Likert

scale, ranging from 1(*not at all likely)* to 5 (*completely likely)*. Seventeen different responses or actions were considered, including *do nothing*, *talk to Anna's parent(s) or guardian*, *talk to Liam on Anna's behalf*, *encourage Anna to talk to her parents/guardians about her feelings*, *encourage Anna to break up with Liam*, *encourage Anna to speak to an adult that she trusts*, *let Anna sort it out with Liam*, *talk to your own parent(s)/guardian and ask them what you should do*, *talk to your own friends and ask them what you should do*, *listen to Anna*, *reassure Anna that she is not to blame*, *help Anna make a decision on what to do next*, *notify a teacher*, *notify a counsellor*, *notify the principal*, and *contact the police*. Potential responses assessed in the current study were derived from previous research (Casey et al., 2018; Futerman, 2014; Sylaska & Walters, 2014), and were expanded for the current study. Most research exploring responses to dating violence has focused on accessing formal supports, such as contacting the police, and much less on informal responses, such as listening to the victim (Sylaska & Walters, 2014). The current study therefore considered both formal and informal responses to a victim of dating violence and explored possible differences in response to the dating violence type experienced. The responses to the scenario questions were meant to explore whether participants felt that action is warranted after a dating violence disclosure.

In order to determine whether item reduction was necessary, one-tailed Pearson Correlations were computed to assess intercorrelations among the 17-items. As shown in Table 2.3 below, the magnitude of the correlations varied considerably. Accordingly, a factor analyses was conducted to determine whether action items factored together.

Table 2. 3   Pearson's Correlation Among Intentions to Respond Items

Intercorrelations Among Intentions to Respond Items (N = 629)

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1 Do Nothing	-.139 **	-.174**	-.174**	-.116**	-.134**	-.211**	.238**	-.115**	-.006	-.135**	-.244**	-.228**	-.138**	-.190**	-.104**	-.133**
2 Talk to A's Parent		.223**	.378**	.042	.172**	.333**	-.135**	.419**	.154**	-.006	.042	.086*	.501**	.437**	.525**	.469**
3 Talk to Liam			.009	.164**	.077*	.084*	-.034	.045	.154**	.037	.080*	.109**	.092*	.103**	.110**	.110**
4 Enc. A to talk to Parents				.280**	.309**	.636**	-.160**	.405**	.154**	.238**	.326**	.268**	.335**	.302**	.333**	.283**
5 Enc. A to talk to Friend					.211**	.264**	.029	.126**	.379**	.237**	.278**	.247**	.039	.094**	-.001	-.040
6 Enc. A to Breakup w/ Liam						.310**	-.239**	.138**	.137**	.093*	.289**	.306**	.135**	.150**	.189**	.223**
7 Enc. A to Speak to Adult							-.194**	.323**	.122**	.294**	.363**	.377**	.351**	.396**	.352**	.243**
8 Let A Sort out w/ Liam								-.123**	.016	-.070*	-.188**	-.191**	-.171**	-.194**	-.166**	-.203**
9 Talk to Own Parent									.363**	.087*	.122**	.139**	.386**	.308**	.354**	.256**
10 Talk to Own Friend										.136**	.128**	.105**	.200**	.158**	.160**	.083*
11 Listen to A											.479**	.367**	.015	.066*	.013	-.007
12 Reassure A not to Blame												.490**	.094**	.131**	.076*	.015
13 Help A Make Decision													.140**	.156**	.094**	.040
14 Notify Teacher														.710**	.769**	.531**
15 Notify Counsellor															.707**	.517**
16 Notify Principal																.689**
17 Notify Police																

Note. Enc. = Encourage, A = Anna, * *p* < .05 level, ** *p* < .01 level.

A principal components analysis (PCA) was conducted on the 17 intentions to respond items. The suitability of PCA was assessed prior to analysis. Inspection of the correlation matrix showed that 14 out of 17 variables had at least one correlation coefficient greater than 0.3. The three items that did not demonstrate any correlations greater than 0.3 were to *do nothing*, *talk to Liam on the Anna's behalf*, and to *let Anna sort it out with Liam*, and thus were dropped from the PCA and a new PCA was conducted with the remaining 14 items. Results of this analysis indicated an overall KMO measure of 0.836, with individual KMO measures between .664 and .929, classifications of 'mediocre' to 'marvelous' according to Kaiser (1974). Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant ($p < .001$), indicating the items could likely be factored. Results of the PCA revealed three components with eigenvalues greater than one, which respectively explained 32.529%, 16.649%, and 8.749% of the total variance. Visual inspection of the scree plot also indicated that three components should be retained (Cattell, 1966).

The three-component solution explained 57.926% of the total variance. A Varimax Rotation was employed to aid interpretability of the three factors (see Table 2.4 below). The items that clustered together on the same factors suggest that factor one reflected reaching out to an adult for support, factor two reflected supporting and encouraging the victim, and factor three reflected reaching out to peers and/or your own parent. Factor one, reaching out to an adult for support, contained five items that were about reaching out to an adult in the situation, and included the items *notify the principal*, *notify a teacher*, *notify a counsellor*, *contact the police*, and *talk to Anna's parent or guardian*. Factor two, supporting or encouraging the victim, contained six items that either reflected efforts to support Anna or encouraged Anna to take some form of action, and included *reassuring Anna she is not to blame*, *helping Anna make a decision on what to do next*, *listen to Anna*, *encouraging Anna to speak with an adult she trusts*,

encourage Anna to talk to her parent or guardian about her feelings, and *encourage Anna to break-up with Liam*. Factor three, reaching out to peers and/or your own parents, contained three items that focused on reaching out to friends and/or the participants parent or guardian, and included *talking to your own friends and asking them what you should do*, *encouraging Anna to talk to her friends about her feelings*, and *talking to your own parent/guardian and asking them what you should do*. To keep each individual item or factor's scoring consistent across response actions, items within each factor were summed and then divided by the number of items to create a composite score, with higher scores reflecting greater likelihood of reaching out to adults, encouraging or supporting the victim, or reaching out to parents and peers. The internal consistency of the three factors were assessed. In the current sample, Cronbach's alpha indicated good internal consistency with $\alpha = .880$ for the reaching out to an adult for support factor, an acceptable internal consistency with $\alpha = .746$ for the supporting or encouraging the victim factor, and low internal consistency with $\alpha = .552$ for the reaching out to friends and/or the participants parent factor.

Based on the lack of previous research considering a wide range of bystander responses and the factor analysis results of the current study, variations in likeliness of different action responses across different types of dating violence was assessed using a series of six ANOVAs, one for each of the three factors, as well as one for each of the three items that did not load on the factor analyses.

Table 2. 4   Principal Components Analysis on Intentions to Respond Items

Rotated Structure Matrix for PCA with Varimax Rotation of a Three Component Scale (N =634)

Items	Rotated Components Coefficients			Communalities
	Reach out to Adult for Support	Support and Encourage Victim	Reach out to Peer or Own Parent	
16: Notify Principal	**.896**	.069	.025	.808
14: Notify Teacher	**.842**	.078	.104	.726
15: Notify Counsellor	**.794**	.152	.053	.656
17: Contact Police	**.781**	.025	-.050	.612
2: Talk to Anna's Parent or Guardian	**.692**	.043	.204	.522
12: Reassure Anna that She is not to Blame	-.016	**.795**	.050	.634
13: Help Anna Make a Decision	.045	**.741**	.019	.552
11: Listen to Anna	-.093	**.672**	.074	.466
7: Encourage Anna to Speak to an Adult She Trusts	.409	**.603**	.197	.570
4: Encourage Anna to Talk to Her Parent or Guardian	.410	**.509**	.298	.516
6: Encourage Anna to Break-up with Liam	.193	**.470**	.092	.266
10: Talk to Your Own Friends	.089	.016	**.836**	.707
5: Encourage Anna to Talk to Her Friends	-.109	.362	**.647**	.562
9: Talk to Your Own Parent or Guardian	.435	.075	**.575**	.525

Note. major loadings for each item are bolded

Chapter 3: Results

3.1 Preliminary Analyses for Blame Items

First, tests of normality were conducted. Checks of assumptions indicated some of the blame items contained outliers (as determined by being greater than 3 box-lengths from the edge of the box in a boxplot for each blame question), as well as issues with skewness and kurtosis. In these instances, outliers were removed and/or the data were transformed to deal with these violations, and then ANOVAs were re-run. In all instances overall findings remained the same and significance levels did not change, therefore, for ease of interpretation, analyses conducted with untransformed data are reported herein.

Preliminary analyses were conducted to explore gender and age differences across blame and violence items. Specifically, a series of eleven 2 (gender [male, female]) by 2 (participant age [14-15-year-olds, 16-17-year-olds]) ANOVAs were conducted, with each of the ten blame items and the single violence item as dependent variables. Results indicated significant gender differences for five blame questions, and significant age differences on two blame questions. Accordingly, both gender and age of participants were included as independent variables in subsequent analyses. Of note, there were no significant age by gender interactions. Significant gender and age effects are presented below as obtained for each of the blame and violence items.

Given the number of analyses conducted for the blame and violence items, an adjusted alpha level of .005 (rounded up from .0045) was used to determine significant effects, with alphas between .005 and .009 considered as marginally significant trends.

3.2 Primary Analyses for Blame Items

3.2.1 Administration Response. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating violence) ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in perceptions of how seriously school

administrators would consider the dating violence reported. Results indicated a significant main effect of vignette condition, $F(4, 629) = 28.303$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .153$. In contrast, results indicated a nonsignificant main effect of gender, $F(1, 629) = 4.774$. $p = .029$, partial $\eta^2 = .008$, and also a nonsignificant main effect of age, $F(1, 629) = 4.287$, $p = .039$. All 2-way and 3-way interactions were nonsignificant. Detailed results of the ANOVAs are available in Appendix E.

Follow-up pairwise analyses (Bonferroni) were conducted to detect significant differences across conditions. Means, standard deviations, and ns for the vignette conditions are presented in Table 3.1. Results of the follow-up analyses indicated that participants rated school administrators as significantly more likely to take both sexual and cyber-sexual dating violence more seriously than reports of physical, psychological, and cyber-psychological dating violence, with no significant differences in perceived seriousness between sexual and cyber-sexual dating violence. Further, participants rated school administrators as likely to take physical dating violence more seriously than either psychological or cyber-psychological dating violence, with no significant differences between the latter two.

Table 3. 1   School Administration Response by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of Perceived Administrator Response as a Function of Vignette Condition

Conditions	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Physical	4.938	1.561	136
Psychological	4.231	1.515	130
Sexual	5.669	1.328	119
Cyber-Psychological	4.069	1.575	146
Cyber-Sexual	5.606	1.459	118

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating perception of school administration taking the dating violence more seriously.

3.2.2 Victim Responsibility. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating violence) ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in perceptions of how responsible the

victim was for the dating violence she experienced. Results indicated a significant main effect

for vignette condition, $F(4, 625) = 17.629$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .101$. There was also a

significant main effect of gender, $F(1, 625) = 20.763$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .032$, with male

respondents ($M = 2.941$, $SD = 1.873$) perceiving the victim to be more responsible for their

victimization than female respondents ($M = 2.328$, $SD = 1.552$). The main effect for participant

age was nonsignificant, $F(1,625) = 1.822$, $p = .178$, partial $\eta^2 = .003$, as were all 2-way and 3-

way interactions. Detailed ANOVA results are available in Appendix E.

Follow-up pairwise analyses (Bonferroni) were conducted to detect significant

differences across conditions. Means, standard deviations, and ns for the vignette conditions are

presented in Table 3.2. Results indicated that participants rated the victim as most responsible in

the cyber-sexual scenario, compared to all other dating violence conditions. Further, the victim in

the sexual and cyber-psychological scenarios were perceived as more responsible than the victim

in the physical scenario, with no other significant differences indicated.

Table 3. 2   Victim Responsibility by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of Perceived Victim Responsibility as a Function of Vignette Condition

Conditions	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Physical	1.983	1.511	137
Psychological	2.227	1.512	129
Sexual	2.656	1.668	116
Cyber-Psychological	2.649	1.537	145
Cyber-Sexual	3.658	1.839	118

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating perception of the victim being more responsible for the dating violence experienced.

