City University of New York (CUNY)
CUNY Academic Works

Dissertations, Theses, and Capstone Projects | CUNY Graduate Center

9-2021

Youth Bystander Intentions to Intervene in Peer Intimate Partner Violence: The Co-Influence of Perceived Perpetrator Race and Perceived Culpability

Nana Amoh
The Graduate Center, City University of New York

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/4444
Discover additional works at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

YOUTH BYSTANDER INTENTIONS TO INTERVENE IN PEER INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE: THE CO-INFLUENCE OF PERCEIVED PERPETRATOR RACE AND PERCEIVED CULPABILITY

by

NANA AMOH

A dissertation submitted to Graduate Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2021

© 2021

NANA AMOH

All Rights Reserved

Youth Bystander Intentions to Intervene in Peer Intimate Partner Violence:

The Co-Influence of Perceived Perpetrator Race and Perceived Culpability

by

Nana Amoh

This manuscript has been read and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in Psychology to satisfy the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

____________________	____________________________________
Date	Maureen Allwood, Ph.D.
	Chair of Examining Committee

____________________	____________________________________
Date	Richard Bodnar, Ph.D.
	Executive Officer

Supervisory Committee:

Phillip Atiba Goff, Ph.D.

Emily Haney-Caron, Ph.D.

Chitra Raghavan, Ph.D.

Brett Stoudt, Ph.D.

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT

Youth Bystander Intentions to Intervene in Peer Intimate Partner Violence: The Co-Influence of Perceived Perpetrator Race and Perceived Culpability

by

Nana Amoh, M.A., M.Phil.

Advisor: Maureen Allwood, Ph.D.

In recent years, bystander intervention programs that focus on addressing violence have notably become more popular and prevalent on college campuses. Bystander intervention programs serve to help college students identify and intervene in emergency situations like intimate partner violence. Despite advances in the bystander intervention literature, there is a dearth of research that has examined bystander intentions to intervene in situations of intimate partner violence among youth who have witnessed violence between peers. This study examined bystander intentions to intervene among young adults who witnessed peer male-to-female physical intimate partner violence and whether intentions to intervene varied depending on perpetrator race. Specifically, the study examined White undergraduates' (n=147) responses to vignettes depicting peer intimate partner violence perpetrated by either a Black man or a White man in a same-race or interracial straight relationship. The study used a 2x2x2 (bystander sex (male/female) x perpetrator race (Black/White) x victim race (Black/White)) between-subjects factorial design to examine main effects and interaction effects of bystander sex and perpetrator and victim race on bystander intentions to intervene. Differences in perceived perpetrator and victim culpability were examined across conditions (e.g., race configurations), and intentions to intervene were examined in relation to perceived perpetrator culpability and victim culpability. Although race

did not emerge as a significant variable in the study, there are a number of caveats and related findings to be considered that can help to inform bystander intervention models.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee. Each member has provided me with extensive feedback and supervision, and I am grateful for their invaluable contributions, support, and insight. I would especially like to thank Maureen Allwood, Ph.D., the chair of my committee. As my advisor, teacher, and mentor, Dr. Allwood has taught me more than I could ever give her credit for about scientific research and clinical psychology. Thank you for always going above and beyond to help me reach my goals. I would like to thank my friends, lab mates, colleagues, and the CASTL research team for their support and camaraderie, and I would like also to thank all of the participants that took part in this study for making this research possible. Nobody has been more instrumental to the success of this project than the members of my family. I would like to thank my family for their unwavering care, love, guidance, and belief in me throughout this process and throughout my life. Without their understanding and encouragement, it would be impossible for me to complete my study. Finally, I thank God for seeing me through this project, for seeing me through my journey as a doctoral student, and for seeing me through this challenging year. I am eternally grateful to Him for all that He has done and all that He continues to do in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT....iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS....vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS....vii
LIST OF TABLES....ix
CHAPTER
I. INTRODUCTION....1
A. Factors Related to Bystander Attitudes, Behaviors, and Intentions to Help Victims of Intimate Partner Violence....5
B. Perceptions of Victim Credibility in Cases of Intimate Partner Violence....12
C. Perceptions of Culpability and Criminality....14
D. Summary and Limitations on Research on Bystander Intentions to Intervene....17
E. The Current Study....18
II. METHODS....20
A. Power Analysis....20
B. Participants....20
C. Procedures....21
D. Measures....24
E. Statistical Analyses....27
III. RESULTS....28
A. Preliminary Analysis and Sample Characteristics....28
B. Primary Analyses....29
C. Post-Hoc Analyses....33
IV. DISCUSSION....35
A. Bystander Awareness and Knowledge....36
B. Differences in Likelihood of Intervention and Likelihood of Reporting across Perpetrator-Victim Configurations....38
C. Culpability Ratings of Perpetrators and Victims in Relation to Race of Perpetrators and Victims....40
D. Clinical and Policy Implications....42

E. Limitations..43
F. Future Directions...45
G. Conclusions...48
TABLES...50
FIGURES...56
APPENDICES..57
A. Vignettes Depicting Intimate Partner Violence between Peers...................................57
B. Measures of Intentions to Intervene and Report……………………..………………..61
C. Measures of Rank-Ordered Bystander Intervention Behaviors……………………......62
D. Measures of Perpetrator and Victim Culpability…...63
REFERENCES..64

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Chi-Square Analyses of Perceived Intentions to Intervene and Perceived Intentions to Report by Participant Sex..50

Table 2. Item Means of Perceived Likelihood of Intervention, Perceived Likelihood of Reporting, and Perceived Culpability Ratings by Sex...51

Table 3. Chi-Square Analyses of Perceived Intentions to Intervene and Perceived Intentions to Report across Conditions..52

Table 4. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Bystander Sex, Perceived Perpetrator Culpability Ratings, Perceived Victim Culpability Ratings, Race of Male Perpetrator, and Race of Female Victim in Association with Perceived Likelihood of Intervention..53

Table 5. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Bystander Sex, Perceived Perpetrator Culpability Ratings, Perceived Victim Culpability Ratings, Race of Male Perpetrator, and Race of Female Victim in Association with Perceived Likelihood of Reporting….54

Table 6. Frequency Table of First and Second Choices of Intervention Reported by Participants ………………………………...…………………..…………………..………….......55

Youth Bystander Intentions to Intervene in Peer Intimate Partner Violence:

The Co-Influence of Perceived Perpetrator Race and Perceived Culpability

Intimate partner violence refers to "physical violence, sexual violence, stalking, and psychological aggression (including coercive acts) by a current or former intimate partner" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2015). Such violence among current or former intimate partners has been recognized as a serious, worldwide public health concern (Campbell, 2002) that can lead to negative psychological outcomes, severe injury, and death (Black et al., 2011; Breiding et al., 2008; Exner-Cortens et al., 2013; Silverman et al., 2004; Wolitzky-Taylor et al., 2008). According to the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, 13.8% of males and 24.3% of females have experienced intimate partner violence (Breiding et al., 2014). Although intimate partner violence is largely considered to be widespread among adults (Breiding et al., 2015), emerging research suggests that rates of intimate partner violence among adolescents and young adults are as high, if not higher, than rates observed among adults. In fact, a review by Dardis et al. (2015) indicated that intimate partner violence among college students is fairly common, with 80% of college students reporting being either the perpetrator or victim of violence in a dating relationship. In addition, Johnson et al. (2015) found that perpetration of intimate partner violence peaks between the ages of 17 – 20 for males and between the ages of 19 – 22 for females, indicating that rates of intimate partner violence are highest during adolescence and young adulthood, which coincides with the college years. These findings indicate that college-aged young adults are at risk for both victimization and perpetration of intimate partner violence, which suggests that college-aged young adults are also likely to be bystander witnesses of intimate partner violence.

Bystanders of intimate partner violence are those who see violence, but who are not directly involved as a perpetrator or victim (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011). According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, over 66% of physical assaults and nearly 33% of sexual assaults occur within the presence of a bystander (Planty, 2002). These high rates of bystander presence suggest that bystanders are also likely to be present during acts of violence that occur between intimate partners. Although adolescents and young adults are likely to witness intimate partner violence as bystanders, they are unlikely to intervene (Hamby et al., 2016; Rueda et al., 2015; Weisz & Black, 2008). In fact, bystanders often have trouble recognizing and interpreting acts of intimate partner violence (Levy, 1990). This is perhaps because most intimate partner violence among young adults is covert rather than overt or physical (Hines & Saudino, 2003; Shorey et al., 2008). An international review of European and North American studies found that reported rates of overt violence (e.g., physical) in adolescent dating relationships range from 2.6%-59% and reported rates of covert violence (e.g., emotional and psychological abuse) in adolescent dating relationships range from 17-88% (Leen et al., 2013). In addition, research on intimate partner violence is shifting towards a focus on coercive control—a covert form of abuse that conceptualizes violence as a tool that is used by perpetrators to assert power and control over victims (Dutton & Goodman, 2005; Hamberger et al., 2017). Coercive control often involves a combination of multiple tactics including physical violence, isolation, intimidation, and threats (Dutton & Goodman, 2005; Hamberger et al., 2017). Physical violence is easily detectable by bystanders, and police intervention in cases of intimate partner violence is generally only warranted if and when the violence is physical (Klein, 2004). Thus, examining bystander intentions to intervene among youth who witness physical intimate partner violence among peers is of particular importance, because bystanders in these situations have the potential to identify

the actions as violent and assaultive, as well as the potential to reduce the likelihood of severe physical injury and death (Arriaga & Foshee, 2004; Cercone et al., 2005; Foshee, et al., 2007; Molidor & Tolman, 1998) via direct (e.g., stopping the fight) and/or indirect intervention (e.g., calling the police).

Although acts of overt intimate partner violence, such as physical assaults, are less prevalent, assaults are more easily observable by bystanders, and therefore are likely to warrant bystander interventions like notifying the police or calling a family member for help (Klein, 2004; Klein 2012). Thus, examination of bystander perceptions and intentions to intervene in intimate partner violence among peers should focus on observable partner violence like physical assaults. In addition, the salience of physical violence is of particular importance, because bystanders might be able to intervene in ways that reduce the risk of severe physical injury and even death (Arriaga & Foshee, 2004; Cercone et al., 2005; Foshee, et al., 2007; Molidor & Tolman, 1998).

Given that bystanders are sometimes able to intervene, call for assistance, and/or de-escalate violence between partners, identifying factors that influence intentions to intervene might have important implications for interventions designed to reduce rates of intimate partner violence. The examination of how demographic characteristics affect bystander intervention behaviors remains an important, yet underdeveloped, area of inquiry within the literature on intimate partner violence and bystander intervention behavior. Findings from existing research suggests that race is one characteristic that may be critical in predicting intentions to intervene and actual intervention behaviors among bystanders of intimate partner violence.

Understanding how the race of a potential perpetrator or victim of intimate partner violence may influence bystander behavior is specifically important given the studies showing

substantial racial differences in the risk and response to intimate partner violence (Breiding et al., 2011; Cho, 2012; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2012; West, 2004). Rennison and Welchans (2000) found that Black females experience intimate partner violence victimization at a rate 35% higher than rates experienced by White females, and Black males experience intimate partner violence victimization at a rate approximately 62% higher than rates experienced by White males. This higher prevalence is coupled with numerous empirical studies that have shown that racial minority victims generally receive slower or less intervention from bystanders compared to White victims (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1977; Gaertner et al., 1982; Katz et al., 2017).

Therefore, the present study aims to increase understanding of young adult bystanders' intentions to intervene in witnessed situations of physical intimate partner violence among peers who are either phenotypically Black or phenotypically White. To shed light upon the factors that influence bystander intervention behaviors, I will first describe Latané and Darley's (1970) Bystander Intervention Model and contextual factors associated with bystanders' intentions to intervene. Next, I will discuss the literature on demographic factors associated with perpetration and victimization of intimate partner violence as potential correlates of bystander intentions to intervene. I will then review research on perceptions of victim and perpetrator credibility and criminality in cases of intimate partner violence to examine how perceptions may be relevant in shaping bystander intentions to intervene among civilians and law enforcement personnel who witness intimate partner violence. Finally, I will draw attention to the ways in which current research has yet to directly assess race as a theorized predictor of bystander intentions to intervene among young adult witnesses of physical intimate partner violence among peers.

Factors Related to Bystander Attitudes, Behaviors, and Intentions to Help Victims of Intimate Partner Violence

Bystander Intervention Model

Understanding how bystander intervention can work to prevent and reduce rates of intimate partner violence is critical because bystanders have the potential to prevent and defuse violence in emergency situations (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011). Latané and Darley's (1970) Bystander Intervention Model states that there are five stages of bystander intervention: (a) noticing the event; (b) interpreting the event as an emergency that requires assistance; (c) accepting responsibility for intervening; (d) knowing how to intervene or provide help; and (e) implementing intervention decisions. Though bystanders often rely on others' reactions to determine whether an event should be considered an emergency (Latané & Darley, 1968), bystanders are less likely to rely on the presence of others to guide their behaviors in situations perceived as dangerous (Fischer et al., 2011). Bystanders in the presence of other bystanders may choose to not intervene, because they may believe that another bystander will intervene (Darley & Latané, 1968). Once bystanders have decided to accept responsibility to intervene, they must know what to do to intervene effectively. When they have a plan, bystanders can implement their plan to actively intervene in the emergency. Successful bystander intervention generally requires that individuals complete all five stages of the model (Latané & Darley, 1970). However, decisions to actively intervene may be impacted by various demographic and interpersonal factors that may ultimately increase or decrease the likelihood of bystander intervention (Burn, 2009; Dovidio et al., 2006; Loewenstein & Small, 2007).

The Impact of Social Influence on Bystander Intervention Behavior

Several researchers have reported that bystander intervention decisions are strongly impacted by social influence (Becker-Haven & Lindskold, 1978; Bickman, 1972; Harada, 1985; Stalder, 2008). Social influence broadly refers to changes in emotion, attitudes, and/or behaviors that occur, consciously or unconsciously, in response to other people (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004). Importantly, social influence has been shown to both facilitate and stymie bystander intervention. Fear of negative evaluation (Berkowitz, 2009; Karakashian et al., 2006), diffusion of responsibility (Bennett et al., 2014), audience inhibition (e.g., fear of being negatively evaluated because one has misinterpreted a situation and help is not required) (Bennett et al., 2014), and the size of the audience, such as large crowds, when witnessing a potentially dangerous situation (Latané & Nida, 1981) have all been shown to be associated with lower likelihood of bystander intervention. On the other hand, a recent study by Deitch-Stackhouse and colleagues (2015) demonstrated an association between social influence and prosocial intervention among 449 college students attending a college in the Northeastern region of the U.S. Results from this study suggested that the association between perceptions of social norms and intended bystander intervention was contingent upon how serious intimate partner violence was considered to be within participants' communities (e.g., college campuses). Thus, bystanders who came from communities where intimate partner violence was perceived to be serious were more likely to endorse intentions to engage in prosocial intervention.

Darley and Latané's (1968) theory of pluralistic ignorance suggests that bystander intervention responses to violence are largely influenced by the way that others choose to respond to violence in the moment and by the way others have historically responded to violence. Individuals whose values do not match up with group norms (e.g., norms that support

active prosocial responses to violence) are still likely to behave in ways that are in line with values directly or indirectly espoused by the majority (Fabiano et al., 2003; Paluck, 2009). For example, youth are likely to endorse willingness to intervene when peer norms support bystander intervention in response to violence (Brown et al., 2014; Fabiano et al., 2003; Stein, 2007). However, youth may remain passive in ambiguous situations involving violence if they notice their peers' passivity while violence is occurring. For instance, youth may choose not to intervene because they may infer that their peers are passive, because they do not believe that the situation warrants intervention (Sandstrom et al., 2012). Youth may conversely be likely to intervene in ambiguous situations of violence if they see their peers actively trying to stop the violence. Taken together, these findings suggest that social influence may increase conformity among individuals in a group, which may encourage group members to shape their behaviors in line with group standards and behaviors.

The aforementioned findings indicate that bystander intervention decisions are largely influenced by the way that other bystanders respond. Importantly, individuals whose values do not match up with those of their peers are still likely to behave in ways that are in line with values espoused by the majority (Casey et al., 2017; Fabiano et al., 2003; Paluck, 2009), because peer norms that support bystander intervention appear to encourage and predict willingness to intervene (Brown et al., 2014; Fabiano et al., 2003; Stein, 2007). For these reasons, social influence may increase conformity among individuals in a group, which may, in turn, encourage group members to shape their behaviors in line with group standards. Indeed, data from the 1995 Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN), which surveyed 8,782 residents of 343 neighborhoods in Chicago, Illinois, demonstrated that greater sense of community was associated with higher intent to help and higher actual helping behavior among

adults living in the community (Sampson et al., 1997). Rutkowski et al. (1983) also found that male college students who regard social responsibility as a group norm are more likely to engage in prosocial bystander intervention behaviors (e.g., helping an injured confederate) when in cohesive groups. Though findings from Rutkowski et al. (1983) suggest that group norms influence bystander behaviors, it is important to bear in mind that all participants were male, thus findings may not be generalizable to female populations.

The Impact of Social Connectedness on Bystander Intervention Behavior

Whether bystanders and individuals involved in potentially dangerous situations are socially connected also seems to have a strong influence on bystander behaviors (Darley & Latané, 1968; Laner et al., 2001). Bystanders in emergency situations are most likely to offer help to family, then to friends, next to acquaintances, and finally to strangers (Coons & Guy, 2009; Graziano et al., 2007; Kuramoto et al., 2008). Research with over 700 college students found that the likelihood of intervention among bystanders is lower if bystanders believe that the perpetrator and victim are related or know each other (Laner et al., 2001). Decisions to intervene become more complicated when bystanders are familiar with those involved in a potentially dangerous situation. For example, a study by Palmer et al. (2018) demonstrated that college students (n=721) asked to make bystander intervention decisions in response to vignettes depicting intimate partner violence chose both direct and indirect interventions based on their perceived relationships with the individuals described in the vignettes. Specifically, students who knew the victim or perpetrator were more likely to report that they would directly intervene in the situation.

Recent research that has examined how relationships to victims and perpetrators may influence bystander intervention behaviors among individuals who witness intimate partner violence suggests that these associations may be more nuanced than previously thought. For example, in contrast to Palmer et al. (2018), Bennett et al. (2017) found that female college students were equally likely to report an intention to intervene when witnessing intimate partner violence whether they knew the perpetrator or not, whereas male college students were less likely to report an intention to intervene if the perpetrator was someone they knew. Researchers postulated that male college students may have been less likely to intervene if they knew the perpetrator involved, because they may have believed that doing so would make their peer vulnerable to sanction. Overall, these findings indicate that social connectedness differentially impacts bystander intentions to intervene among male and female college students who are personally related to individuals involved in situations of intimate partner violence. Specifically, bystander connectedness may increase the likelihood that female bystanders can identify and consequently help victims in intimate partner violence situations. Given that social connectedness appears to increase willingness to intervene among female, but not male, bystanders of intimate partner violence, studies examining bystander intentions to intervene should specify the connectedness to both perpetrators and victims and address potential sex differences.

Demographic Differences in Bystander Intervention Behavior

Gender Socialization and Bystander Intervention Behavior

A considerable amount of literature has been published on sex differences in bystander intervention behaviors, but explanations for gendered behaviors have largely focused on

determining how and why masculinity influences male bystander behaviors (Carlson, 2008; Eagly & Crowley, 1986; Tice & Baumeister, 1985; Brown et al., 2014). Less research has focused on explanations of female bystander behaviors. Nonetheless, research of college students has shown that females are more likely to report engaging in prosocial bystander behavior than males are (McMahon & Banyard, 2012). In a sample of 178 college students attending a university in the Southwest, Sylaska and Walters (2014) examined whether participant sex, victim sex, and perpetrator sex influenced participants' responses to a hypothetical situation of intimate partner violence. Study findings demonstrated that male participants were more likely than female participants to perceive the victim as responsible for the violence and also more likely to ignore the situation. In contrast, female participants were more likely than male participants to encourage the victim to seek professional help and also to seek help from another person for the victim.

Other studies have also shown that male college students endorse fewer positive attitudes about bystander intervention than female college students endorse (McMahon et al., 2011; McMahon & Banyard, 2012). Among a community-based sample of over 200 adult males, Leone and colleagues (2016) examined whether masculinity would influence bystander decision-making processes among men responding to hypothetical situations involving male-to-female sexual aggression. Men completed measures of bystander efficacy (e.g., confidence in being able to implement bystander behaviors) and behavior, gender role norms, and masculine gender role stress, and findings showed that the belief that men should not engage in stereotypically feminine behaviors and the belief that men should be tough and aggressive were each independently positively associated with low bystander efficacy. The established associations between stereotypical beliefs about gender roles and bystander behaviors underscores the importance of

examining sex and gender differences in bystander intentions to intervene in situations involving intimate partner violence.