3.2.3 Victim Behavior. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating violence)

ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in perceptions of how much the victim's behavior

was to blame for the dating violence. Results indicated a significant main effect for vignette

condition, $F(4, 621) = 9.681$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .059$. Results also indicated a significant main effect of gender, $F(1, 621) = 17.797$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .028$, as male respondents ($M = 2.477$, $SD = 1.566$) perceived the victim's behavior as more blameworthy than female respondents ($M = 2.009$, $SD = 1.226$). In addition, there was a significant main effect for age, $F(1, 621) = 11.563$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .018$, as younger respondents ($M = 2.431$, $SD = 1.452$) perceived the victim's behavior as more to blame, compared to older respondents ($M = 2.054$, $SD = 1.249$). All 2-way and 3-way interactions were nonsignificant. Details of the ANOVA results are available in Appendix E.

Follow-up pairwise analyses (Bonferroni) were conducted to detect significant differences across conditions. Means, standard deviations, and ns for the vignette conditions are presented in Table 3.3. Results of these follow-up analyses indicated that participants rated the victim's behavior as more blameworthy in the cyber-sexual condition, compared to the physical and psychological conditions, with no significant differences between cyber-sexual, sexual or cyber-psychological conditions. In addition, respondents were more likely to blame the victim's behavior in the sexual and cyber-psychological conditions than in the physical condition. No other significant results were indicated.

Table 3. 3   Victim Behavior by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of Perceived Blame of Victim Behavior as a Function of Vignette Condition

Conditions	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Physical	1.746	1.164	134
Psychological	2.008	1.383	128
Sexual	2.311	1.383	115
Cyber-Psychological	2.379	1.316	146
Cyber-Sexual	2.770	1.439	118

Note. Scores ranged from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating more victim blame as a result of her behavior.

3.2.4 Victim Enjoyment. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating violence) ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in perceptions of how much the victim enjoyed the attention she received from the perpetrator. Results indicated a nonsignificant main effect of vignette condition, $F(4,621) = 2.042$, $p = .087$, partial $\eta^2 = .013$. However, there was a significant main effect of gender, $F(1, 621) = 10.529$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .017$, with male respondents ($M = 2.426$, $SD = 1.631$) perceiving that the victim enjoyed the attention she received from the perpetrator more, compared to female respondents ($M = 2.021$, $SD = 1.378$). Finally, there was a nonsignificant main effect of participant age, $F(1, 621) = 1.691$, $p = .194$, partial $\eta^2 = .003$, and all 2-way and 3-way interactions were also nonsignificant. Details regarding the ANOVA results are available in Appendix E. Means, standard deviations, and *n*s for the vignette conditions are presented in Table 3.4.

Table 3. 4   Victim Enjoyment by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of Perceived Victim Enjoyment as a Function of Vignette Condition

Conditions	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Physical	2.225	1.523	131
Psychological	1.890	1.353	129
Sexual	2.442	1.456	118
Cyber-Psychological	2.259	1.453	146
Cyber-Sexual	2.304	1.602	117

Note. Scores ranged from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating a higher perception of the victim enjoying the attention she received from the perpetrator.

3.2.5 Victim Upset. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating violence) ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in perceptions of how upset the victim would be by the dating violence. Results indicated a significant main effect of vignette condition, $F(4, 627) = 10.149$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .061$, but nonsignificant main effects for both gender, $F(1, 627) = 2.580$, $p = .109$, partial $\eta^2 = .004$, and age, $F(1, 627) = 1.824$, $p = .177$, partial $\eta^2 = .003$.

All 2-way and 3-way interactions were also nonsignificant. Details regarding the ANOVA results are available in Appendix E.

Follow-up pairwise analyses (Bonferroni) were conducted to detect significant differences across conditions. Means, standard deviations, and ns for the vignette conditions are presented in Table 3.5. Results of these analyses indicated that participants rated the victim as more upset in the cyber-sexual condition, compared to the psychological, sexual, and cyber-psychological conditions, although the cyber-sexual and physical conditions were not significantly different from one another. Further, participants in the physical and psychological conditions rated the victim as more upset than participants in the cyber-psychological condition. Finally, ratings of victim upset in the sexual condition did not differ significantly from either the physical, psychological, or the cyber-psychological conditions.

Table 3. 5   Victim Upset by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of Perceived Victim Upset as a Function of Vignette Condition

Conditions	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Physical	5.888	1.273	135
Psychological	5.797	1.310	128
Sexual	5.753	1.277	119
Cyber-Psychological	5.332	1.314	147
Cyber-Sexual	6.356	.928	118

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating perception of the victim being more upset by the dating violence experienced.

3.2.6 Victim Impact. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating violence) ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in perceptions of how likely the victim's future romantic relationships would be negatively affected as a result of the dating violence. Results indicated a significant difference for vignette condition, $F(4, 626) = 7.819, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .048$. Although nonsignificant, there was a trend of gender differences, $F(1, 626) = 7.741, p =$

.006, partial η^2 = .012, with male respondents (M = 5.291, SD = 1.357) tending to perceive the

victim as less negatively impacted than female respondents (M = 5.580, SD = 1.215). Finally,

there were no significant age differences, $F(1, 626)$ = .072, p = .789, partial η^2 = .000, and all 2-

way and 3-way interactions were also nonsignificant. Details regarding the ANOVA analyses are

available in Appendix E.

Follow-up pairwise analyses (Bonferroni) were conducted to detect significant

differences across conditions. Means, standard deviations, and ns for the vignette conditions are

presented in Table 3.6. Results of these analyses indicated that participants rated that the dating

violence would most negatively impact the victim's future romantic relationships in the cyber-

sexual condition, compared to the physical, psychological, and cyber-psychological conditions,

although there were no significant differences in ratings between the cyber-sexual and sexual

conditions. Respondents in the sexual condition rated the victim being more negatively impacted

compared to the psychological condition. There were no other significant differences among

conditions.

Table 3. 6 Victim Impact by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of Perceived Impact Toward Victim's Future Romantic Relationships as a Function of Vignette Condition

Conditions	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Physical	5.346	1.265	135
Psychological	5.056	1.356	129
Sexual	5.649	1.258	119
Cyber-Psychological	5.242	1.251	145
Cyber-Sexual	5.885	1.024	118

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating perception of victim's future relationships being more negatively impacted due to the dating violence.

3.2.7 Perpetrator Responsibility. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating

violence) ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in perceptions of how responsible the

perpetrator was for the dating violence. Results indicated a nonsignificant main effect of vignette condition, $F(4, 626) = 1.951$, $p = .100$, partial $\eta^2 = .012$. There was also a nonsignificant effect of gender, $F(1, 626) = 3.889$. $p = .049$, partial $\eta^2 = .006$, as well as age, $F(1, 626) = 1.418$, $p = .234$, partial $\eta^2 = .002$. All 2-way and 3-way interactions were also nonsignificant. Participant ratings of perpetrator responsibility did not differ across conditions, or as a function of age or sex of respondent. Details regarding the ANOVA analyses are available in Appendix E. Means, standard deviations, and ns for the vignette conditions are presented in Table 3.7.

Table 3. 7   Perpetrator Responsibility by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of Ratings of Perceived Perpetrator Responsibility as a Function of Vignette Condition

Conditions	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Physical	6.477	1.255	137
Psychological	6.203	1.275	129
Sexual	6.472	1.043	116
Cyber-Psychological	6.129	1.467	146
Cyber-Sexual	6.402	1.106	118

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating perception that the perpetrator is more responsible for the dating violence.

3.2.8 Perpetrator Punishment. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating violence) ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in perceptions of whether the perpetrator should be punished for his actions, and the extent of the punishment. Results indicated a significant main effect for vignette condition, $F(4, 624) = 31.179$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .167$. The main effect of gender was nonsignificant, $F(1, 624) = 5.786$, $p = .016$, partial $\eta^2 = .009$, as was the main effect for participant age, $F(1,624) = 2.619$, $p = .106$, partial $\eta^2 = .004$. All 2-way and 3-way interactions were also nonsignificant. Details regarding the ANOVA analyses are available in Appendix E.

Follow-up pairwise analyses (Bonferroni) were conducted to detect significant differences in perceptions of punishment deserved across conditions. Means, standard deviations, and ns for the vignette conditions are presented in Table 3.8. Results indicated that participants in the physical, sexual, and cyber-sexual dating violence conditions rated the perpetrator as deserving more severe punishment, compared to those in the psychological and cyber-psychological conditions. There were no significant differences in ratings between the physical, sexual, and cyber-sexual conditions, as well as no significant differences in ratings between the psychological and cyber-psychological conditions.

Table 3. 8   Perpetrator Punishment by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of Perceptions of Perpetrator Punishment as a Function of Vignette Condition

Conditions	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Physical	5.795	1.395	138
Psychological	4.789	1.535	126
Sexual	6.125	1.029	118
Cyber-Psychological	4.827	1.333	145
Cyber-Sexual	6.151	.985	117

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating that the perpetrator should be punished more severely.

3.2.9 Perpetrator Behavior. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating violence) ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in perceptions of whether the perpetrator's violent behavior was because he really liked the victim. Results indicated a significant main effect of vignette condition, $F(4, 614) = 4.274$, $p = .002$, partial $\eta^2 = .027$. Results also indicated a main effect for gender, $F(1, 614) = 45.265$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .069$, with male respondents ($M = 3.918$, $SD = 1.853$) perceiving that the perpetrator's violent behavior was more a result of him liking the victim, compared to female respondents ($M = 2.897$, $SD = 1.784$). In addition, results indicated a significant main effect for respondent age, $F(1, 614) =$

9.010, $p = .003$, partial $\eta^2 = .014$, with younger participants ($M = 3.636$, $SD = 1.909$) perceiving

the perpetrators violent behavior was a result of him liking the victim, compared to older

respondents ($M = 3.180$, $SD = 1.803$). All 2-way and 3-way interactions were nonsignificant.

Details regarding the ANOVA analyses are available in Appendix E.

Follow-up pairwise analyses (Bonferroni) were conducted to detect significant

differences across conditions. Means, standard deviations, and ns for the vignette conditions are

presented in Table 3.9. Results indicated that participants in the psychological and cyber-

psychological conditions perceived the perpetrator's violent behavior as a result of liking the

victim more than the cyber-sexual condition. There were no other significant differences across

vignette conditions.

Table 3. 9   Perpetrator Behavior by Vignette Condition

*Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of Perceived Perpetrator Behavior as a
Function of Vignette Condition*

Conditions	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Physical	3.314	1.876	131
Psychological	3.659	1.830	125
Sexual	3.524	1.941	116
Cyber-Psychological	3.707	1.807	145
Cyber-Sexual	2.835	1.859	117

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating a higher perception that the
perpetrator engaged in dating violence as a result of liking the victim so much.

3.2.10 Perpetrator Intentions. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating

violence) ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in whether respondents perceived that

the perpetrator did not intend to harm the victim, but got carried away. Results indicated a

significant main effect of vignette condition, $F(4, 619) = 4.649$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .029$.

Results also indicated a significant main effect for gender, $F(1, 619) = 47.851$, $p < .001$, partial

$\eta^2 = .072$, with male participants ($M = 3.516$, $SD = 1.839$) perceiving the perpetrator as getting

more carried away, compared to female participants ($M = 2.580$, $SD = 1.478$). The main effect of age was nonsignificant, $F(1, 619) = 1.080$, $p = .299$, partial $\eta^2 = .002$, as were all 2-way and 3-way interactions. Details regarding the ANOVA analyses are available in Appendix E.

Follow-up pairwise analyses (Bonferroni) were conducted to detect significant differences across conditions. Means, standard deviations, and ns for the vignette conditions are presented in Table 3.10. Results indicated that respondents in the cyber-psychological condition were more likely to perceive the perpetrator as getting carried away, compared to the physical and cyber-sexual conditions. There were no other significant differences among vignette conditions.

Table 3. 10   Perpetrator Intentions by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of Perceived Level of Perpetrator Intentions as a Function of Vignette Condition

Condition	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Physical	2.747	1.670	134
Psychological	3.169	1.609	126
Sexual	3.221	1.810	116
Cyber-Psychological	3.424	1.553	145
Cyber-Sexual	2.681	1.630	118

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating a higher perception that the perpetrator did not intend to harm the victim, but just got carried away.