Race and Bystander Intervention Behavior

Contrary to the large body of research that has examined how sex and gender influence bystander intentions to intervene and bystander behaviors, few studies have investigated how race may influence bystander intentions to intervene and bystander behaviors. Research that has examined how race may impact bystander intervention behaviors has some caveats to consider: 1) this research is largely comprised of homogenous samples (e.g., all Latinx youth) and has not utilized comparison groups to examine whether racial differences in bystander intervention behaviors exist and 2) this research is largely comprised of small samples. In a community sample of 202 African American seventh-graders, Weisz and Black (2008) found that most students reported that they would not get involved in a hypothetical situation involving intimate partner violence, because "the violence was only the couple's business" (Weisz & Black, 2008, p. 186). Some adolescents also expressed worry about potentially worsening the situation by intervening. Findings from this research suggest that African American youth may be less likely to intervene in situations involving intimate partner violence when the individuals involved are familiar to them and/or when the individuals involved are similar to themselves (e.g., same race).

Focus group research that has examined how the race and ethnicity of bystanders influence intervention behaviors also suggests that race may moderate the association between witnessing intimate partner violence and intervening in intimate partner violence (Ocampo et al., 2007; Rueda et al., 2015). Among a sample of 43 Latinx teens in the ninth grade, reluctance to express intentions to intervene in situations involving intimate partner violence was common if the

described hypothetical situation involved a perpetrator and victim that the teens were friends with (Ocampo et al., 2007). Many teens reported that they would not intervene because they believed that "it's not their business and they don't want to get in trouble" (Ocampo et al., 2007, p. 186). Similar findings yielded from a study that examined help-offering among 64 Mexican-American teens (ages 15 to 17) showed that adolescents would offer help to peers experiencing intimate partner violence only when they specifically asked for it (Rueda et al., 2015). Findings from these research studies suggest that Latinx and perhaps African American youth bystanders of intimate partner violence may be likely to behave in line with cultural standards that advocate for the importance of privacy above the importance of help-offering. However, it remains unclear whether youth bystanders' decisions to intervene vary by racial or ethnic differences between bystanders and the parties directly involved. Several studies have demonstrated that race, ethnicity, and sex are tightly correlated with assumptions of credibility (Eigenberg & Policastro, 2016; George & Martnez, 2002), which importantly implies a potential association between assumptions of credibility and bystander intentions and behaviors.

Perceptions of Victim Credibility in Cases of Intimate Partner Violence

Bystander, perpetrator, and victim demographic factors influence bystander intentions to intervene (Hart & Rennison, 2003; Katz et al., 2017; Rueda et al., 2015) which suggests that these factors also influence perceptions of victim credibility. Studies that have examined associations between victim and perpetrator sex and perceptions of victim credibility in cases of intimate partner violence suggest that female victims are generally viewed as less credible than male perpetrators (Eigenberg & Policastro, 2016; George & Martinez, 2002; Gillum, 2002). A law review by Schafran (1997) highlighted landmark cases of women being regarded as less

credible, including the 1991 Anita Hill case, which centered on allegations of sexual harassment against then Supreme Court Nominee, Clarence Thomas. Schafran (1997) stated that "custom and law have taught that women are not to be taken seriously and not to be believed" (p. 40). Race-based stereotypes may further impact perceptions of credibility of female victims of intimate partner violence, such that individuals view Black female victims as less credible than White female victims because of stereotyped perceptions of Black women as "non-feminine, independent, overpowering" (Taft et al., 2009, p. 53), and unchaste (Crenshaw, 1992). As pointed out by Crenshaw (1992), courts equated chastity with other virtues, including truth-telling. Judges warned jurors "that the general presumption of chastity applicable to white women did not apply to Black women" (Crenshaw, 1992, p. 1470). In contrast to widely held negative perceptions of Black women, White women are commonly viewed as passive, suggestible, warm, and pious (Collins, 2000; Landrine, 1985; Niemann et al., 1994; White, 1985). Research suggests that perceptions of Black women as domineering can actually lead to victim blaming because individuals may perceive Black female victims as intentionally provocative and thus responsible for experiences of violence (Brice-Baker, 1994).

Similar biases have been found in studies that have examined the influence of race on likelihood of arrest among victims and perpetrators of intimate partner violence (Bachman & Coker, 1995; Harrison & Esqueda, 1999). Though Black women are more likely to call the police after a domestic dispute than White women are (Bachman & Coker, 1995; Harrison & Esqueda, 1999), research suggests that police may be less likely to arrest a man accused of violence against a Black woman (Ferraro, 1989; Robinson & Chandek, 2000). In addition, a recent study by Kahn et al. (2016) notably demonstrated that police use less force with individuals who appear more phenotypically White compared to individuals who look less

phenotypically White, suggesting that Whiteness is a protective factor against harsh treatment from police officers. Findings from these studies suggest that police officers may be less likely to use harsh methods when intervening in situations involving intimate partner violence when perpetrators appear more phenotypically White and when perpetrators engage in violence against Black female victims. Bystanders who witness intimate partner violence may similarly be less likely to intervene when violence is perpetrated by a White (or seemingly White) partner against a Black female partner. These potential intervention biases have been further explained by studies examining perceptions of culpability and criminality (Ferguson & Negy, 2004; Stewart et al., 2012).

Perceptions of Culpability and Criminality

Associations between aspects of identity and perceptions of culpability or blame in cases of intimate partner violence suggest that sex and race greatly influence whether and the extent to which suspects of intimate partner violence perpetration are perceived as culpable for their alleged actions. Among a sample of students from two universities in the South, Stewart et al. (2012) found that both male and female participants perceived female perpetrators as less culpable for perpetration of intimate partner violence compared to male perpetrators. Participants in the study also attributed less behavioral stability to female perpetrators of intimate partner violence, suggesting that participants may have viewed violence perpetrated by females as stemming from situational factors versus dispositional factors (Stewart et al., 2012). Based on study findings, researchers concluded that perceptions of male perpetrators as more culpable than female perpetrators may be linked to perceptions of male violence as trait-like behavior versus state-dependent behavior.

With regards to race and culpability, in a vignette study using an experimental design, Ferguson and Negy (2004) found that White college students expressed greater criticism towards Black perpetrators of intimate partner violence compared to White perpetrators of the same exact offense. Similarly, in another vignette study, Willis et al. (1996) found that a White man who perpetrated violence against a woman was thought of as less culpable for the violence when the woman was Black versus White. Esqueda and Harrison (2005) also utilized vignettes in their study and found that college students' culpability ratings of married couples that were engaged in intimate partner violence varied by race. Specifically, culpability ratings of a Black husband who perpetrated violence against his Black wife were lower when the Black woman was described as being provocative (e.g., screaming obscenities and slapping him prior to being punched by the husband), but not resistant (e.g., punching the husband back or stabbing him in retaliation). However, culpability ratings of a White husband who perpetrated violence against a White wife did not differ regardless of the wife's described use of provocation or resistance. Results from these vignette studies suggest that Black and White men who perpetrate violence against Black women may be viewed as less culpable for the violence, perhaps due to perceptions of Black women as aggressive and provocative (Esqueda & Harrison, 2005; Taft et al., 2009). Given that research suggests an association between attributions of blame and perceptions of negative traits (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008; Harrison & Esqueda, 1999; Tonizzo et al., 2000), it may be the case that bystanders are less likely to intervene in situations of intimate partner violence that involve Black female victims if they perceive less culpability for men when the victim is a Black woman.

Ascription of Criminality

Black men and women (same-race partners) involved in intimate partner violence may be viewed as more culpable of the violence compared to White men and women involved in intimate partner violence, because Black men and Black women are widely stereotyped as criminals or as having criminal characteristics (Blair et al., 2004; Eberhardt et al., 2006; Rome, 2004; Welch, 2007). Extant literature has established a clear link between perceptions of race and criminality such that racial minorities, particularly Black men, women, and children, are perceived as having a propensity for criminal behaviors (Correll et al., 2007; Goff et al., 2014; Mears et al., 2013). Utilizing a sample of police officers and college students, Eberhardt et al. (2004) demonstrated that seeing Black faces influences ability to detect images of objects associated with crime. This relationship was shown to be bidirectional, and crime-related objects similarly activated attentional biases of the faces of social group members thought to be criminal (e.g., Black individuals). In line with these findings, bystanders of intimate partner violence may be likely to view Black men and women involved in intimate partner violence as perpetrators rather than victims of crime.

Findings from Eberhardt et al. (2004) corroborated findings from Payne (2001), which similarly showed that being primed with Black faces led to faster identification and categorization of crime-related objects like guns among college students. Implicit racial bias may also make bystanders who witness intimate partner violence perpetrated by Black men or women against White women or men, respectively, more likely to identify and intervene in violence in the aforementioned situations, because these situations may be perceived as more dangerous in line with stereotypes of Black criminality. Research has also shown that Black people are viewed as more threatening and more dangerous than their White counterparts (Correll et al., 2007;

Correll et al., 2011; Payne, 2001). Indeed, in comparison to Black men and women, White men and women are commonly perceived to be intelligent, sophisticated, worldly, and articulate (Fordham & Obgu, 1986; Fryer Jr. & Torelli, 2010; Ogbu, 2004). Findings suggest that implicit biases may influence culpability ratings of perpetrators of intimate partner violence, such that Black perpetrators are viewed as more culpable of violence compared to White perpetrators of violence.

Summary and Limitations of Research on Bystander Intentions to Intervene

In sum, the current body of literature on intimate partner violence and bystander intentions to intervene among young adults who witness peer intimate partner violence suggests that factors that may promote or preclude help-offering among this population are varied. Research has shown that intimate partner violence is prevalent among adolescents and young adults (Dardis et al., 2015; Johnson et al., 2015). Furthermore, previous studies have shown that bystanders are directly exposed to intimate partner violence and resultantly may be able to intervene in violence as it is happening (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; McMahon & Banyard, 2012). Myriad factors influence bystander intentions and decisions to intervene, including victim and perpetrator sex and race (Burn, 2009; Dovidio et al., 2006; Loewenstein & Small, 2007). However, it is unclear whether bystander intentions to intervene vary in response to same-race couples versus in response to interracial couples. Given extant research that suggests that demographic factors like race and sex influence and shape bystander intentions and behaviors, further examination of race and sex as potential covariates of bystander intentions to intervene is of critical importance.

Examining factors that influence intentions to engage in bystander intervention among young adults is essential because youth bystanders have the potential to intervene in intimate partner violence while it is happening. Bystanders can aid in violence intervention and reporting of violence, and they may be able to do so without facing the same risks and consequences faced by the victims (and the perpetrators) of intimate partner violence who initiate the report. Identifying factors associated with intentions to intervene among young adults who witness physical intimate partner violence among peers may also help to inform bystander intervention programs designed to reduce intimate partner violence among young adults, which is critical because intimate partner violence specifically places young adults at increased risk for serious mental health problems and sexual health risks (Exner-Cortens et al., 2013; Silverman et al., 2004; Wolitzsky-Taylor et al., 2008).

The Current Study

Among a sample of 147 White-identifying college students, this study utilized vignettes depicting intimate partner violence to examine whether bystander intentions to intervene in the violence varied by perpetrator race, victim race, and the racial composition of the couple (interracial; same race). Because racial differences in perceptions of the events described and intentions to intervene were expected to vary by participant race, this study included only White participants in the current analysis. This single participant-race study allowed for the most parsimonious examination of bystander-perpetrator-victim characteristics in relation to bystander intentions to intervene. Specifically, this study utilized a 2x2x2 (bystander sex (male/female) x male perpetrator race (Black/White) x female victim race (Black/White)) between-subjects factorial design (see Figure 1 for depiction of the examined model). Participants were randomly

assigned to read one of four vignettes depicting bidirectional, male-to-female physical intimate partner violence between Black and White college students in either same-race or interracial romantic straight relationships. The study also examined whether perceived culpability ratings were related to the race of the perceived perpetrator or victim or the racial composition of the couple, and perceived victim and perpetrator culpability ratings were also examined as potential correlates of perceived likelihood of intervention and reporting.

Three hypotheses of bystander intentions to intervene were examined.

Hypothesis 1. Regardless of bystander sex, vignettes depicting violence by Black male perpetrators against White female victims will be associated with higher perceived likelihood of intervention and higher perceived likelihood of reporting compared to vignettes depicting all other perpetrator-victim configurations (i.e., White male perpetrators against White female or Black female victims; Black male perpetrators against Black female victims).

Hypothesis 2. Perceived culpability ratings of Black male perpetrators will be higher compared to perceived culpability ratings of White male perpetrators.

Hypothesis 3. Perceived culpability ratings will be associated with higher perceived likelihood of intervention and higher perceived likelihood of reporting, and perceived culpability ratings will moderate the associations between perpetrator race and decisions to intervene, such that Black men rated as highly culpable will be associated with the highest perceived likelihood of intervention ratings and the highest perceived likelihood of reporting ratings.

METHODS

Power Analysis

The power analysis was conducted using the program G*Power (Faul et al., 2007). Given that no known studies have examined the effects of race on intimate partner violence perceptions, the coefficients from a study evaluating the effects of participant-perpetrator-victim sex on perceptions of intimate partner violence (Sylaska & Walters, 2014) were used in the power analyses. With 178 college students in the study, Sylaska and Walters (2014) found outcomes that were significant at or below the .001 alpha level, and effect sizes ranged from medium to large according to conventions established by Cohen (1988). Post-hoc power analyses determined that the Sylaska and Walters (2014) study yielded a power of .99. Based on the coefficients found in Sylaska and Walters (2014), a power analysis using G*Power showed that, at a power of .80 and p-value of .05, at least 126 participants were needed to detect a medium effect size (e.g., f=.25) using analyses of variance (ANOVA) (Cohen, 1988). Thus, it was estimated that for the current study at least 126 participants would be needed to attain sufficient power to detect small to moderate effects.

Participants

Participants were 147 White-identifying young adults (ages 18 – 25 years) recruited from two commuter colleges in the Northeastern region of the U.S. One of the colleges has a primary social justice focus (*N*=94) and the other college has a primary business focus (*N*=53). The average age of participants was 19.32 years (*SD*=1.77). The sample was predominantly female (59.2%). Approximately 67 percent (66.7%) of the sample was comprised of first or second-year students.

Procedures

As part of Introductory Psychology course requirements at two colleges, students either completed a brief paper on research or participated in research studies. This study was offered as one research option and students self-selected into the study. Participants were informed that the purpose of the study was to increase understanding of peer friendships among young adults. All procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board and all participants provided informed consent. Thirty-seven participants completed the study in an on-campus computer lab, and in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, 110 participants completed the study off-campus. Regardless of location, all study materials were completed online using the Qualtrics data collection platform.

On Campus Procedures

Participants completed the study in a computer laboratory on campus on a desktop computer in small groups of 10 or fewer under the supervision of a trained research assistant. Upon arrival at the computer laboratory, participants signed in with a trained research assistant to confirm attendance. Participants were then handed cards with assigned alphanumeric identification (ID) codes. After providing informed consent, participants entered their assigned ID code, provided demographic information that included questions about age, race/ethnicity, sex, and college standing, and completed study measures.

Following completion of the study, participants were debriefed regarding the nature of the study by a trained research assistant. Debriefing highlighted the potential impact of reading the vignettes (e.g., “We recognize that these vignettes may have been difficult to read given the depiction of violence, and we are able to provide you with resources in the case that you found

any of the study materials distressing.”). Participants also received a copy of the debriefing form, which included a list of referrals to on-campus (e.g., Wellness Center) and local resources (e.g., Safe Horizon). The trained research assistant then collected all ID cards from participants and destroyed them.

Off Campus Procedures

In light of the COVID-19 pandemic, data collection conducted during and after April 2020 took place remotely, with participants using their own personal electronic devices. All responses in Qualtrics were anonymized to prevent Qualtrics from collecting any identifiable information including contact information, IP addresses, etc. Instead of receiving ID cards, participants were asked to use the following random number generator website (https://numbergenerator.org/random-6-digit-number-generator) to generate their 6-digit ID number to ensure that their ID number was not linked with any identifying information.

Participants who completed the study remotely received the debriefing form and resource list electronically. The debriefing form and resource list were included as graphics that were automatically displayed following completion of the study. The debriefing form and resource list were also available as downloadable files. Following completion of the study, participants received an automated email that indicated that they had completed the study, which they were asked to forward to the Principal Investigator as proof of their completion of the study.

Vignettes

Vignettes were randomized such that each condition was distributed equally among male and female participants. Participants read the vignette randomly assigned to them and answered

all questions and prompts related to the vignette. Vignettes were adapted from a study conducted by Sylaska and Walters (2014), which examined college students' perceptions and reactions to peer intimate partner violence. Participants were randomly assigned to read one of four vignettes depicting a scenario involving physical intimate partner violence between undergraduate peers in a straight dating relationship. Each vignette detailed a scenario in which participants witnessed a female peer being victimized by a male partner. Vignettes encompass steps 1 and 2 of the Bystander Intervention Model (e.g., 1. noticing that something is happening 2. interpreting the event as an emergency).

The perceived races of the male and of the female were manipulated using photos and assigned names. For example, race and sex of perpetrators and victims were indicated using names denoting race (e.g., Keisha representing a Black woman and Brad representing a White male). Names were selected from a study that aggregated common male and female names widely recognized as White or Black/African American (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004). Photos of Black and White male and female faces accompanied vignettes to ensure that respondents correctly identified the race and sex of the perpetrators and victims described in the vignettes. Photos were selected from the Chicago Face Database, which is a free stimulus set comprised of 158 high-resolution, standardized photos of Black and White males and females between the ages of 18 and 40 (Ma et al., 2015). Pictures were selected and matched based on age, average ratings of attractiveness, and average ratings of threateningness. In total, four pictures of college-aged male and female faces were used (i.e., Black male, Black female, White male, White female). Only names, pronouns, and pictures were changed across vignettes; all other details provided were identical. As a manipulation check, participants were required to

identify the victim and the perpetrator described in the vignette after reading it. Vignettes are provided in Appendix A.

Measures

Perceived Intentions to Intervene and Likelihood of Intervention

Based on previous research (Darley & Latané, 1968; Latané & Darley, 1970) and the aims of the current study, participants were asked to provide qualitative and quantitative information about their ***intentions to intervene*** in the situation and their likely course of action following witnessing this event (see Appendix B).

There were three questions that focused on intentions to intervene. The questions assessed perceptions of responsibility, perceptions of knowledge regarding how to intervene or provide help, and perceptions of actual intentions to intervene. Participants answered each question with a Yes/No response (1. Given the situation, are you responsible for intervening? 2. If you were in this situation, would you know how to intervene or provide help? 3. Would you intervene?). These questions map onto steps 3, 4, and 5 of the Bystander Intervention Model, respectively (e.g., 3. take responsibility for providing help 4. decide how to provide help 5. take action to provide help). Following the three quantitative items, participants were asked to provide 2-3 sentences describing what they would do to intervene and why, and if they indicated that they would not intervene, participants were asked to provide 2-3 sentences describing what it would take for them to intervene. There was also one question in which participants rated the likelihood that they would intervene using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("Extremely unlikely") to 7 ("Extremely likely"). This one-item rating is referred to as the perceived likelihood of intervention item.

Perceived Intentions to Report and Likelihood of Reporting to Authorities

Participants were asked to indicate if they would report violence to authorities with a Yes/No response (Would you report the violence to authorities?). This question maps onto step 5 of the Bystander Intervention Model (e.g., 5. take action to provide help). Participants also rated the likelihood that they would report violence to authorities using a 7-point ranging from 1 ("Extremely unlikely") to 7 ("Extremely likely"). This one-item rating is referred to as the perceived likelihood of reporting item.

Intervention and Reporting Behaviors

To assess which behaviors participants were most likely to select if they were in the situation depicted by the vignette, they were then asked to rank order ten intervention behaviors according to their perceptions of how likely they would be to engage in the listed behaviors. Participants were asked to use 1 to indicate the first choice of what they would do, 2 to indicate their second choice, etc. They were also asked to use a "0" to indicate something that they would not do.

Intervention behaviors were selected and adapted based on findings from a research report on bystander intervention behaviors in situations involving sexual violence conducted by Banyard, et al. (2005) on behalf of the U.S. Department of Justice (see Appendix C). Direct interventions were operationalized as the following behaviors: 1) Try to stop the fight by physically getting in between (victim's name) and (perpetrator's name), 2) Tell (perpetrator's name) to stop and encourage him/her to walk away, 3) Tell (victim's name) to stop and encourage him/her to walk away, 4) Help (victim's name) fight back against (perpetrator's name), 5) Ask for help from the passengers on the subway car. Reporting was operationalized as

the following behaviors: 6) Alert a police officer/call 911, 7) Alert train or station personnel. Participants also had the option to 9) Do nothing and/or 10) Wait for the passengers on the subway car to do something. The following behaviors were categorized as indirect interventions: 5) Alert a police officer/call 911 6) Alert train or station personnel 7) Ask for help from the passengers on the subway car. Participants who indicated that they would engage in an "Other" intervention behavior wrote in how they would intervene in 2 or 3 sentences.