3.2.11 Violence Response Item. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating violence) ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in the degree to which participants perceived the situation as an act of dating violence. Results indicated a significant main effect of vignette condition, $F(4,620) = 14.697$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .087$. The main effect of gender was nonsignificant, $F(1,620) = 5.741$, $p = .010$, partial $\eta^2 = .011$, as was the main effect of age, $F(1,620) = .282$, $p = .596$, partial $\eta^2 = .000$. All 2-way and 3-way interactions were also nonsignificant. Details regarding the ANOVA analyses are available in Appendix E.

Follow-up pairwise analyses (Bonferroni) were conducted to detect significant differences across conditions. Means, standard deviations, and *n*s for the vignette conditions are presented in Table 3.11. Results indicated that participants perceived the physical and sexual dating violence as more violent than the psychological and cyber-psychological conditions, with no significant differences between the physical and sexual conditions, nor between the psychological and cyber-psychological conditions. Further, participants in the cyber-sexual conditions were more likely to perceive the situation as dating violence, compared to the cyber-psychological condition. No other significant differences were observed.

Table 3. 11   Perception of Violence by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of Perceptions of the Situation as Dating Violence as a Function of Vignette Condition

Condition	Mean	Standard Deviation	*n*
Physical	6.240	1.241	136
Psychological	5.367	1.633	128
Sexual	6.240	1.141	114
Cyber-Psychological	5.176	1.496	146
Cyber-Sexual	5.899	1.368	116

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating perception that the perpetrator committed an act of dating violence.

3.3 Preliminary Analyses for Intentions to Respond Items and Factors

In evaluating participant responses to the disclosure, first, tests of normality were conducted. Checks of assumptions indicated some of the single action items and factors contained outliers (as determined by being greater than 3 box-lengths from the edge of the box in a boxplot for each blame question), as well as issues with skewness and kurtosis. In these instances, outliers were removed and/or the data were transformed to deal with these violations, and then ANOVAs were re-run. In all instances overall findings remained the same and significance levels did not change, therefore, for ease of interpretation, analyses conducted with untransformed data are reported herein.

Preliminary analyses were conducted to explore age and gender differences across intention to respond items and factors. Specifically, a series of six 2 (gender [male, female]) by 2 (participant age [14-15-year-olds, 16-17-year-olds]) ANOVAs were conducted, with each of the six items or factors as dependent variables. Results indicated significant gender differences for three of the intentions to respond items/factors, and significant age differences on one factor. Accordingly, both gender and age of participants were included as independent variables in subsequent analyses. Significant gender and age main effects are presented below as obtained for each of the intentions to respond items. Of note, there were no significant age by gender interactions.

Given the number of analyses conducted for the intentions to respond items, an adjusted alpha level of .008 was used to determine significant effects, with alphas between .008 and .017 considered as marginally significant trends.

3.4 Primary Analyses for Intentions to Respond Items and Factors

3.4.1 Reach out to an Adult. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating violence) ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in how likely participants would be to reach out to an adult for support if the victim had told them about experiencing dating violence. Results indicated a significant main effect of vignette condition, $F(4, 624) = 4.479$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .028$. The main effect of gender was nonsignificant, $F(1, 624) = .856$, $p = .355$, partial $\eta^2 = .001$. However, the main effect of age was significant, $F(1, 624) = 12.222$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .019$, with younger participants ($M = 2.934$, $SD = 1.009$) being more likely to reach out to an adult for support, compared to older participants ($M = 2.647$, $SD = .937$). All 2-way and 3-way interactions were also nonsignificant. Details regarding the ANOVA results are available in Appendix F.

Follow-up pairwise analyses (Bonferroni) were conducted to detect significant differences across conditions. Means, standard deviations, and *n*s for the vignette conditions are presented in Table 3.12. Results of the follow-up analyses indicated that participants in the sexual condition were significantly more likely to reach out to an adult for support than participants in either the psychological or cyber-psychological conditions, with no significant differences between the latter two. Further, participants in the cyber-sexual condition were more likely to reach out to an adult compared to participants in the psychological condition. There were no other significant differences detected.

Table 3. 12   Reach Out to Adult by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of the Likelihood to Reach Out to an Adult for Support as a Function of Vignette Condition

Condition	Mean	Standard Deviation	*n*
Physical	2.859	.942	138
Psychological	2.543	.919	128
Sexual	2.992	.960	117
Cyber-Psychological	2.627	1.034	145
Cyber-Sexual	2.932	.998	116

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating a higher likelihood of reaching out to an adult.

3.4.2 Encourage or Support the Victim. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating violence) ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in how likely participants would engage in actions that were supportive of the victim or encouraged her to take some form of action in the situation. Results indicated a nonsignificant main effect of vignette condition, $F(4, 622) = 2.036$, $p = .088$, partial $\eta^2 = .013$. However, there was a significant main effect for gender, $F(1, 622) = 52.276$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .078$, as male respondents ($M = 4.221$, $SD = .686$) were less likely to engage in supportive or encouraging actions, compared to female respondents ($M = 4.543$, $SD = .416$). Finally, there was a nonsignificant main effect for age, $F(1, 622) = .366$, $p =$

.545, partial $\eta^2 = .001$. All 2-way and 3-way interactions were nonsignificant. Details regarding

the ANOVA results are available in Appendix F. Means, standard deviations, and *n*s for the

vignette conditions are presented in Table 3.13.

Table 3. 13   Encourage or Support Victim by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of the Likelihood to Encourage or Support the Victim as a Function of Vignette Condition

Condition	Mean	Standard Deviation	*n*
Physical	4.419	.504	136
Psychological	4.349	.539	126
Sexual	4.440	.620	117
Cyber-Psychological	4.277	.542	146
Cyber-Sexual	4.425	.522	117

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating a higher likelihood of engaging in a supportive or encouraging action toward the victim.

3.4.3 Reach out to Peers and/or Your Parent. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type

of dating violence) ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in how likely participants

would be to reach out to their friends and/or parents for support, or to encourage the victim to

reach out to her friends. Results indicated a significant main effect of vignette condition, $F(4,$

$626) = 5.043, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .031$. There was also a significant main effect for gender, $F(1,$

$626) = 24.726, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .038$, as male participants ($M = 3.123, SD = .883$) were less

likely to reach out to their own friends or parents for guidance, and/or encouraging the victim to

reach out to a friend, compared to female participants ($M = 3.480, SD = .854$). Results indicated

a nonsignificant main effect of age, $F(1, 626) = .113, p = .737$, partial $\eta^2 = .000$. All 2-way and

3-way interactions were nonsignificant. Detailed results of the ANOVA are available in

Appendix F.

Follow-up pairwise analyses (Bonferroni) were conducted to detect significant

differences across conditions. Means, standard deviations, and *n*s for the vignette conditions are

presented in Table 3.14. Results of the follow-up analyses indicated that participants in the

physical condition were significantly more likely to talk to their own parent/guardian or a friend

for support on what to do, or to encourage the victim to speak with a friend, compared to

respondents in the sexual and cyber-sexual conditions. There were no other significant

differences reported.

Table 3. 14   Reach Out to Peer or Own Parent by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of the Likelihood to Reach Out to Participants Own Friends or Parents, or to Encourage Anna to Reach out to a Friend, as a Function of Vignette Condition

Condition	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Physical	3.546	.792	137
Psychological	3.236	.902	129
Sexual	3.157	.918	118
Cyber-Psychological	3.430	.852	144
Cyber-Sexual	3.137	.891	118

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating a higher likelihood of reaching out to a friend and/or parent for help, or to encourage the victim to reach out to a friend.

3.4.4 Do Nothing. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating violence) ANOVA

was conducted to explore variations in how likely participants would do nothing if a friend had

told them about experiencing dating violence. Results indicated a nonsignificant main effect of

vignette condition, $F(4, 626) = 1.972$, $p = .097$, partial $\eta^2 = .012$. However, there was a

significant main effect for gender, $F(1, 626) = 18.365$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .029$, as male

respondents ($M = 2.007$, $SD = 1.044$) would be more likely to do nothing in response to dating

violence than female participants ($M = 1.647$, $SD = .971$). Finally, there was a nonsignificant

main effect of age, $F(1, 626) = .438$, $p = .508$, partial $\eta^2 = .001$. All 2-way and 3-way

interactions were nonsignificant. Thus, there were no differences in the reported likelihood of

doing nothing in response to a disclosure of dating violence regardless of the type of violence

perpetrated. Detailed results of the ANOVA are available in Appendix F. Means, standard

deviations, and ns for the vignette conditions are presented in Table 3.15.

Table 3. 15   Do Nothing by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of Doing Nothing as a Function of Vignette Condition

Condition	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Physical	1.766	.965	137
Psychological	1.926	1.058	128
Sexual	1.752	1.012	118
Cyber-Psychological	1.999	1.107	146
Cyber-Sexual	1.690	.848	117

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating a higher likelihood of doing nothing.

3.4.5 Talk to Perpetrator. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating violence)

ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in how likely participants would be to speak to the

perpetrator themselves if a friend had told them about experiencing dating violence. Results

indicated a nonsignificant main effect of vignette condition, $F(4, 632) = 1.405$, $p = .231$, partial

$\eta^2 = .009$. There was also a nonsignificant main effect for gender, $F(1, 632) = 1.743$, $p = .187$,

partial $\eta^2 = .003$, as well as nonsignificant main effect of age, $F(1, 632) = 1.355$, $p = .245$, partial

$\eta^2 = .002$. Thus, across conditions, gender, and age, participants would be equally likely to talk

to the perpetrator on behalf of the victim. Detailed results of the ANOVA are available in

Appendix F. Means, standard deviations, and ns for the vignette conditions are presented in

Table 3.16.

Table 3. 16   Talk to Perpetrator by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of Talking to the Perpetrator on Behalf of the Victim as a Function of Vignette Condition

Condition	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Physical	3.588	1.226	138
Psychological	3.413	1.156	130
Sexual	3.648	1.225	119
Cyber-Psychological	3.624	1.149	147
Cyber-Sexual	3.789	1.201	118

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating a higher likelihood of talking to the perpetrator on behalf of the victim.

3.4.6 Let the Victim Sort it Out with the Perpetrator. A 2 (gender) by 2 (age group) by 5 (type of dating violence) ANOVA was conducted to explore variations in how likely participants would be to let the victim sort it out with the perpetrator. Results indicated nonsignificant main effects for vignette condition, $F(4, 629) = 2.055$, $p = .085$, partial $\eta^2 = .013$, as well as for gender, $F(1, 629) = 2.509$, $p = .114$, partial $\eta^2 = .004$, and age, $F(1, 629) = 3.926$, $p = .048$, partial $\eta^2 = .006$. All 2-way and 3-way interactions were also nonsignificant. That is, participants were equally likely to consider just letting the victim and perpetrator work it out, regardless of the nature of the violence or the gender or age of respondent. Detailed results of the ANOVA are available Appendix F. Means, standard deviations, and *n*s for the vignette conditions are presented in Table 3.17.

Table 3. 17   Victim Sort Out with Perpetrator by Vignette Condition

Means, Standard Deviations, and ns for Ratings of Letting the Victim Sort it out with the Perpetrator as a Function of Vignette Condition

Condition	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Physical	2.710	.968	139
Psychological	2.764	1.023	128
Sexual	2.633	1.096	118
Cyber-Psychological	2.926	1.022	146
Cyber-Sexual	2.570	1.090	118

Note. Item scores ranged from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating a higher likelihood of letting the victim sort it out with the perpetrator.

Chapter 4: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to expand on the existing literature on adolescent responses to peer disclosures of dating violence. Using a quantitative approach, this study assessed high school students' victim blaming attitudes toward adolescent dating violence, and examined relative differences across five types of dating violence. Specifically, this study explored whether participant age, gender, and the type of violence experienced by a peer influenced adolescents' perceptions of blame, understandings of violence, and intentions to act.

Several hypotheses were made in the current study in relation to participant characteristics. Considering participant age, it was first hypothesized that older adolescents would perceive all dating violence situations to be more violent than younger adolescents. Previous research has indicated that younger students are more likely to be accepting and tolerant of dating violence, compared to their older counterparts (Courtain & Glowacz, 2021; Geiger et al., 2004; Price et al., 1999). Contrary to this previous work, results from the current study did not show age as a factor that influenced perceptions of whether the perpetrator committed an act of dating violence, as younger and older students held similar attitudes. Within the current study, both younger and older students considered all dating violence situations as violence, as all condition means were quite high. Although previous research has found age differences in perceptions of violence, it is important to note that these studies were generally conducted with a wider age range than what was feasible in the current study, which perhaps relates to the lack of differences in the current sample (Courtain & Glowacz, 2021; Price et al., 1999). Previous research has included participants between the ages of 11 and 20-years-old; whereas the current study only considered participants between the ages of 14 to 17-years-old. The age range within the current study may have been too small to reveal age-related changes that emerge over longer

time periods. As the current study only considered differences across four years, in order to have sufficient cell sizes to run meaningful analyses, two separate age groups were created, one for 14–15-year-olds, and the second for 16–17-year-olds.

Although not specifically hypothesized as this was a new area of research, the current study also explored other age differences across blame and action items. For perceptions of blame, results indicated that, compared to older students, younger students perceived the victim's behavior as more blameworthy and were more likely to consider the perpetrator's actions as a response of liking the victim so much. These results are consistent with previous research indicating that younger adolescents are generally more tolerant and accepting of dating violence than older students (Courtain & Glowacz, 2021; Geiger et al., 2004; Price et al., 1999). In addition, the current study also found younger students were more likely to reach out to an adult for support in the aftermath of a disclosure of dating violence.

The quantitative research exploring action responses to dating violence disclosure is limited. However, there is some qualitative research that suggests telling an adult may be a more common response option for younger adolescents compared to their older counterparts (Casey et al., 2018). As previous research has shown that adolescents are more likely to reach out to a peer than an adult in the aftermath of dating violence, perhaps older adolescents are able to recognize that although reaching out to an adult for some form of support is a positive step to getting the victim help, it is one they recognize as a step they are less likely to actually take. It remains unclear why younger participants are more likely to reach out for support than their older counterparts, although the magnitude of these differences were quite modest in the current study.

Although the current study (in addition to previous research) found some differences across age groups in perceptions of teen dating violence, age alone may not account for these

differences in attitudes. Age may actually serve in conjunction with dating and dating violence experience in what drives these differences in attitudes toward dating violence. Research with adolescent samples has found that, in addition to age differences, experience with romantic relationships and/or dating violence (whether as victim or perpetrator) impacts their tolerance and acceptance of dating violence (Courtain & Glowacz, 2021; Price et al., 1999; Ybarra & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2019). Further, previous research has hypothesized that as students get older, they may have more experience with romantic relationships, thus becoming more aware of the impact of dating violence (Price et al., 1999). With age, they are more likely to have opportunities to enter into romantic relationships, increasing the possibility of experiencing some form of dating violence or having their peers experience such violence, which could influence general perceptions about dating violence. It is important to note that even though experience with dating and dating violence could impact perceptions of dating violence, it is unclear the direction of this relationship, and whether dating and dating violence experience impacts attitudes, or vice versa.

Although the current study included a question on the participants' experience with dating violence, the question was both limited in its definition of dating violence, as well as vague as to whether the participant was the victim or perpetrator of such violence, thus was not included in any analyses. It is important that future research consider how experiences with romantic relationships and dating violence, in addition to age, relate to overall acceptance of dating violence acceptance, as well as age-related changes in such attitudes.

In addition to age differences, this study considered whether participant gender would influence perceptions of blame. Considering previous research, it was expected that male participants would assign more blame and responsibility to the victim, and less to the perpetrator,

irrespective of the type of dating violence depicted (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008; Carlson, 1999; Cauffman et al., 2000; Dardis et al., 2017; Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Rhatigan et al., 2011; Witte et al., 2006). Consistent with previous research, this study found that male participants saw the victim as more responsible and her behavior as more blameworthy than female participants. However, in contrast to previous research, no significant gender differences were found for blame of the perpetrator, as both male and female students attributed considerable blame toward the male perpetrator regardless of the type of dating violence. Further, across conditions, male participants were more likely to view the victim as liking the attention she received from the perpetrator, and were less likely to view all dating violence scenarios as violence, compared to female participants. With regard to action responses, male participants were less likely to reach out to an adult or peer, and were less likely to encourage and support the victim after a disclosure of dating violence, compared to female participants. These findings are consistent with previous research using adult samples which also finds that women are more likely engage in more empathetic forms of support than men (Sylaska & Walters, 2014; West & Wandrei, 2002). Also consistent with previous research, male participants in the current study were more likely to do nothing in response to disclosure (Seelau & Seelau, 2005; Sylaska & Walters, 2014).

Although there were no differences in the explicit perception of perpetrator responsibility (as all participants held the perpetrator responsible, regardless of gender), there were other areas in which male participants demonstrated subtle attitudes that were supportive or sympathetic toward the perpetrator. For example, male participants in the current study were more likely than female participants to view the perpetrator's abusive behavior as a result of liking the victim. They were also more likely to consider that the perpetrator did not intend to harm the victim, but got carried away. It is important for research on victim blame to consider not only explicit views

of perpetrator responsibility but also more implicit and covert attitudes that are often overlooked. For example, in the current study, it would be difficult for a participant not to consider the perpetrator as highly responsible across all conditions as he is acting in violent ways against his romantic partner with no clear provocation. However, when considering the perpetrator's behavior to be a result of liking the victim, his intentions, or whether or not he got carried away, these questions consider the more nuanced elements of victim blaming that exonerate or lift the responsibility off of the perpetrator's shoulders. If these attitudes are held, they provide ways in which one may feel sympathy for the perpetrator, perhaps as a result of being caught up in the moment, or that he really likes the victim, and that his actions should be regarded in that light. Unfortunately, these attitudes may make people see perpetrators in a sympathetic light so they receive little to no punishment, but more importantly these attitudes end up redistributing the blame and responsibility onto the victim, further victimizing them and harming their recovery.

A primary focus of the present study was to investigate relative differences in perceptions and responses across types of dating violence. In order to best understand how the types of violence impacted perceptions of the victim, perpetrator, and intentions to respond, each blame and action item is independently discussed.

Considering school administration response, participants in the sexual and cyber-sexual conditions perceived that school administrators would take the report of dating violence more seriously than participants in the physical, psychological, and cyber-psychological conditions. In addition, participants in the physical condition perceived that school administration would take the report of violence more seriously than those in the psychological and cyber-psychological conditions. These results are likely an indication of the perceived severity of the incident, as similar research with adult samples has demonstrated that physical and sexual violence are

perceived as more severe and abusive than psychological violence (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008; Dardis et al., 2017; Taylor & Sorenson, 2004).

Considering victim responsibility, participants in the current study perceived that the victim in the cyber-sexual scenario was most responsible for her victimization, compared to all other forms of dating violence. Participants may have perceived the cyber-sexual victim most at fault because they only considered that the victim allowed the perpetrator to take a sexually explicit photo of her, while failing to consider her repeated "no" and expression of discomfort. Further, some participants may have also failed to consider how the perpetrator shared the sexually explicit photo with his friends, despite the victim telling the perpetrator not to. Previous research has shown that actions preceding incidences of dating violence can serve to legitimize that violence in the minds of many individuals (Pavlou & Knowles, 2001; Rhatigan et al., 2011; Taylor & Sorenson, 2005; Witte et al., 2006). Within the cyber-sexual scenario, participants may have considered that the victim relenting to take the photo (despite her discomfort and repeated refusals) was enough to consider her more responsible than all other scenarios.

In addition to the cyber-sexual victim being seen as most responsible, the victims in the sexual and cyber-psychological scenarios were perceived as more responsible than the victim in the physical scenario. Similar to the cyber-sexual scenario, participants may have perceived that the actions prior to the assault served to legitimize the violence for both the sexual and cyber-psychological scenarios. Because the victim in the sexual scenario initially started to kiss the perpetrator (although she withdrew her consent shortly after), and because the victim in the cyber-psychological scenario handed the perpetrator her phone and passwords, participants may have perceived these victims as more responsible than the physical victim, who clearly did not consent to being hit. It is important to note that no victim of dating violence is responsible for

their assault, and that responsibility lies entirely with the perpetrator, regardless of any actions that preceded the violence. Although no victim is at fault, past and present research has shown that for many participants, situational elements such as provocation or initial consent, seem to blur the lines of blame and responsibility. These findings identify a clear need for teen dating violence programming on prevention and bystander education to address these attitudes and misconceptions of what or who is to blame across different dating violence situations.

Considering victim behavior, participants perceived the victim's behavior in the cyber-sexual condition as more blameworthy than in the physical and psychological conditions, with no differences between the cyber-sexual, sexual, and cyber-psychological conditions. In addition, participants perceived the victims in the sexual and cyber-psychological conditions as more blameworthy for their assaults than the victim in the physical condition. Similar to victim responsibility, participants may have focused on the victim's behavior and actions leading up to the assaults when ascribing blame. It is important to note that participants responded to questions on victim blame and victim responsibility similarly, regardless of dating violence condition. Participants may have perceived the questions about the blameworthiness or responsibility of the victim as considering the same construct.

When asked about how upset the victim would be by the event, participants perceived that the victim in the cyber-sexual condition would be more upset than the victim in the psychological, sexual, and cyber-psychological conditions, without any differences between the cyber-sexual and physical conditions. In addition, participants perceived that the victim in the physical and psychological scenarios would be more upset than the victim in the cyber-psychological condition. Differences between perceived likelihood of feeling upset across the conditions may have been a result of the perceived severity of the events, leading participants to

perceive that upset would be more warranted in certain contexts (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008; Price et al., 1999). Considering physical violence, the high likelihood of physical injuries compared to other conditions, may have indicated to some a more severe incident worthy of emotional upset on the victim's part. Further, within the cyber-sexual context, the perpetrator's sharing of the sexually explicit photo of the victim without her consent may have also been seen as more worthy of upset. It is important to note that, although there were significant differences between conditions, participants recognized that all victims would be upset overall, as all scores were above 5 on a 7-point scale.

Considering negative impact, results for whether the dating violence would negatively affect the victim's future romantic relationships indicated that the cyber-sexual victim would be more impacted than the physical, psychological, and cyber-psychological victims, although there were no differences between the cyber-sexual and sexual victims. Similar to the victim upset item, participants across all conditions recognized that the victim would likely be negatively affected as a result of what happened. The increased perception of negative impact for the cyber-sexual victim may be a result of participants considering that the dating violence experienced may be longer lasting or impact their reputation, as the perpetrator has the ability to continuously show others or post online the sexually explicit photo he took of her, in contrast to a potentially isolated incident in the band room (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010). Further, some adolescents perceive that cyber forms of dating violence can be more humiliating or embarrassing than traditional in-person forms due to the potential that the events or photos can reach a large audience very quickly, and that the victim feels a loss of control in their life (Stonard, 2020).

When considering victim impact and upset, adolescents are generally able to recognize the serious impact that distributing sexually explicit images would cause, both in online and

offline forums (Stonard, 2020). Although participants in the current study recognized the harm and upset that the cyber-sexual victim would feel, this victim was also perceived to be most responsible and most to blame for her victimization. Unfortunately, as this study did not have open-ended responses to further inquire into participants perspectives on both victim and perpetrator, it is not possible to definitively know why participants responded this way. However, it does appear that understanding of the victim impact is distinct from considering victim blame and responsibility. This disconnect may be a result of the assumption that, in certain contexts, the victim should have "known better" about a perpetrator's intentions (Wakelin & Long, 2003). Participants may be able to recognize the potential long-term harm that would come out of having one's sexually explicit photos being shared without their consent, but participants may also feel as though the victim should also have recognized the risk and not allowed the photos to be taken in the first place. Similarly, in relationships with the continuous abuse of one's partner, individuals outside of the relationship can likely recognize the harm the victim experiences, but there may also be a similar belief of the victim knowing better, that if it happens once, it will happen again, or that it is their fault for staying (Casey et al., 2017). Dating violence education programs need to consider and spend time on changing the mindset of victim blame and responsibility, and help adolescents recognize the multitude of factors as to why one may send a sexually explicit photo or stay in an abusive relationship, and rather than blaming the victim, find ways to help or support them in these situations. Further, it is important for future research to consider which attitudes toward the situation, victim, and perpetrator impact whether one decides to engage in helping behaviors in the aftermath of a dating violence disclosure.