Perceived Culpability

Information about the perceived culpability of victims and perpetrators (see Appendix D). Four items were included to assess ***participants' perceptions of culpability of the perpetrator and victim*** (e.g., "Is (perpetrator's name) responsible for what happened?"). Participants were first asked to indicate whether they believed the perpetrator was responsible for what happened with a Yes-No response, participants rated the extent to which they viewed the perpetrator as culpable of the violence using a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("Not at all") to 6 ("Entirely") (see Appendix D) These questions are referred to as the perceived perpetrator culpability item and the perceived perpetrator culpability rating, respectively. Participants were asked these same questions with regard to the victim and these two questions are referred to as the perceived victim culpability item and the perceived victim culpability rating, respectively.

Experiences with Intimate Partner Violence

Participants were also asked to indicate whether they had ever been in a situation involving peer intimate partner violence similar to the situation described in the vignette (1. Have you ever been in a situation like this? 2. If yes, indicate whether you intervened in the situation). If they intervened in the past situation, participants were asked to provide 2-3 sentences describing how they intervened.

Statistical Analyses

All analyses were conducted using SPSS version 26.0 and PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2013). Data cleaning and management took place before analyses were conducted. Preliminary analyses included descriptive statistics, which assessed the distribution and properties of each measure. First, data were screened for skewness and kurtosis to ensure that both values were within the acceptable range and did not exceed recommended cutoff values of 3.0 and 8.0, respectively (Kline, 2011) for any of the variables. Data points that were beyond 2 standard deviations from the mean were considered outliers. No outliers were found for these measures which were primarily Yes/No responses or one-item Likert scale ratings. Results from t-test analyses showed no significant differences for outcome measures for on campus versus off campus completions and no significant differences for outcome measures for participants across campuses. Therefore, all analyses included the full sample of 147 participants who identified as White. Preliminary analyses also included chi-square and t-test examinations of sex differences on all items.

Chi-square analyses were also conducted to examine whether perceived intentions to intervene and perceived intentions to report differed across the four conditions. Next, analysis of

variance (ANOVA) was used to assess main effects and interaction effects of each factor (e.g., bystander sex, perpetrator race, and victim race) on perceived likelihood of intervention and perceived likelihood of reporting across the four conditions (Hypothesis 1). T-tests were then used to determine whether mean perceived culpability ratings of Black male perpetrators were significantly higher than mean perceived culpability ratings of White male perpetrators (Hypothesis 2). To test Hypothesis 3, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to determine if perceived perpetrator culpability ratings were associated with higher perceived likelihood of intervention and perceived likelihood of reporting. Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro was used to examine whether perceived perpetrator culpability ratings would moderate associations between perpetrator race and perceived likelihood of intervention and between perpetrator race and perceived likelihood of reporting. PROCESS macro was also used to examine indirect effects of perceived perpetrator culpability ratings on perceived likelihood of intervention and perceived likelihood of reporting.

Finally, post-hoc analyses were conducted to further examine participants' perceptions of bystander intervention behaviors. First, a Friedman test was conducted to determine whether participants differentially rank ordered intervention behaviors. Then, chi-square analyses were used to examine the potential role of having previous experience with intimate partner violence in past intervention behaviors

RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis and Sample Characteristics

Preliminary analyses examined the distributional properties of each measure to ensure that assumptions of normality were met for analyses. Assumptions of normality were met, and

the structure of the data met all necessary criteria for analyses with chi-square tests of independence, t-tests, ANOVAs, and hierarchical multiple regression analyses.

Among the full sample, 76.2% of participants said that, given the situation, they were responsible for intervening, 72.1% said they would know how to intervene in the situation, 95.9% said that if they were in the situation they would intervene, and 37.4% said that they would report the violence to the authorities. There were significant sex differences in these reports. As shown in Table 1, chi-square analyses indicated that 100% of women reported that they would intervene in peer intimate partner violence compared to only 90% of the men ($\chi^2(1, N=147) = 9.070$, $p = .003$, Cramer's $V=.248$). Women were also significantly less likely to report that they would know how to intervene compared to men ($\chi^2(1, N=147) = 13.269$, $p < .001$, Cramer's $V=.300$). Moreover, significantly more women than men indicated that they would report the violence to the authorities ($\chi^2(1, N=147) = 6.965$, $p = .008$, Cramer's $V=.218$). Examining the mean ratings of likelihood of reporting the violence to authorities showed that women had a marginally higher rating than men (Table 2). There were no other significant or marginally significant sex differences in the ratings for likelihood to intervene and report nor were there any sex differences in mean culpability ratings (Table 2).

Primary Analyses

Contrary to hypotheses, the percentage of participants that reported intentions to intervene, intentions to report violence to authorities, responsibility to intervene, and knowledge about how to intervene did not significantly differ across conditions (see Table 3). To further test the hypothesis that there would be a higher rate of intervention for vignettes depicting Black men as perpetrators (Hypothesis 1), a one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of

perpetrator race on the ratings of perceived likelihood of intervention across conditions depicting different perpetrator-victim configurations. A one-way ANOVA demonstrated that there was no statistically significant difference in the mean ratings of perceived likelihood of intervention across conditions, $F(3, 137) = .661$, $p = .577$, $\eta_p^2=.014$.

A one-way ANOVA was also conducted to compare the effect of perpetrator race on the ratings of perceived likelihood of reporting to authorities across conditions depicting different perpetrator-victim configurations. Findings demonstrated that there was no statistically significant difference in ratings of perceived likelihood of reporting across conditions, $F(3, 143) = .258$, $p = .855$, $\eta_p^2=.005$

A three-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of bystander sex, perpetrator race, and victim race on ratings of perceived likelihood of intervention. There was a marginally statistically significant main effect of bystander sex on ratings of perceived likelihood of intervention, $F\ (1, 133) = 2.960$, $p = .088$, $\eta_p^2=.022$. Estimated marginal means demonstrated that males reported greater perceived likelihood of intervention (M=5.791, 95% *CI* [5.232, 6.350]) compared to females (M=5.170, 95% *CI* [4.725, 5.614]). There was also a marginally statistically significant interaction between the effects of bystander sex, perpetrator race, and victim race on ratings of perceived likelihood of intervention, $F(1, 133) = 3.327$, $p = .070$, $\eta_p^2=.024$. Estimated marginal means demonstrated that perceived likelihood of intervention was greatest among male participants in response to violence perpetrated by a Black male against a Black female (M=6.250, 95% *CI* [5.255, 7.245]) and lowest among female participants in response to violence perpetrated by a Black male against a Black female (M=4.538, 95% *CI* [3.434, 5.643]. There was no statistically significant interaction effect and no statistically significant interaction between

the effects of bystander sex, perpetrator race, and victim race on perceived likelihood of reporting, F (1, 139) = .010, p = .919, η_p^2=.000.

To test the hypothesis that Black males would be seen as more culpable than White males (Hypothesis 2), an independent t-test was conducted to examine differences in ratings of perceived perpetrator culpability. Contrary to Hypothesis 2, ratings of perceived perpetrator culpability of Black males (M=4.67, SD=1.093) compared to ratings of perceived perpetrator culpability of White males (M=4.83, SD=1.065), t(145)=-.859, p=.391, d= 0.148) did not significantly differ. To further examine whether race might be related to perceived culpability, t-test analysis was conducted for perceived victim culpability. Differences in perceived victim culpability among female victims were marginally significant such that ratings of culpability of Black females (M=2.75, SD=1.060) were slightly higher than ratings of White females (M=2.46, SD=1.012), t(145)=.861, p=.098, d=. 280).

Although the direct associations between perceived perpetrator race, intentions to intervene, and ratings of culpability were not directly associated as hypothesized, the potential indirect effects were examined using hierarchical multiple regression and PROCESS analyses. Using hierarchical multiple regression to examine ratings of perceived likelihood of intervention, bystander sex was entered in the first step, race of male perpetrators and female victims were entered in step 2, and ratings of perceived perpetrator culpability and perceived victim culpability were entered in the third step, (see Table 4). At step 1, sex was not shown to be significantly associated with ratings of perceived likelihood of intervention, β =-.122, t(139) = -1.453, p=.149. At step 2, sex, male perpetrator race, and female perpetrator race were not shown to be significantly associated with ratings of perceived likelihood of intervention (see Table 4). Perceived perpetrator culpability ratings were significantly associated with ratings of perceived

likelihood of intervention, β = .229, t(135) = 2.643, p=.009, and perceived victim culpability ratings were also significantly associated with perceived likelihood of intervention, β = .370, t(135) = 2.206, p=.029, f^2=.092. As shown in Table 4, together with sex and perpetrator and victim race, the culpability ratings of perceived perpetrators and perceived victims accounted for 8.4% of the variance in perceived likelihood of intervention (R^2 change =.084). The model remained the same when sex was excluded from the model. A moderation analysis using the Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro was then conducted to determine whether perceived perpetrator culpability moderated the relationship between perpetrator race and perceived likelihood of intervening. A non-significant interaction term indicated that no moderation was present, b= 0.022, t(137.00) =.4041, 95% *CI* [-.0857, .1297], p=.6867. Results from a mediation analysis conducted using the Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro demonstrated no direct or indirect effect of perpetrator race on perceived likelihood of intervention. A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was also conducted with same-race couples and interracial couples as predictor variables in the model, and similar to the use of separate variables for perpetrator and victim race, results showed no significant associations between race of couples (e.g., same race versus interracial) and likelihood of intervention.

A second hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine whether bystander sex, race of male perpetrators and female victims, and culpability ratings of perpetrator and victim would be significantly associated with ratings of likelihood of intention to report violence to authorities. Bystander sex was entered at step 1, race of male perpetrators and female victims were entered in step 2, and culpability ratings were entered at step 3. Findings demonstrated that none of the aforementioned predictors were significantly associated with likelihood of intention to report violence to authorities (see Table 5). The model remained the

same when sex was excluded from the model. A moderation analysis using the Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro was then conducted to determine whether perceived culpability moderated the relationship between perpetrator race and perceived likelihood of reporting. A non-significant interaction term indicated that no moderation was present, b= 0.0523, t(143.00) =.1.2348, 95% CI [-.0314, .1361], p=.2189, f^2=.038. Results from a mediation analysis conducted using the Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro found no direct or indirect effect of perpetrator race on ratings of perceived likelihood of reporting. Similar to the findings for likelihood of intervention, there were no changes in the findings if the variables were organized to illustrate same race versus interracial couples.