When considering whether participants perceived the victim as enjoying the attention she received from the perpetrator, there were no differences across conditions. Further, all groups did

not consider the victim as enjoying the attention as all means were quite low (as all scores were under 2.5 on a 7-point scale). The lack of differences and low means across conditions may be because of how participants considered the victim's emotional state in the scenarios. For example, all scenarios depicted the victim as unsure and confused about what to do after experiencing dating violence. Some participants may have considered these emotions as indicators of her not enjoying the attention she received from the perpetrator. Similar to victim impact and upset, even if participants considered the victim to blame for her assault, participants could still recognize that the victim would not have enjoyed the violent attention she received.

Regarding perpetrator blame items, there were no significant differences in perceptions of the perpetrator's responsibility across all dating violence scenarios. Participants across all conditions perceived the perpetrator as being extremely responsible for the dating violence (i.e., scores of 6 on a 7-point scale). In contrast, perceptions of the victim's responsibility varied by type of violence experienced and were overall much lower on average than that of the perpetrator's perceived responsibility. It appears that even if respondents thought the victim had a role in the dating violence, it was still predominantly the perpetrator's responsibility for what happened. Further, although perceived victim responsibility is context dependent (as is common in victim blame research; Davies et al., 2001, 2006; Rogers & Davies, 2007; Suarez & Gadalla, 2010), within the current study, the explicit responsibility of the perpetrator was not. This result may be due to more explicit attitudes and morals around dating violence, as participants seemed to clearly understand the obvious wrong in the perpetrators actions. However, asking about victim responsibility and blame revealed more subtle attitudes. As stated before, it is hard to not fault the perpetrator when asked explicit questions about his responsibility and actions in the

situation. However, the disconnect in responsibility happens when asked more subtle questions, such as about his intentions, his liking of the victim, and whether he got carried away.

Considering perpetrator punishment, respondents thought that the perpetrator in the physical, sexual, and cyber-sexual conditions should receive a more severe punishment than the perpetrator in the psychological and cyber-psychological conditions. Previous research with adult samples has found that sexual and physical forms of dating violence are often perceived as the ones in need of most police or legal repercussions, compared to psychological forms of dating violence (Taylor & Sorenson, 2004). These results may also indicate different perceptions in the severity of the dating violence experienced, and thus different repercussions for the perpetrator would be warranted. Indeed, previous research with adult samples has found that physical and sexual dating violence are perceived as more severe and abusive than those involving psychological aggression (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008; Dardis et al., 2017). Although these previous studies were not assessing perceptions of dating violence severity and its relationship to the severity of the punishment for the perpetrator, it is reasonable to assume the more severe one presumes the dating violence to be, the more likely one would perceive that a harsher punishment is warranted.

In relation to the perpetrator's behavior, respondents perceived that the perpetrator in the psychological and cyber-psychological conditions engaged in dating violence as a result of liking the victim more so than the perpetrator in the cyber-sexual condition. There is qualitative research to suggest that some forms of psychological dating violence, such as jealous or monitoring behaviors, are perceived in certain contexts by youth as normal or demonstrating caring for one's partner, and not necessarily as abuse (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010; Lucero et al., 2014; Sears et al., 2006). Some participants may have perceived that monitoring a partner's

whereabouts (as in the cyber-psychological scenario), or signs of jealousy (as in the psychological scenario) were actually signs of liking their partner rather than dating violence. In contrast, the perpetrator in the cyber-sexual scenario lied to his romantic partner when he said he would not share the sexually explicit photo with anyone, likely a sign of not liking her. Considering that monitoring one's partner and being jealous are sometimes viewed as signs of liking someone or a normative part of relationship maintenance, these results fall in line with past research.

Considering perpetrator intentions, participants in the cyber-psychological condition were more likely than participants in the physical and cyber-sexual conditions to perceive that the perpetrator did not intend to harm the victim; he just got carried away. Similar to perpetrator behavior, respondents may have perceived the monitoring of a partner's online activity and physical location to be a result of getting carried away in his concern for her, and not necessarily perceived as a negative or abusive action. In contrast, respondents had a hard time seeing that the intention was not to harm the victim when engaging in physical violence or taking sexually explicit photos and later sharing them. Physical violence is an intentional act, and one most people find hard to justify under any circumstances, even in moments of "getting carried away." In a similar vein, it is also hard to justify getting carried away in the moment when the perpetrator shared the sexually explicit photos later in the day after what happened in the band room.

Overall, blame attributed to the victim and perpetrator varied. However, perceptions of explicit blame toward the victim were relatively low and blame toward the perpetrator was high. Even though participants rated victim blame and responsibility low, there was still some level of blame attributed to the victim. It is important to note that any level of victim blaming has the

potential to harm and to hinder the recovery of a victim of dating violence. Research has demonstrated that victims of dating violence who receive negative or blaming reactions to their victimization report significant impacts to their well-being and recovery from such violence (Jackson et al., 2000; Klein, 2004; Moe, 2007; Rose & Campbell, 2000). In addition, for those victims who may not yet have disclosed their assault, hearing others engage in victim blaming may send the message that victims are to blame for such violence. Hearing these attitudes may cause a victim to either blame themself, or possibly prevent them from speaking out and getting support for fear of being blamed. Ultimately, when considering victim blaming attitudes, even seemingly low levels of victim blaming have the potential to harm those who have experienced dating violence.

In addition to considering victim and perpetrator blame, this study was the first to compare differences in responses to victim disclosures across five different types of violence. Although previous research has considered likely and actual actions of respondents, these studies have primarily focused on gender differences among participants, victims, and perpetrators. While it is crucial to understand gender differences in response to dating violence disclosure, one of the goals of the study was to explore potential differences across five forms of dating violence and how they may play a role in responding to a victim of dating violence.

Participants in the sexual condition were more likely to respond by reaching out to an adult than participants in the psychological and cyber-psychological conditions. Further, participants in the cyber-sexual condition were more likely to reach out to an adult than those in the psychological condition. As previous research has not considered differences across types of dating violence and disclosure recipient action, it is only possible to speculate about these findings. Similar research with adult samples has found that participants are more likely to reach

out to formal support when the violence is perceived as more severe (Dardis et al., 2017; Sylaska & Walters, 2014; Taylor & Sorenson, 2004). Further, these studies have shown that sexual violence is generally seen as more severe than psychological and physical forms of violence (Dardis et al., 2017; Sylaska & Walters, 2014; Taylor & Sorenson, 2004). Within the current study, adolescents may have considered any adult as a formal source of support, although previous research had not considered it as such (i.e., only police officers and counsellors are generally considered formal supports). For an adolescent, perhaps talking to the victim's parents or reaching out to a teacher or the principal may feel as though they are reaching out to a formal authority figure within their own lives. These findings may simply reflect youth acknowledging the serious nature of the sexual and cyber-sexual violence, and recognizing that outside support, such as a teacher or the victim's parents, is required to adequately deal with such violence.

In regard to encouraging or supporting the victim, there were no significant differences across dating violence conditions, as all conditions were very likely to engage in this type of response. The likelihood of engaging in supportive or encouraging behavior in response to dating violence disclosure has been found to be a very common response in past qualitative research (Casey et al., 2018). Even in cases where a participant held victim blaming attitudes, past research has found that some participants would still be likely to provide support or encouragement to the victim (Casey et al., 2018). In addition, the lack of differences across conditions may be a result of the actions within this construct being in the moment responses that do not require the respondent to plan or seek out other supports or information after the initial disclosure. Some of these actions are also passive on the recipient's part, such as listening to the victim. For individuals that may only engage in passive actions, these responses are not necessarily due to a lack of care, as previous research indicates that many adolescents do not feel

equipped to effectively deal with and support victims of dating violence. For some, being there

in the moment to listen to the victim or to advise them to seek outside support demonstrates care

on the recipient's part, while also acknowledging their limited capacity to help and support

victims of dating violence (Casey et al., 2018).

Regarding reaching out to peers and/or the respondent's parent or guardian, participants

in the physical condition were more likely to reach out than those in the sexual and cyber-sexual

conditions. Although significant, the magnitude of these differences was small. It is possible that

participants in the sexual and cyber-sexual conditions were less likely to reach out to a peer

and/or their parent because they may have considered that more formal forms of support (such as

law enforcement) were more necessary in these instances. Previous research has shown that

sexual forms of violence are perceived as most in need of legal intervention (Taylor & Sorenson,

2004), and perhaps participants in the current study considered that the informal support of peers

or their parent would not be adequate in this situation.

Considering whether participants would do nothing, there were no differences across

vignette conditions. Overall, few respondents were very likely to respond by doing nothing. In

contrast, Casey et al. (2018) found that, when asking adolescents about witnessing a dating

violence scenario, participants believed they would be most likely to respond by doing nothing.

A potential limitation of the current study and possible explanation for this discrepancy in

findings could be related to the use of forced choice survey questions in the current study,

compared to qualitative, open-ended interview questions utilized by Casey et al.. Participants in

the current study may have considered that within a list of 17 options, there would be at least one

action to engage in, in contrast to an open-ended question without any prompts or suggestions

about how to respond. A strength of the current study using forced choice is that it may have

helped participants really consider the likelihood of each option provided, compared to a participant quickly providing a vague response to an open-ended question. Further, using forced-choice items in the current study provided a wider range of options than has been given in previous research within this area, as these studies have either provided limited or vague response options that could be interpreted widely.

For the participants that did indicate they would do nothing in response to a dating violence disclosure, there are a number of reasons why adolescents would react this way. For example, adolescents have reported not wanting to take action in response to dating violence because they fear retribution by the perpetrator if they step in, they worry their actions will do nothing or make the situation worse, or they view dating violence as a personal matter to be dealt with in the relationship (Casey et al., 2017, 2018; Thongpriwan & McElmurry, 2009). Further, adolescents may feel unsure of how to differentiate dating violence from a "normal" argument (Casey et al., 2017). For youth that choose to do nothing, qualitative research has found these youth generally do want to intervene, but feel unequipped to do so safely and effectively, and in ways that will help the situation (Casey et al., 2017). Future research should delve deeper into why participants choose to do nothing in response to dating violence, and ascertain whether adolescents are more or less likely to do nothing depending on type of violence experienced.

Similarly, there were no significant differences across conditions for letting the victim sort it out with the perpetrator on her own. As indicated above, some participants may not know how to respond, or believe that the relationship violence is to be dealt with in the relationship (Casey et al., 2018; Thongpriwan & McElmurry, 2009). The participants who selected this option may be similar to those that would likely respond by doing nothing, as they may also lack the skills and self-efficacy needed to effectively support a victim of dating violence.

When asked about whether participants would talk to the perpetrator in response to a dating violence disclosure, there were no significant differences indicated between the types of dating violence. Across conditions, this was a somewhat common response option that participants thought they would be likely to engage in, with ratings of 3.5 out of 5 across dating violence scenarios. One possibility for this common response is that participants could have interpreted this question widely, as previous qualitative research has found some participants consider that talking to the perpetrator includes expressing disapproval of dating violence, setting expectations about appropriate behaviors within a romantic relationship, or even starting a physical altercation with the perpetrator (Casey et al., 2017, 2018). Future research should continue parsing out specifics of different possible actions in engaging with the perpetrator in order better understand other possible responses individuals may have in response to dating violence disclosure.

4.1 Limitations and Strengths

There were several limitations in the current study. First, there is the possibility of a self-selection bias for participants, as students had the option to decline participation and could withdraw from the study without consequences. Second, there may also have been systematic differences between the students who were able to obtain parental consent for the current study compared to those who were not. Third, as aforementioned, participants may have responded differently if they had been provided with open-ended rather than closed, forced-answer questions. Fourth, participants were provided with a hypothetical dating violence scenario about a peer, and were then asked to indicate their perceptions of blame and the likelihood of engaging in certain actions, which might be different than what participants would actually do if they were in that situation. Although research that asks about individual's lived experiences or provides

open-ended responses is important, quantitative research with hypothetical vignettes and forced choice questions is also critical to understanding how certain factors influence one's perception of the victim, perpetrator, and intentions to respond.

A final limitation of the current study relates to the gender of the victim and perpetrator. In addition to measuring male perpetrators and female victims, the original intent of the current study was to also consider male victims, female perpetrators, and same-gendered romantic relationships. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it was not possible to obtain a large enough sample size to consider all of these different gender and sexual orientation dynamics. The author acknowledges that dating violence can occur within all forms of relationships regardless of age, gender, or sexual orientation. It is important for future research within adolescent dating violence to explore these areas of study, as previous research has indicated that adolescent males certainly experience dating violence victimization (sometimes at equal or higher rates than female adolescents, depending on type) (Stonard et al., 2014; Wincentak et al., 2016), and that non-heterosexual individuals experience equal (Luo et al., 2014) or higher (Espelage et al., 2018) rates of violence victimization and perpetration than their heterosexual counterparts.

Despite the limitations mentioned above, the current study has numerous strengths and expands on previous research within the adolescent dating violence literature. Specifically, this study was the first to assess quantitative perceptions of adolescents regarding peer disclosures of dating violence, a critical but understudied area despite the fact that youth are most likely to disclose to peers (Bundock et al., 2020). It is also the first study to consider differences across traditionally recognized and cyber forms of dating violence. The current study documents differences in youth attributions of victim and perpetrator blame, understandings of violence, and

intentions to respond across physical, psychological, sexual, cyber-psychological, and cyber-sexual dating violence and as a function of age and gender. Further, as the current study obtained student participants across three provinces in Canada, these samples provide a strong picture of adolescent attitudes throughout the country, compared to studies that may have been confined to a single city or region.

Another strength of the current study relates to the nature of the vignettes used. The vignettes utilized in the current study provided more context and created a more realistic scenario, in contrast to other research that either uses single-sentence vignettes or explicitly states the type of dating violence experienced. The detailed vignettes within the current study provided context without leading language, and allowed for participants to consider multiple factors that may have influenced blame levels toward both the victim and perpetrator.

4.2 Future Directions and Applications

More work needs to be done that considers how victim and perpetrator blame impact responses to peer disclosures of dating violence. Recently, there have been studies that consider how participants' attributions of blame, self-efficacy, empathy, age, and gender may impact response to violence (Casey et al., 2017, 2018; Edwards & Dardis, 2020). Within this literature, results have demonstrated some teens may not intervene when they hold certain victim blaming attitudes (Casey et al., 2017). However, one of the limitations of this research on dating violence is that it assesses victim blame by only asking explicit questions about victim and perpetrator responsibility. Results from the current study demonstrated that even when there was not explicit blame toward the victim, there were other subtle blame-related attitudes that individuals held. For example, although perpetrator responsibility was quite high across all conditions (over 6 on a

7-point scale), participants also attributed some of his behavior to liking the victim or getting carried away (both these results ranged from 2.8 to 4 on a 7-point scale).

Research to date has focused primarily on how age and gender influence one's intention to respond to dating violence, overlooking the type of violence experienced. In addition to age and gender, the current study demonstrated that type of dating violence also influences intentions to respond. The present results underscore the need for future research to use measures of victim blame that assess more subtle aspects of the construct than are used traditionally, in addition to considering how the type of dating violence experienced may impact blaming attitudes and intentions to respond.

The findings of the current study serve to inform dating violence intervention and prevention programs, emphasizing the need to consider how different types of dating violence experienced impact attitudes toward victims, perpetrators, understandings of violence, and intentions to respond. Research has shown that adolescent bystanders want to help victims of violence, but may lack the self-efficacy and skills to do so in an effective and safe way. The findings of the current study demonstrate how intervention and prevention programs would better serve youth if they addressed the specific contexts and issues unique to each type of dating violence, rather than used a general approach that treats all forms of dating violence as the same. This study also highlights the needs for both research and educational programs to consider cyber forms of dating violence in addition to the traditionally recognized forms, better reflecting the realities of adolescents in the contemporary world.

References

Basile, K. C., Black, M. C., Simon, T. R., Arias, I., Brener, N. D., & Saltzman, L. E. (2006). The association between self-reported lifetime history of forced sexual intercourse and recent health-risk behaviors: Findings from the 2003 National Youth Risk Behavior Survey. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 39(5), 752.e1–752.e7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2006.06.001

Beyers, J. M., Leonard, J. M., Mays, V. K., & Rosén, L. A. (2000). Gender differences in the perception of courtship abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*(5), 451-466. https://doi.org/10.1177/088626000015005001

Black, K. A., & Gold, D. J. (2008). Gender differences and socioeconomic status biases in Judgments about blame in date rape scenarios. *Violence and Victims, 23*(1), 115-128. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.23.1.115

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

Breiding, M. J., Basile, K. C., Smith, S. G., Black, M. C., & Mahendra, R. (2015). *Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements.* Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Bundock, K., Chan, C., & Hewitt, O. (2020). Adolescents' help-seeking behavior and intentions following adolescent dating violence: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 21*(2), 350-366. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838018770412

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

Carlson, B. E. (1999). Student judgments about dating violence: A factorial vignette analysis.

    Research in Higher Education, 40(2), 201-220. Retrieved from:

    https://jstor.org/stable/40196339

Casey, E. A., Lindhorst, T., & Storer, H. L. (2017). The situational-cognitive model of

    adolescent bystander behavior: Modeling bystander decision-making in the context of

    bullying and teen dating violence. *Psychology of Violence, 7*(1), 33-44.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/vio0000033

Casey, E. A., Storer, H. L., & Herrenkohl, T. I. (2018). Mapping a continuum of adolescent

    helping and bystander behavior within the context of dating violence and bullying.

    American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 88(3), 334-345.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ort0000245

Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research,*

    1, 245-276. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr0102_10

Cauffman, E., Feldman, S. S., Arnett Jensen, L., & Jensen Arnett, J. (2000). The

    (un)acceptability of violence against peers and dates. *Journal of Adolescent Research,*

    15(6), 652-673. https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558400156003

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed,). New York:

    Psychology Press.

Courtain, A., & Glowacz, F. (2021). Exploration of dating violence and related attitudes among adolescents and emerging adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(5-6), NP2975-NP2998. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518770185

Dardis, C. M., Edwards, K. M., Kelley, E. L., & Gidycz, C. A. (2017). Perceptions of dating violence and associated correlates: A study of college young adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 32*(21), 3245-3271. https:doi.org/10.1177/0886260515597439

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. doi:10.1080/00224545.2010.522617

Davies, M., Pollard, P., & Archer, J. (2001). The influence of victim gender and sexual orientation on judgments of the victim in a depicted stranger rape. *Violence and Victims, 16*(6), 607-619. Retrieved from: https://proquest.com/scholarly-journals/influence-victim-gender-sexual-orientation-on/docview/808564677/se-2?accountid=14656

Davies, M., Pollard, P., & Archer, J. (2006). Effects of perpetrator gender and victim sexuality on blame toward male victims of sexual assault. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 146*(3), 275-291. doi:10.3200/SOCP.146.3.275-291

Davies, M., & Rogers, P. (2009). Perceptions of blame and credibility toward victims of childhood sexual abuse: Differences across victim age, victim-perpetrator relationship, and respondent gender in a depicted case. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 18*(1), 78-92. doi:10.1080/10538710802584668

Davies, M., Rogers, P., & Bates, J. (2008). Blame toward male rape victims in a hypothetical sexual assault as a function of victim sexuality and degree of resistance. *Journal of Homosexuality, 55*(3), 533-544. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918360802345339

Davies, M., Rogers, P., & Whitelegg, L. (2009). Effects of victim gender, victim sexual orientation, victim response and respondent gender on judgments of blame in a hypothetical adolescent rape. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 14*, 331-338. https://doi.org/10.1348/978185408X386030

Draucker, C. B., & Martsolf, D. S. (2010). The role of electronic communication technology in adolescent dating violence. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing, 23*, 133-142. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6171.2010.00235.x

Edwards, K. M., & Dardis, C. M. (2020). Disclosure recipients' social reactions to victims' disclosures of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 35*(1-2), 53-76. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516681155

Edwards, K. M., Dardis, C. M., Sylaska, K. M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2015). Informal social reactions to college women's disclosure of intimate partner violence: Associations with psychological and relational variables. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*(1), 25-44. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514532524

Espelage, D. L., Merrin, G. J., & Hatchel, T. (2018). Peer victimization and dating violence among LGBTQ youth: The impact of school violence and crime on mental health outcomes. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 16*(2), 156-173. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204016680408

Exner-Cortens, D., Baker, E., & Craig, W. (in press). The national prevalence of adolescent dating violence in Canada. *Journal of Adolescent Health.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2021.01.032

Exner-Cortens, D., Eckenrode, J., & Rothman, E. (2013). Longitudinal associations between teen
dating violence victimization and adverse health outcomes. *Pediatrics 131*(1), 71-78.
https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2012-1029

Foshee, V. A., Reyes, H. L. M., Gottfredson, N. C., Chang, L., & Ennett, S. T. (2013). A
longitudinal examination of a psychological, behavioral, academic, and relationship
consequences of dating abuse victimization among a primarily rural sample of
adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 53*(6), 723-729.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adohealth.2012.06.016

Futerman, R. (2014). Reporting sexual violence in school: Pre-service teachers' attitude and
behaviours. [Master's Thesis, Western University]. Electronic Thesis and Dissertation
Repository.

Geiger, B., Fischer, M., & Eshet, Y. (2004). Date-rape supporting and victim-blaming attitudes
among high school students in a multiethnic society: Israel. *Journal of Interpersonal
Violence, 19*(4), 406-426. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260503262080

Hamby, S., & Jackson, A. (2010). Size does matter: The effects of gender on perceptions of
dating violence. *Sex Roles, 63*, 324-331. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9816-0

Hutchinson, K. M. (2012). Predictors of college students' dating violence perceptions and help-
seeking recommendations. (Publication No. 3510770) [Doctoral Dissertation, The
University of Akron]. ProQuest Dissertation Publishing.

Jackson, S. M., Cram, F., & Seymour, F. W. (2000). Violence and sexual coercion in high school
students' dating relationships. *Journal of Family Violence, 15*(1), 23-36.
https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007545302987

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika, 39*, 32-36. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575

Kiley, S. N. (2016). Adults' attributions of victim blame toward adolescent victims of physical dating violence (Publication No. 10109062) [Doctoral Dissertation, Barry University]. ProQuest Dissertation Publishing.

Klein, R. (2004). Sickening relationships: Gender-baased violence, women's ealth, and the role of informal third parties. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21*(1), 149-165. https://doi.org/10.1177/026540704039842

Leen, E., Sorbing, E., Mawer, M., Holdsworth, E., Helsing, B., & Bowen, E. (2013). Prevalence, dynamic risk factors, and the efficacy of primary interventions for adolescent dating violence: An international review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 18*(1), 159-174. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.11.015

Lucero, J. L., Weisz, A. N., Smith-Darden, J., & Lucero, S. M. (2014). Exploring gender differences: Socially interactive technology use/abuse among dating teens. *Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work, 29*(4), 478-491. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109914522627

Luo, F., Stone, D. M., Tharp, A. T. (2014). Physical dating violence victimization among sexual minority youth. *American Journal of Public Health, 104(10)*, 66–73. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.302051

Maynard, C., & Wiederman, M. (1997). Undergraduate students' perceptions of child sexual abuse: Effects of age, sex, and gender-role attitudes. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 21*(9), 833-844. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134(97)00045-8

Moe, A. M. (2007). Silenced voices and structured survival: Battered women's help seeking. *Violence against Women, 13*, 676-699. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801207302041

Morrison, K. E., & Pedersen, C. L. (2020). The influence of sexual orientation on attributions of blame toward victims of sexual assault. *Journal of Homosexuality, 67*(2), 189-205. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2018.1534412

Muñoz-Rivas, M. J., Gámez-Guadix, M., Fernández-González, L., González Lozano, M. P. (2011). Validation of the attitudes about aggression in dating situations (AADS) and the justification of verbal/coercive tactics scale (JVCT) in Spanish adolescents. *Journal of Family Violence, 26*, 575-584. http://dx/doi.org/10.1007/s10896-011-9391-3

Orchowski, L. M., Untied, A. S., & Gidycz, C. A. (2013). Social reactions to disclosure of sexual victimization and adjustment among survivors of sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*(10), 2005-2023. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512471085

Pavlou, M., & Knowles, A. (2001). Domestic violence: Attributions, recommended punishments and reporting behavior related to provocation by the victim. *Psychiatry, Psychology, and Law,8*(1), 76-85. https://doi.org/10.1080/13218710109525006

Perilloux, C., Duntley, J. D., & Buss, D. M. (2014). Blame attribution in sexual victimization. *Personality and Individual Differences, 63*, 81-86. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.058

Price, E. L., Byers, E. S., & the Dating Violence Research Team (1999). The attitudes towards dating violence scales: Development and initial validation. *Journal of Family Violence, 14*(4), 351-375. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022830114772

Reeves, P. M., & Orpinas, P. (2012). Dating norms and dating violence among ninth graders in Northeast Georgia: Reports from student surveys and focus groups. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(9), 1677-1698. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511430386

Rhatigan, D. L., Stewart, C., & Moore, T. M. (2011). Effects of gender and confrontation on attributions of female-perpetrated intimate partner violence. *Sex Roles, 64*, 875-887. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-9951-2

Rogers, P., & Davies, M. (2007). Perceptions of victims and perpetrators in a depicted child sexual abuse case: Gender and age factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(5), 566-584. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260506298827

Rose, L. E., & Campbell, J. (2000). The role of social support and family relationships in women's responses to battering. *Health Care for Women International, 21*(1), 27-39. https://doi.org/10.1080/073993300245384

Sawyer, R. G., Pinciaro, P. J., & Jessel, J. K. (1998). Effects of coercion and verbal consent on university students' perceptions of date rape. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 22*(1), 46-53.