Post-Hoc Analyses

To further examine participants' perceptions of their bystander options, a Friedman test was conducted to determine whether participants differentially rank ordered intervention behaviors. Bystanders rank ordered ten intervention behaviors that were either direct (e.g., trying to stop the fight by physically getting in between the victim and the perpetrator) or indirect (e.g., doing nothing). Participants were given the option to do nothing in response to violence in light of research that has shown that direct intervention has the potential to escalate the intensity of violence and/or to displace the violence onto the bystander (Berkowitz, 2009). Results from the Friedman test showed that there was a significant difference between rank orders of intervention behaviors, $\chi_F(9) = 33.417$, $p < .001$. Findings demonstrated that most participants reported that they would most likely use direct interventions in response to a situation of intimate partner violence involving peers. Most participants (28.6%) ranked the following behavior as their first choice of action: Try to stop the fight by physically getting in between (victim's name) and

(perpetrator's name). When first and second choice rankings were combined, this behavior was still shown to be ranked highest by most participants (34.7%). The second highest ranked behavior by participants (20.4%) was "Other." Examples of Other interventions included the following:

"I would do a combination of get physically involved and tell Jamal to walk away" "I would attempt to verbally calm down the situation and allow the two of them to talk it out" "Rather than encouraging them to walk away, I'd probably try to get them to talk it through. I guess it depends on how the situation is going." Participants were also asked to explain why they chose the intervention they ranked first in two or three sentences. Examples of explanations included the following: "Because they are my friends—I care about them and I don't want them to hurt each other." "I feel like getting between them would be instinctual, however, this might not be the safest." "If they're my friends I would prefer to stop the fight myself."

Post-hoc analyses also examined the potential role of having previous experience with intimate partner violence in past intervention behaviors. Eight percent of female participants (*n*=7) and 11.7% of male participants (*n*=7) reported that they had previously witnessed peer intimate partner violence (9.5% of sample). Of those who reported previously witnessing peer intimate partner violence, 85.7% indicated that they intervened in the situation. One hundred percent of female participants who had previously witnessed intimate partner violence indicated that they intervened in the situation, and 71.4% of male participants who had previously witnessed intimate partner violence indicated that they intervened in the situation.

DISCUSSION

Few studies have examined bystander intervention behaviors among youth who have witnessed peer intimate partner violence. Specifically, there remains a paucity of research that has focused on the influence of victim and perpetrator sex and race on young adult bystander intentions to intervene. The majority of research conducted on bystander intervention behaviors has primarily focused on situational variables and individual variables related to characteristics of the bystander. This study built upon on existing research by exploring whether perceived likelihood of intervention, perceived likelihood of reporting, perceived intentions to intervene, and perceived intentions to report were related to differences in bystander sex, perceived perpetrator race, and perceived victim race. The present study modified and adapted measures currently being used in a bystander intervention program evaluation among college students to examine student perceptions of peer intimate partner violence and prosocial bystander behaviors. This chapter will provide a summary of the statistical results of the study and provide a discussion about the clinical and policy implications of findings for clinicians, educators, and advocates along with a discussion of the limitations of the study and future directions for this line of research.

The present study utilized a sample of White college students to investigate whether bystander intentions to intervene among youth who witness male-to-female physical intimate partner violence vary depending on bystander sex, victim race, and/or perpetrator race. Overall, the results showed no differences in perceived likelihood of intervention and no differences in perceived likelihood of reporting by race across conditions. Findings indicated that females reported greater perceived likelihood of intervention at a marginally higher percentage compared to males. In addition, ratings of culpability of White male perpetrators versus Black male

perpetrators did not significantly differ, and ratings of White female victims and Black female victims did not significantly differ. However, after controlling for bystander sex, male and female culpability ratings were shown to be significantly positively associated with perceived likelihood of intervention, but not significantly associated perceived likelihood of reporting. Post-hoc analyses demonstrated differences in rank orders of intervention behaviors; differences in how bystanders may choose to intervene may have affected the results of the analyses examining if they would intervene (Yes/No) and the ratings of the likelihood of intervening.

Bystander Awareness and Knowledge

Guided by Latané and Darley's (1970) five-step bystander model, bystander awareness and knowledge were examined to determine whether intentions to intervene were contingent upon awareness of the need for intervention in the emergency situation, personal responsibility to intervene, and knowledge of intervention strategies. Among this White-identifying sample, female participants were more likely than male participants to report that they would not know how to intervene in the violence depicted or provide help to individuals involved in the violence. Also, in line with previous research (Brown et al., 2014; McMahon & Banyard, 2012; Sylaska & Walters, 2014), female participants were more likely to report that they would intervene in peer intimate partner violence than male participants. Previous research suggests that females tend to report greater perceived lack of skills than males report (Burn, 2009), and perceived lack of skills are notably associated with lower engagement in bystander helping behaviors. (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Burn, 2009). Results from this study suggest that reported intentions to intervene may not necessarily be associated with knowledge of bystander intervention behaviors or confidence in one's ability to perform as a bystander. Females who witness peer intimate

partner violence may notice the event, recognize the need for help, and resultantly assume responsibility to intervene, which may make them likely to report prosocial intentions to intervene as well as actual engagement in prosocial intervention behavior.

Results from this study also demonstrated that male participants were less likely than female participants to report that they would report peer intimate partner violence to authorities. This finding appears to reflect broad gendered differences in help-seeking socialization. Research suggests that males are less likely to seek help from outside parties because they are socialized to be self-reliant (Goodey, 1997). Indeed, males may choose to engage in self-help violence, which involves retaliatory aggression, instead of reporting violence to the police (Black, 1983), because they may want to handle violent incidents they are involved in on their own (Langton et al., 2012).

Another possible explanation for sex differences in reported intentions to report violence to authorities in this study could be that males reported lower intentions to report violence to authorities because vignettes used in this study only depicted male-perpetrated violence. Other research on reporting behaviors suggests that males and females report violence to authorities differently depending on the sex of the perpetrator. Using a sample of 18,627 physical assaults from the National Crime Victimization Survey (1993–2015), findings from a study by Hullenaar and Ruback (2020) demonstrated that female victims were 21.9% more likely to report violence to the police when the offender was male (versus female) and male victims were 45.8% more likely to report violence to the police when the offender was female (versus male). These findings indicate that victims of violence are more likely to report violence to authorities when perpetrators are of the opposite sex. In addition, female victims may be more likely to report male-perpetrated violence to authorities for protection, whereas male victims may be more likely

to report female-perpetrated violence to authorities to facilitate de-escalation of violence. It is important to note that findings from this research focused on victim experiences and not bystander experiences. However, given that bystanders report violence using methods that are similarly used by victims of violence, it is reasonable to presume that findings from this research generalizes to bystander populations.

Differences in Likelihood of Intervention and Likelihood of Reporting across Perpetrator-Victim Configurations

Contrary to Hypothesis 1, vignettes depicting violence by Black male perpetrators against White female victims were not associated with higher intentions to intervene and report compared to vignettes depicting violence by White male perpetrators against Black female victims and all other perpetrator-victim configurations (i.e., White male perpetrators against White female victims; Black male perpetrators against Black female victims). Previous literature suggests that White college students may be less likely to help peers who are different from them (Brown et al., 2014; Katz et al., 2017). Given that peers in this study were described as friends, it is possible that participants reported virtually equal likelihood to intervene across conditions because participants considered their affiliation with peers above and beyond the race configurations depicted by the photos and names in the vignettes. Findings from post-hoc analyses demonstrated that participants ranked direct interventions above indirect interventions, suggesting that participants would be most likely to use direct interventions, such as trying to stop the fight by physically getting in between (victim's name) and (perpetrator's name), telling (perpetrator's name) to stop and encourage him/her to walk away, and telling (victim's name) to stop and encourage him/her to walk away in response to a situation of intimate partner violence

involving peers. Qualitative data provided by participants offered further evidence that participant decisions to directly intervene were influenced by the level of relatedness participants had with the individuals described in the vignettes (e.g., friends). Participants described feeling invested in taking direct action because the individuals involved in the violence they witnessed were their friends and because they wanted to reduce the likelihood that their friends would experience harm. Research has demonstrated that individuals are more likely to report intervening in emergency situations when they know or are relationally close to the parties involved versus when the individuals involved are strangers (Coons & Guy, 2009; Graziano et al., 2007; Kuramoto et al., 2008), which may explain why participants did not report different intentions to intervene across conditions. In addition, most participants in the study attended a college with a social justice focus. Research has shown that youth who engage in bystander intervention behaviors report being strongly motivated by a sense of social justice (Cappadocia et al., 2012). This finding suggests that college students with an academic focus on social justice may be similarly motivated to intervene. Furthermore, these students may have already received education about the importance of bystander intervention in situations involving intimate partner violence.

A marginally significant finding emerged indicating that males reported higher perceived likelihood of intervention compared to females. Two marginal findings revealed that perceived likelihood of intervention was highest in response to violence perpetrated by a Black male against a Black female among male participants and lowest among female participants in response to violence perpetrated by a Black male against a Black female. These findings should be interpreted with caution given that findings only approached significance. However, these findings appear to suggest that violence involving Black male perpetrators and Black female

victims may elicit intentions to intervene from White male participants because these situations may be viewed as particularly dangerous (Wilson et al., 2017).

Culpability Ratings of Perpetrators and Victims in Relation to Race of Perpetrators and Victims

Given that individuals are less likely to provide help to individuals perceived as culpable of violence (e.g., Black male and Black females) (Gaertner et al., 1982; Katz et al., 2017; Merrilees et al., 2018), culpability ratings of perpetrators and victims were examined as potential correlates of perceived likelihood of intervention and perceived likelihood of reporting. No support was found for Hypothesis 2. Culpability ratings of Black female victims were marginally higher than culpability ratings of White female victims, and this result should be interpreted with caution given the marginal level of significance. However, it is worth noting that this difference is consistent with what has been found in previous research. Indeed, previous research has shown that culpability ratings of Black women in situations of intimate partner violence are typically higher compared to culpability ratings of White women in the same situations (Esqueda & Harrison, 2005). Perceptions of Black female victims as culpable of violence may lead to victim blaming, which in turn, could make bystanders of intimate partner violence involving Black female victims less likely to intervene.