Sears, H. A., & Byers, E. S. (2010). Adolescent girls' and boys' experiences of psychologically, physically, and sexually aggressive behaviors in their dating relationships: Co-occurrence and emotional reactions. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 19*(5), 517-539. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2010.495035

Sears, H. A., Byers, E. S., Whelan, J. J., Saint-Pierre, M., & the Dating Violence Research Team. (2006). "If it hurts you, then it is not a joke." Adolescents' ideas about girls' and boys' use and experience of abusive behavior in dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*(9), 1191-1207. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260506290423

Seelau, S. M., & Seelau, E. P. (2005). Gender-role stereotypes and perceptions of heterosexual, gay and lesbian domestic violence. *Journal of family violence, 20*(6), 363-371. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10896-005-7798-4

Slep, A. M. S., Cascardi, M., Avery-Leaf, S., & O'Leary, K. D. (2001). Two new measures of

attitudes about the acceptability of teen dating aggression. *Psychological Assessment,*
13(3), 306-318. doi:10.1037//1040-3590.13.3.306

Stonard, K. E. (2020). "Technology was designed for this": Adolescents' perceptions of the role

and impact of the use of technology in cyber dating violence. *Computers in Human*
Behavior, 105, 106211. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.106211

Stonard, K. E., Bowen, E., Lawrence, T. R., & Price, S. A. (2014). The relevance of technology

to the nature, prevalence and impact of adolescent dating violence and abuse: A research
synthesis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 19*, 390-417.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.06.005

Suarez, E., & Gadalla, T. M. (2010). Stop blaming the victim: A meta-analysis on rape myths.

Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25(100), 2010-2035.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509354503

Sylaska, K., & Walters, A. S. (2014). Testing the extent of the gender trap: College students'

perceptions of and reactions to intimate partner violence. *Sex Roles, 70*, 134-145.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-014-0344-1

Taylor, C. A., & Sorenson, S. B. (2004). Injunctive social norms of adults regarding teen dating

violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 34,* 468-479. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1054-
139X(03)00342-2

Taylor, C. A., & Sorenson, S. B. (2005). Community-based norms about intimate partner

violence: Putting attributions of fault and responsibility into context. *Sex Roles, 53*(7/8),
573-589. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-7143-7

Thongpriwan, V., & McElmurry, B. J. (2009). Thai female adolescents' perceptions of dating

violence. *Health Care for Women International, 30*(10), 871-891.

https://doi.org/10.1080/07399330903066392

Ullman, S. E., & Peter-Hagane, L. (2014), Social reactions to sexual assault disclosure, coping,

perceived control, and PTSD symptoms in sexual assault victims. *Journal of Community*

Psychology, 42(4), 495-508. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21624

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*, 523-531.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.07.008

Wakelin, A., & Long, K. M. (2003). Effects of victim gender and sexuality on attributions of

blame to rape victims. *Sex Roles, 49*(9/10), 477-487.

https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025876522024

Wekerle, C., & Wolfe, D. A. (1999). Dating violence in mid-adolescence: Theory, significance,

and emerging prevention initiatives. *Clinical Psychology Review, 19*(4), 435-456.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358(98)00091-9

Weisz, A. N., Tolman, R. M., Callahan, M. R., Saunders, D. G., & Black, B. M (2007). Informal

helpers' responses when adolescents tell them about dating violence or romantic

relationship problems. *Journal of Adolescence, 30*, 853-868.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2006.09.004

West, A., & Wendrei, M. L. (2002). Intimate partner violence: A model for predicting

interventions by informal helpers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*(9), 972-986.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260502017009004

Wincentak, K., Connolly, J., & Card, N. (2016) Teen dating violence: A meta-analytic review of prevalence rates. *Psychology of Violence, 7*(2), 224-241. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040194

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/10.1521/jscp.2006.25.6.647

Ybarra, M. L., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2019). Linkages between violence-associated attitudes and psychological, physical, and sexual dating abuse perpetration and victimization among male and female adolescents. *Aggressive Behavior, 45*, 622-634. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21856

Zweig, J., Dank, M., Yahner, J., & Lachman, P. (2013). The rate of cyber dating abuse among teens and how it relates to other forms of teen dating violence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 42*(7), 1063-1077. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-9922-8

Zweig, J. M., Lachman, P., Yahner, J., & Dank, M. (2014). Correlates of cyber dating abuse among teens. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 43*(8), 1306-1321. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-0047-x

Appendices

Appendix A – Demographics

1. How old are you? _____ years; ___ months

2. Although we all live in Canada, people will sometimes identify themselves by the racial, ethnic, or cultural group to which their parents, grandparents, or ancestors belong. How do you identify your racial or ethnic background? (please check all that apply)
    - ○ African/Caribbean
    - ○ East Asian (e.g., China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea, North Korea, etc.)
    - ○ First Nations
    - ○ Inuit
    - ○ Latin American
    - ○ Metis
    - ○ Middle Eastern/West Asian (e.g., Afghanistan, Israel, Iran, Palestine, Saudi Arabia, Syria, etc.)
    - ○ South Asian (e.g., Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, etc.)
    - ○ Southeast Asian (e.g., Cambodia, Thailand, Vietnam, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Philippines, etc.)
    - ○ White/European descent
    - ○ Other, please specify: _____

3. What is your gender identity?
    - ○ A man
    - ○ Women
    - ○ Non-Binary

4. Are you transgender, genderqueer, genderfluid or unsure about your gender identity?
    - ○ Yes
    - ○ No

5. With which sexual orientation do you identify most?
    - ○ Straight or heterosexual
    - ○ Gay/lesbian
    - ○ Bisexual
    - ○ Queer, pansexual or polysexual
    - ○ Two-spirited
    - ○ Questioning
    - ○ Prefer not to disclose
    - ○ Other, please specify

6. Have you ever been victimized by physical and or sexual abuse/violence in a romantic relationship (current or past)?

       o   Yes
       o   No
       o   Prefer not to answer

7. What grade are you in?
       o   7
       o   8
       o   9
       o   10
       o   11
       o   12

8. How many close friends or family members have disclosed to you that they have been either physically, sexually, verbally, psychologically, or emotionally assaulted or stalked by a romantic partner?
       o   0
       o   1
       o   2-3
       o   4-5
       o   6+   Specify: ___

Appendix B - Dating Violence Scenarios

Note: Below are all versions of the vignettes. Participants will be randomly assigned to read one

of the five possible vignettes, and answer the same set of proceeding questions, irrespective of

vignette scenario.

<div align="center">

Physical Scenario

</div>

Instructions: Please read the following scenario carefully. Once you have finished reading the scenario, click next and proceed to the following page.

Anna is a girl in your grade that you've gotten to know over the past year while working on several group projects. After school, Anna asks if you have time to talk with her. You agree and together you go to an empty classroom where you can talk privately. Anna tells you about something that happened earlier that day with Liam, a boy who she's been dating for six months.

Anna tells you that she, Liam, and a few friends planned to skip class today and meet in the old band room to hang out, since the room is often empty. While the friends went to buy lunch down the street, Anna and Liam waited alone together in the band room. Liam started asking Anna about how much time she's been spending with another boy from school. Even though Anna said that she is working on a school project with the boy and nothing more, Liam accused Anna of lying and cheating on him. Anna tried to tell Liam that she would never cheat on him, but Liam became angry and slapped Anna across the face, saying 'stop lying to me'. Without saying anything more, Liam suggested they should leave and find their friends.

As Anna tells you the story, she seems confused about what happened, and what she should do.

<div align="center">

Psychological Scenario

</div>

Instructions: Please read the following scenario carefully. Once you have finished reading the scenario, click next and proceed to the following page.

Anna is a girl in your grade that you've gotten to know over the past year while working on several group projects. After school, Anna asks if you have time to talk with her. You agree and together you go to an empty classroom where you can talk privately. Anna tells you about something that happened earlier that day with Liam, a boy who she's been dating for six months.

Anna tells you that she, Liam, and a few friends planned to skip class today and meet in the old band room to hang out, since the room is often empty. While the friends went to buy lunch down the street, Anna and Liam waited alone together in the band room. Liam started asking Anna about where she had been yesterday, as Liam had called and texted her over 10 times last night and Anna never picked up or responded to Liam's calls and texts. When Anna told Liam that she had gone to bed early because she did not feel well, Liam started yelling at Anna, calling her a piece of trash and accusing her of lying and cheating. Anna denied cheating, but Liam just

started yelling more, saying that Anna was worthless and lucky to be with him. Without saying anything more, Liam suggested they should leave and find their friends.

As Anna tells you the story, she seems confused about what happened, and what she should do.

Sexual Scenario

Instructions: Please read the following scenario carefully. Once you have finished reading the scenario, click next and proceed to the following page.

Anna is a girl in your grade that you've gotten to know over the past year while working on several group projects. After school, Anna asks if you have time to talk with her. You agree and together you go to an empty classroom where you can talk privately. Anna tells you about something that happened earlier that day with Liam, a boy who she's been dating for six months.

Anna tells you that she, Liam, and a few friends planned to skip class today and meet in the old band room to hang out, since the room is often empty. While the friends went to buy lunch down the street, Anna and Liam waited alone together in the band room. Liam started to kiss Anna, and at first Anna kissed Liam back. Liam told Anna how much he cared about her, and Anna said the same to him. Then Liam started to fondle and undress Anna. Anna felt nervous about the situation and asked Liam to stop, saying she was nervous and worried their friends might walk in and see them. Liam kept telling Anna how much he liked her and that their friends wouldn't be back for a while. Liam told Anna that if she really cared, she would want to show him how much. Anna said she didn't want to keep going, but Liam proceeded to have sex with her. When Liam finished, they got dressed and left to find their friends.

As Anna tells you the story, she seems confused about what happened, and what she should do.

Cyber Scenario

Instructions: Please read the following scenario carefully. Once you have finished reading the scenario, click next and proceed to the following page.

Anna is a girl in your grade that you've gotten to know over the past year while working on several group projects. After school, Anna asks if you have time to talk with her. You agree and together you go to an empty classroom where you can talk privately. Anna tells you about something that happened earlier that day with Liam, a boy who she's been dating for six months.

Anna tells you that she, Liam, and a few friends planned to skip class today and meet in the old band room to hang out, since the room is often empty. While the friends went to buy lunch down the street, Anna and Liam waited alone together in the band room. Liam started complaining that Anna seemed more interested in her social media than in spending time with him. Anna denied spending a lot of time on social media, but that she liked to keep up with her friends online. Liam then took Anna's phone and went through her message history. Liam asked for Anna's passwords so he could check on Anna's social media from his phone, saying 'if you trust me, you'll give me your passwords'. Anna reluctantly gave Liam her passwords. Liam then set up an

app on Anna's phone so he could track her location anytime, which Liam said was to protect Anna. Without saying anything more, Liam suggested they should leave and find their friends.

As Anna tells you the story, she seems confused about what happened, and what she should do.

Cyber-Sexual Scenario

Instructions: Please read the following scenario carefully. Once you have finished reading the scenario, click next and proceed to the following page.

Anna is a girl in your grade that you've gotten to know over the past year while working on several group projects. After school, Anna asks if you have time to talk with her. You agree and together you go to an empty classroom where you can talk privately. Anna tells you about something that happened earlier that day with Liam, a boy who she's been dating for six months.

Anna tells you that she, Liam, and a few friends planned to skip class today and meet in the old band room to hang out, since the room is often empty. While the friends went to buy lunch down the street, Anna and Liam waited alone together in the band room. Liam started asking Anna to take off her clothes so Liam could take a "sexy" photo of her. Anna felt nervous and said no, but Liam kept telling Anna how much he cared for her, and that if Anna cared she would do this for him. Anna still felt unsure but was tired of saying no, so she agreed to take the photo if Liam promised that it was only for him and not to be shared. Liam agreed and took the photo, but later in the day Anna saw Liam sharing the photo with his friends.

As Anna tells you the story, she seems confused about what happened, and what she should do.

Appendix C - Manipulation Check and Blame Questionnaire

Questions:

The following questions are designed to ensure that you have thoroughly read and understood the previous vignette.

1. What is the name of Anna's romantic partner?
   - o Liam
   - o Leah
   - o Lily
   - o Logan

2. How long has anna been dating her romantic partner?
   - o 1 month
   - o 3 months
   - o 6 months
   - o 1 year

You will now be asked for your opinion on the following questions in regard to the scenario you have just read. Please answer the following questions by indicating from 1 to 7 the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement based on the vignette you just read. Please note there are no right or wrong answers – we are only interested in your opinions.

1. If Anna reported what happened in the band room to the school administration, how seriously do you think they would take it?

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

   Not seriously   Very Seriously

2. How responsible do you think Anna was for what happened to her in the band room?

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

   Not Responsible   Very Responsible

3. To what extent is Liam responsible for what happened in the band room?

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

   Not Responsible   Very Responsible

4. Should Liam be punished for what he did to Anna?

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

   No Punishment   Severe Punishment

5. How much do you think Anna actually enjoyed the attention she received from Liam?

   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

   No Pleasure   High Pleasure

6. How upset do you think Anna is by this event?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not Upset   Very Upset

7. How likely do you think that what happened to Anna will negatively affect her future romantic relationships?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not Likely   Very Likely

8. Liam would not have behaved this way if he didn't like Anna so much. How much do you agree?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree

9. Liam did not mean to hurt Anna, he just got carried away. How much do you agree?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree

10. How much do you think that Anna's behavior was to blame for what happened in the band room?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

No Blame   High Blame

11. Liam committed an act of dating abuse/violence. How much do you agree with this statement?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree

12. To a total of 100, how much blame would you assign to each of the following (all numbers summed cannot add up to more than 100)?
    - Anna   ___
    - Liam   ___
    - The situation   ___
    - Current societal values   ___
    - Chance   ___

Appendix D - Intention to Respond Question

13. How likely are you to do each of the following in response to the situation described in the vignette if it was reported to you? (Each question is rated from 1 (Not at all likely) to 5 (Completely likely)
    A. Do nothing
    B. Talk to Anna's parent(s) or guardian
    C. Talk to Liam on Anna's behalf
    D. Encourage Anna to talk to her parents or guardian about her feelings
    E. Encourage Anna to talk to her friends about her feelings
    F. Encourage Anna to break up with Liam
    G. Encourage Anna to speak to an adult that she trusts
    H. Let Anna sort it out with Liam
    I. Talk to your own parent(s)/guardian(s) and ask them what you should do
    J. Talk to your own friends and ask them what you should do
    K. Listen to Anna
    L. Reassure Anna that she is not to blame
    M. Help Anna make a decision on what to do next
    N. Notify a teacher
    O. Notify a counsellor
    P. Notify the principal
    Q. Contact the police
    - Also, please identify the first three things you might do in this situation (with options of A-Q as options

Debrief

The purpose of this section was to understand how individuals attribute responsibility in different scenarios of dating violence. In no way was this survey intending to blame individuals who were victimized in the scenarios. This research will help us develop interventions and/or programs which can address attitudes that wrongly blame victimized individuals.

Appendix E – Analysis of Variance Tables for Blame and Violence Items

Table E 1   Perception of School Administration Response Analyses

ANOVA for Perceptions of School Administration Response (N = 649)

Source	df	F	Partial η^2	p
Vignette Condition (V)	(4, 629)	28.303	.153	< .001
Gender (G)	(1, 629)	4.774	.008	.029
Age (A)	(1, 629)	4.287	.007	.039
V X G	(4, 629)	.258	.002	.905
G X A	(1, 629)	.076	.000	.783
V X A	(4, 629)	.311	.002	.871
V X G X A	(4, 629)	.525	.003	.718

Table E 2   Perception of Violence Analyses

ANOVA for Perceptions of the Situation as Violence ($N = 640$)

Source	df	F	Partial η^2	p
Vignette Condition	(4, 620)	14.697	.087	< .001
Gender	(1, 620)	6.702	.011	.010
Age	(1, 620)	.282	.000	.596
V X G	(4, 620)	.566	.004	.687
G X A	(1, 620)	.157	.000	.692
V X A	(4, 620)	1.942	.012	.102
V X G X A	(4, 620)	.630	.004	.642

Table E 3   Perception of Victim Analyses

Analysis of Variance for All Perception of Victim Blame Items

Source	df	F	Partial η^2	p
ANOVA for Perceptions of Victim Responsibility (N = 645)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 625)	17.629	.101	< .001
Gender	(1, 625)	20.763	.032	< .001
Age	(1, 625)	1.822	.003	.178
V X G	(4, 625)	.762	.005	.550
G X A	(1, 625)	1.472	.002	.225
V X A	(4, 625)	.466	.003	.761
V X G X A	(4, 625)	.730	.005	.572
ANOVA for Perceptions of Victim Behavior (N = 641)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 621)	9.681	.059	< .001
Gender	(1, 621)	17.797	.028	< .001
Age	(1, 621)	11.563	.018	< .001
V X G	(4, 621)	.271	.002	.896
G X A	(1, 621)	.415	.001	.519
V X A	(4, 621)	1.386	.009	.237
V X G X A	(4, 621)	.421	.003	.794
ANOVA for Perceptions of Victim Enjoyment (N = 641)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 621)	2.042	.013	.087
Gender	(1, 621)	10.529	.017	.001
Age	(1, 621)	1.691	.003	.194
V X G	(4, 621)	.152	.001	.962
G X A	(1, 621)	.119	.000	.730
V X A	(4, 621)	.260	.002	.904
V X G X A	(4, 621)	.023	.000	.999
ANOVA for Perceptions of Victim Upset (N = 647)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 627)	10.149	.061	< .001
Gender	(1, 627)	2.580	.004	.109
Age	(1, 627)	1.824	.003	.177
V X G	(4, 627)	1.267	.008	.282
G X A	(1, 627)	3.130	.005	.077
V X A	(4, 627)	.880	.006	.476
V X G X A	(4, 627)	.765	.005	.548
ANOVA for Perceptions of Victim Impact (N = 646)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 626)	7.819	.048	< .001
Gender	(1, 626)	7.741	.012	.006
Age	(1, 626)	.072	.000	.789
V X G	(4, 626)	2.868	.018	.023
G X A	(1, 626)	1.338	.002	.248
V X A	(4, 626)	.903	.006	.462
V X G X A	(4, 626)	.324	.002	.862

Table E 4   Perception of Perpetrator Analyses

Analysis of Variance for All Perception of Perpetrator Items

Source	df	F	Partial η^2	p
ANOVA for Perceptions of Perpetrator Responsibility ($N = 646$)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 626)	1.951	.012	.100
Gender	(1, 626)	3.889	.006	.049
Age	(1, 626)	1.418	.002	.234
V X G	(4, 626)	.724	.005	.576
G X A	(1, 626)	1.598	.003	.207
V X A	(4, 626)	.489	.003	.744
V X G X A	(4, 626)	.902	.006	.463
ANOVA for Perceptions of Perpetrator Punishment ($N = 644$)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 624)	31.179	.167	< .001
Gender	(1, 624)	5.786	.009	.016
Age	(1, 624)	2.619	.004	.106
V X G	(4, 624)	.615	.004	.652
G X A	(1, 624)	.116	.000	.733
V X A	(4, 624)	.366	.002	.833
V X G X A	(4, 624)	.346	.002	.847
ANOVA for Perceptions of Perpetrator Behavior ($N = 634$)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 614)	4.274	.027	.002
Gender	(1, 614)	45.265	.069	< .001
Age	(1, 614)	9.010	.014	.003
V X G	(4, 614)	.245	.002	.913
G X A	(1, 614)	.183	.000	.669
V X A	(4, 614)	.725	.005	.575
V X G X A	(4, 614)	1.473	.010	.209
ANOVA for Perceptions of Perpetrator Getting Carried Away ($N = 639$)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 619)	4.649	.029	.001
Gender	(1, 619)	47.851	.072	< .001
Age	(1, 619)	1.080	.002	.299
V X G	(4, 619)	.874	.006	.479
G X A	(1, 619)	.226	.000	.635
V X A	(4, 619)	.533	.003	.711
V X G X A	(4, 619)	.362	.002	.836

Appendix F – Analysis of Variance Table for Intentions to Respond Items and Factors

Table F 1   Intentions to Respond Analyses

Analysis of Variance for All Intentions to Respond Items

Source	df	F	Partial η^2	p
ANOVA for Likelihood of Reaching out to Adult (N = 644)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 624)	4.479	.028	.001
Gender	(1, 624)	.856	.001	.355
Age	(1, 624)	12.222	.019	< .001
V X G	(4, 624)	.626	.004	.644
G X A	(1, 624)	.902	.001	.343
V X A	(4, 624)	.796	.005	.528
V X G X A	(4, 624)	.247	.002	.911
ANOVA for Likelihood of Encouraging or Supporting the Victim (N = 642)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 622)	2.036	.013	.088
Gender	(1, 622)	52.276	.078	< .001
Age	(1, 622)	.366	.001	.545
V X G	(4, 622)	.886	.006	.472
G X A	(1, 622)	.357	.001	.550
V X A	(4, 622)	.488	.003	.745
V X G X A	(4, 622)	.892	.006	.468
ANOVA for Reaching out to Peers/Your Parents (N = 646)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 626)	5.043	.031	< .001
Gender	(1, 626)	24.726	.038	< .001
Age	(1, 626)	.113	.000	.737
V X G	(4, 626)	1.787	.011	.130
G X A	(1, 626)	.942	.002	.332
V X A	(4, 626)	1.194	.008	.312
V X G X A	(4, 626)	.126	.001	.973
ANOVA for Doing Nothing (N = 646)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 626)	1.972	.012	.097
Gender	(1, 626)	18.365	.029	< .001
Age	(1, 626)	.438	.001	.508
V X G	(4, 626)	.225	.001	.924
G X A	(1, 626)	.002	.000	.967
V X A	(4, 626)	.461	.003	.765
V X G X A	(4, 626)	1.551	.010	.186
ANOVA for Talk to Perpetrator (N = 652)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 632)	1.405	.009	.231
Gender	(1, 632)	1.743	.003	.187
Age	(1, 632)	1.355	.002	.245
V X G	(4, 632)	2.432	.015	.046
G X A	(1, 632)	1.876	.003	.171
V X A	(4, 632)	1.297	.008	.270
V X G X A	(4, 632)	3.394	.021	.009

Source	df	F	Partial η^2	p
ANOVA for Letting the Victim Sort it out with Perpetrator ($N = 649$)				
Vignette Condition	(4, 629)	2.055	.013	.085
Gender	(1, 629)	2.509	.004	.114
Age	(1, 629)	3.926	.006	.048
V X G	(4, 629)	.599	.004	.664
G X A	(1, 629)	.107	.000	.744
V X A	(4, 629)	.148	.001	.964
V X G X A	(4, 629)	1.528	.010	.192