Bystander sex and race of perpetrators and victims were not shown to be significantly associated with perceived likelihood of intervention or perceived likelihood of reporting. However, in partial support of Hypothesis 3, findings did show that higher perceived perpetrator culpability ratings and higher perceived victim culpability ratings were significantly associated with higher perceived likelihood of intervention but not at all associated with perceived

likelihood of reporting. These results importantly demonstrate that perceived likelihood of intervention is higher when individuals involved in violence are viewed as culpable of the violence. Given that successful bystander intervention requires clear identification of an emergency situation as a situation that warrants intervention, these findings suggest that perceptions of culpability of partners involved in violence play an important role in helping bystanders better recognize whether a situation requires intervention.

Participants in this study were notably unlikely to report that they would report violence to authorities. Studies that have specifically looked at reporting of intimate partner violence to the police have exclusively focused on victim and not bystander reporting behaviors. However, research suggests that trust in the police may predict whether a victim or bystander decides to report a crime to the police. Trust in the police influences reporting such that individuals who trust the police are more likely to report victimization experiences to the police than individuals who do not trust the police (Rocque, 2011; Tyler, 2004). Since approximately half of American young adults report not having confidence in the fairness of the justice system (Harvard Institute of Politics, 2015), it is not surprising that most participants in this study reported no intention to report violence to authorities.

Research also suggests that demographic factors and characteristics of violence influence whether victims report their victimization to the police (Baumer, 2002; Hart & Rennison, 2003; Rennison, 2007). Female victims are more likely than males to either report to the police or to have someone report to the police on their behalf (Baumer, 2002; Hart & Rennison, 2003). Older victims are more likely to report to police than younger victims, and married individuals are more likely to report to police than are single individuals (Baumer, 2002). Unemployed individuals are less likely to report to police compared to individuals who work full-time

(Baumer, 2002). In line with findings from this study, results from these studies collectively suggest that single and unemployed young adults (e.g., college students) may be particularly unlikely to report violence to the police.

Clinical and Policy Implications

Bystander education programs, particularly on college campuses, have been effective in preventing and reducing intimate partner violence among youths (Ahrens et al., 2011; Coker et al., 2011; Banyard et al., 2007; Foubert et al., 2010; Gidycz et al., 2011; Moynihan et al., 2011; Potter et al., 2009), which is encouraging, because bystanders can potentially help victims before, during, and/or after violence occurs (McMahon & Banyard, 2012; Planty, 2002). Studies on sexual assault prevention suggest that increasing understanding of assault among bystanders may be key to increasing rates of intervention among young adults who witness this kind of violence (Banyard et al., 2005; Burn, 2009; Coker et al., 2011; McMahon, 2010). Feeling as though one has the skills to intervene in violence and taking responsibility for helping are both critical steps in successful bystander intervention according to Latané and Darley's (1970) Bystander Intervention Model. Notably, 76.2% of participants in this study said that they were responsible for intervening in the situation of intimate partner violence, 72.1% of participants said they would know how to intervene in the situation, and 95.9% of participants reported an intention to intervene. These findings suggest that youth may intervene in intimate partner violence situations without having the proper knowledge about how to effectively do so. All youth have the propensity to be helpers/prosocial allies of youth involved in intimate partner violence (McMahon & Banyard, 2012). However, many youths do not feel responsible for

intervening in violence and many youths are not aware of how to intervene in violence, rendering them unlikely to successfully intervene in violence.

As violence prevention and educational programming becomes more popular on college campuses, continued dissemination of information on bystander intervention to students and assessment of individual and situational factors that influence an individual's willingness to engage in positive bystander intervention behaviors by providers, educators, researchers, and clinicians will be of critical importance. Trainings should address issues of perceived dangerousness and perceptions of female victim culpability, given that perceived dangerousness and perceptions of victims as culpable may both limit bystander willingness to intervene. This growing knowledge base will be instrumental in improving multi-pronged primary prevention and intervention approaches focused on increasing bystander intervention knowledge and prosocial bystander intervention strategies among youth bystanders of intimate partner violence.

Limitations

There are a few chief limitations of this study. First, all participants identified as White. As a result, findings from this study may be more representative of White youth experiences and consequently may not generalize to youth experiences of individuals who identified as non-White. In addition, 94 participants in the study were students at a college with a social justice focus whereas 53 participants in the study were students at a college with a business focus. Given that the sample was primarily drawn from an institution focused on social justice, it is possible that participants' tendency to indicate that they would intervene in situations of intimate partner violence more broadly reflects students' personal and academic commitment to social

justice and activism. It could be the case that conducting the study with a different sample would yield different results.

An additional limitation of this study is the examination of self-reported bystander intentions to intervene and report violence to authorities using vignettes and not actual bystander intervention and reporting behaviors. Reading a vignette about peer intimate partner violence does not fully capture the experience of witnessing and responding to this form of violence in an everyday life situation. In turn, using vignettes along with proxy measures to explore bystander intervention behaviors may have limited the predictive validity and external validity of results from this study given that these measures may not necessarily generalize to actual bystander intervention behaviors. In addition, the use of one-item measures may have limited measure sensitivity and content validity given that these items did not allow for a measure of internal consistency. Thus, future research should utilize multi-item measures of bystander intervention behavior in order to better examine how and whether numerous factors influence intervention behaviors in real scenarios that require bystander behavior.

Finally, this study focused on responses to peer intimate partner violence among straight couples in college, and the vignettes only depicted male-to-female physical violence. For this reason, results from this study do not provide information about intentions to intervene in response to other forms of intimate partner violence (e.g., cyber dating abuse) or in response to violence among other youth populations who experience intimate partner violence as frequently, if not more frequently, than youth who experience male-to-female violence in straight couples (e.g., LGBTQ couples, adolescents with disabilities, homeless youth) (Bonomi et al., 2018; Goldenberg et al., 2018; Petering et al., 2014; Scheer et al., 2019). Given this study limitation, inferences about responses to intimate partner violence among LGBTQ couples, adolescent

couples with disabilities, and homeless youth cannot be drawn based on findings from this research.

Future Directions

Recommendations for Future Research

There are a number of important considerations for future research. First, future research should aim to replicate findings from this study using a sample of students attending a college of general studies. Given the study focus, it is important to determine whether intentions to intervene in response to peer intimate partner violence among students attending a college with a social justice focus vary or compare with intentions to intervene endorsed by other college student populations. Furthermore, measurement and assessment issues present in this study should be addressed in future research. Future studies should focus on creating reliable and valid multi-item measures of perceived perpetrator and victim culpability, bystander intentions to intervene and report, and actual bystander intervention behaviors. Single-item measures do not fully capture the constructs measured in this study (e.g., perceived perpetrator and victim culpability or intentions to intervene and report). Moreover, it remains unclear whether the aforementioned measures can be used to predict actual bystander intervention behaviors. More robust measures are needed to better assess perceived perpetrator and victim culpability and intentions to intervene and report among college students who witness situations of intimate partner violence. These measures should be integrated into prospective longitudinal studies to facilitate increased understanding of the temporal sequencing of factors that may promote or preclude prosocial bystander intentions to intervene in peer intimate partner violence.

Bystander Intentions to Intervene and Report among Diverse Youth

The current findings extend the literature on bystander intentions to intervene by examining the influence of sex, race, and culpability ratings of perpetrators and victims on bystander intentions to intervene and report violence to authorities. These findings are important, because they suggest that bystander intervention behaviors may vary depending on bystander sex, perceptions of victim and perpetrator race, and perceptions of victim and perpetrator culpability. Future studies should consider examining associations between bystander race and culture and bystander intentions to intervene by utilizing comparison groups to examine whether racial differences in bystander intervention behaviors exist. Individuals from cultures that espouse values that emphasize the importance of female loyalty and male dominance may be more likely to condone acceptance of intimate partner violence in relationships where males are perpetrating violence against women who have committed a perceived wrong (Capezza & Arriaga, 2008). As a result, these individuals may be less likely to report intentions to intervene in situations of male-to-female peer intimate partner violence. Research should specifically examine bystander race and culture as potential moderators in the relationship between witnessing intimate partner violence and likelihood of intervention. Findings from this research could help to inform prevention and intervention programs for bystanders of intimate partner violence and for youth personally at risk for intimate partner violence.

Bystander Intentions to Intervene and Report among LGBTQ Youth

Future research should also focus on examining intentions to intervene and report violence to authorities among youth commonly involved in intimate partner violence as bystanders and as victims (e.g., LGBTQ youth). Data from national samples have shown that

sexual minority males and females experience higher rates of intimate partner victimization than their heterosexual counterparts (Basile et al., 2020; Goldberg & Meyer 2013). LGBTQ youth are also at increased risk for disabilities and homelessness (Kidd et al., 2016; Rhoades et al., 2018), which makes them particularly vulnerable to exposure to intimate partner violence given that disability classifications and homelessness are both associated with increased risk for intimate partner violence exposure and victimization (Breiding & Armour, 2015; Tyler et al. 2008). LGBTQ youth are also more likely to experience higher rates of discrimination due to stigma associated with being a sexual minority, which impacts their access to services for victims of intimate partner violence, and in turn, places them at heightened risk for revictimization (Gaetz 2004; Martin-Storey, 2015; Tyler and Beal 2010; Walls and Bell 2011). As a result, LGBTQ youth may rely more greatly on partners or peers for social support (Scheer et al., 2020), which suggests that they may also be more likely to seek help for violence from bystanders versus authorities. Research on bystander intentions to intervene and report violence among LGBTQ youth may play a significant role in helping to identify and develop affirmative prevention and response strategies to violence that occurs among young LGBTQ couples.

Bystander Intentions to Intervene and Report in Response to Cyber Dating Abuse

Research has yet to examine bystander intentions to intervene in response to other forms of intimate partner violence that occur in online contexts. Cyber dating abuse is a form of intimate partner violence that causes harm to a partner's reputation and/or sense of psychological safety. Cyber dating abuse may involve impersonating a partner online, publicly posting private or embarrassing photos or negative comments about a partner, frequently contacting a partner for information about the partner's location, and/or using a technological device (e.g., cell phone) to

stalk, control, or harass a partner (Zweig et al., 2013). Since online violence between adolescents is highly prevalent (Juvonen & Gross, 2008; Lenhart et al., 2011), many youths may not necessarily perceive acts of violence that occur online as serious because they may not see tangible evidence of experienced injury or harm to victims online. Given the covert and complicated nature of online violence, determining whether and how bystanders of cyber dating abuse intervene in this form of violence with empirical research is critical. Online interactions are typically viewed by large audiences, and bystanders may resultantly be less likely to respond to violence perpetrated on public online platforms due to diffusion of responsibility. Most social media sites have features that allow for reporting of abusive or inappropriate content, but it is unclear whether youth use these features to report witnessed peer intimate partner violence. Findings from research on bystander intentions to intervene and report online violence may help to increase understanding of ways that youth can identify and report online incidents of intimate partner violence, which is important because online violence has the potential to escalate into real-life violence (Patton et al., 2014).

Conclusions

Many adolescents engage in romantic relationships during adolescence, and relationships among adolescents who date are likely to involve some form of intimate partner violence (Dardis et al., 2015; Johnson et al., 2015). Research has shown that less than 3% of adolescents who have experienced intimate partner violence reported violence to an authority figure (Molidor & Tolman, 1998), which suggests that other modes of prevention and intervention may be more effective in reducing intimate partner violence among youth. The aforementioned findings highlight the need for more education and training about intimate partner violence, the various

forms it may take (e.g., physical versus cyber), and intervention strategies that bystanders can use to safely and effectively defuse and/or stop violence before it happens, as it is happening, and after it happens. Incorporating this education and training into core college curriculums could help to ensure that students learn how they can help before actually being confronted with violence. Enhancing awareness and knowledge of bystander intervention behaviors should help to mobilize a wider community response to youth intimate partner violence.

Table 1
Chi-Square Analyses of Perceived Intentions to Intervene and Perceived Intentions to Report by Participant Sex

Intentions to Intervene and Report	Male (n=60)	Female (n=87)
Given the situation, are you responsible for intervening?	80%	73.6%
If you were in this situation, would you know how to intervene?	88.3%	60.9%***
Would you intervene (either directly or indirectly)?	90%	100%**
Would you report the violence to authorities?	25%	46.5%**

*$p \leq .05$. **$p \leq .01$. ***$p \leq .001$.

Table 2
Item Means of Perceived Likelihood of Intervention, Perceived Likelihood of Reporting, and Perceived Culpability Ratings by Sex

	Entire Sample (*n*=147)	Male (*n*=60)	Female (*n*=87)
How likely would you be to intervene?	5.48 (2.03)	5.80 (1.90)	5.29 (2.10)
How likely would you be to report the violence to authorities?	3.93 (1.65)	3.65 (1.66)	4.13 (1.61) †
Perpetrator Culpability Ratings	4.76 (1.08)	4.67 (1.17)	4.82 (1.01)
Victim Culpability Ratings	2.61 (1.04)	2.70 (1.05)	2.55 (1.04)

† $.05 \le p \le .10$. *$p \le .05$. **$p \le .01$. ***$p \le .001$. Standard Deviations appear in parentheses beside means.

Table 3
Chi-Square Analyses of Perceived Intentions to Intervene and Perceived Intentions to Report across Conditions

	Black Male Perpetrator		White Male Perpetrator	
Intentions to Intervene and Report	White Female Victim (*n*=37)	Black Female Victim (*n*=30)	White Female Victim (*n*=34)	Black Female Victim (*n*=46)
Given the situation, are you responsible for intervening?	73.0%	70.0%	73.5%	84.8%
If you were in this situation, would you know how to intervene?	70.3%	76.7%	67.6%	73.9%
Would you intervene (either directly or indirectly)?	91.9%	96.7%	100%	95.7%
Would you report the violence to authorities?	48.6%	33.3%	41.2%	28.9%

$^*p \leq .05$. $^{**}p \leq .01$. $^{***}p \leq .001$.

Table 4

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Bystander Sex, Perceived Perpetrator Culpability Ratings, Perceived Victim Culpability Ratings, Race of Male Perpetrator, and Race of Female Victim in Association with Perceived Likelihood of Intervention

	Step 1			Step 2			Step 3		
Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Bystander Sex	-.509	.350	-.122	-.464	.356	-.111	-.445	.347	-.107
Perpetrator Race				-.001	.058	-.002	-.003	.057	-.005
Victim Race				-.074	.087	-.074	-.076	.086	-.075
Perpetrator Culpability Ratings							.443	.167	.229**
Victim Culpability Ratings							.370	.168	.192*
ΔR^2		.015			.020			.084*	

**p* ≤.05. ***p*≤.01. ****p*≤.001.

Table 5

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Bystander Sex, Perceived Perpetrator Culpability Ratings, Perceived Victim Culpability Ratings, Race of Male Perpetrator, and Race of Female Victim in Association with Perceived Likelihood of Reporting

	Step 1			Step 2			Step 3		
Variable	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Bystander Sex	.476	.274	.143	.482	.279	.144	.460	.279	.138
Perpetrator Race				-.029	.046	-.052	-.037	.046	-.068
Victim Race				.004	.069	.005	-.013	.070	-.016
Perpetrator Culpability Ratings							.079	.134	.052
Victim Culpability Ratings							-150	.138	-.095
ΔR^2		.020			.003			.014	

**p* ≤.05. ***p*≤.01. ****p*≤.001

Table 6

Frequency Table of First and Second Choices of Intervention Reported by Participants

Intervention Behaviors in Rank Order based on Participant Responses	First Ranked Choice of Intervention (% of participants)	Second Ranked Choice of Intervention (% of participants)
1) Try to stop the fight by physically getting in between (victim's name) and (perpetrator's name)	28.6%	6.1%
2) Tell (perpetrator's name) to stop and encourage him/her to walk away	12.2%	21.1%
3) Tell (victim's name) to stop and encourage him/her to walk away	9.5%	12.2%
4) Other	20.4%	2.0%
5) Help (victim's name) fight back against (perpetrator's name)	12.9%	10.2%
6) Alert train or station personnel	15.0%	8.8%
7) Ask for help from the passengers on the subway car	12.9%	6.8%
8) Wait for the passengers on the subway car to do something	17.0%	6.1%
9) Alert a police officer/call 911	10.9%	10.2%
10) Do nothing	19.7%	2.7%

		(*IV*) Victim Race	
(*IV)* Bystander Sex	(*IV*) Perpetrator Race	Black	White
Male	Black	Violence by Black man against Black woman	Violence by Black man against White woman
Female	White	Violence by White man against Black woman	Violence by White man against White woman

Figure 1. 2x2x2 Between-subjects factorial design.

Appendix A

Black Male Perpetrator/Black Female Victim

Keisha and Jamal are two of your best friends. The three of you have been friends since early high school and have remained close since coming to college. Keisha has been in a dating relationship with Jamal for about 10 months. You've hung out with Jamal and Keisha together and feel that they make a good couple; Keisha has told you that she's in love with Jamal and you have sensed that Keisha seems very happy with her life. Since the school year started, Keisha has mentioned casually some of Jamal's behavior that has made you suspicious of their relationship. Jamal has been starting fights quite frequently because he is jealous that Keisha spends much of her time with other men; Jamal genuinely believes that Keisha is cheating on him. Jamal gets very heated during these fights and, in his anger, has been known to throw things. In preparation for an upcoming exam, Keisha suggests that you, her, and Jamal study together. After you have finished studying together, Keisha invites you over to hang out with her and Jamal at their apartment. You all take the subway together, and you notice that there are very few passengers on the subway car. While on the subway, Jamal and Keisha begin arguing. Jamal then punches Keisha in the face. After getting punched in the face, Keisha slaps Jamal, and they both start hitting each other.

Note. (Modified vignettes are adapted from Sylaska & Walters, 2014)

Black Male Perpetrator/White Female Victim

Emily and Jamal are two of your best friends. The three of you have been friends since early high school and have remained close since coming to college. Emily has been in a dating relationship with Jamal for about 10 months. You've hung out with Jamal and Emily together and feel that they make a good couple; Emily has told you that she's in love with Jamal and you have sensed that Emily seems very happy with her life. Since the school year started, Emily has mentioned casually some of Jamal's behavior that has made you suspicious of their relationship. Jamal has been starting fights quite frequently because he is jealous that Emily spends much of her time with other men; Jamal genuinely believes that Emily is cheating on him. Jamal gets very heated during these fights and, in his anger, has been known to throw things. In preparation for an upcoming exam, Emily suggests that you, her, and Jamal study together. After you have finished studying together, Emily invites you over to hang out with her and Jamal at their apartment. You all take the subway together, and you notice that there are very few passengers on the subway car. While on the subway, Jamal and Emily begin arguing. Jamal then punches Emily in the face. After getting punched in the face, Emily slaps Jamal, and they both start hitting each other.

Note. (Modified vignettes are adapted from Sylaska & Walters, 2014)

White Male Perpetrator/Black Female Victim

Keisha and Brad are two of your best friends. The three of you have been friends since early high school and have remained close since coming to college. Keisha has been in a dating relationship with Brad for about 10 months. You've hung out with Brad and Keisha together and feel that they make a good couple; Keisha has told you that she's in love with Brad and you have sensed that Keisha seems very happy with her life. Since the school year started, Keisha has mentioned casually some of Brad's behavior that has made you suspicious of their relationship. Brad has been starting fights quite frequently because he is jealous that Keisha spends much of her time with other men; Brad genuinely believes that Keisha is cheating on him. Brad gets very heated during these fights and, in his anger, has been known to throw things. In preparation for an upcoming exam, Keisha suggests that you, her, and Brad study together. After you have finished studying together, Keisha invites you over to hang out with her and Brad at their apartment. You all take the subway together, and you notice that there are very few passengers on the subway car. While on the subway, Brad and Keisha begin arguing. Brad then punches Keisha in the face. After getting punched in the face, Keisha slaps Brad, and they both start hitting each other.

Note. (Modified vignettes are adapted from Sylaska & Walters, 2014)

White Male Perpetrator/White Female Victim

Emily and Brad are two of your best friends. The three of you have been friends since early high school and have remained close since coming to college. Emily has been in a dating relationship with Brad for about 10 months. You've hung out with Brad and Emily together and feel that they make a good couple; Emily has told you that she's in love with Brad and you have sensed that Emily seems very happy with her life. Since the school year started, Emily has mentioned casually some of Brad's behavior that has made you suspicious of their relationship. Brad has been starting fights quite frequently because he is jealous that Emily spends much of her time with other men; Brad genuinely believes that Emily is cheating on him. Brad gets very heated during these fights and, in his anger, has been known to throw things. In preparation for an upcoming exam, Emily suggests that you, her, and Brad study together. After you have finished studying together, Emily invites you over to hang out with her and Brad at their apartment. You all take the subway together, and you notice that there are very few passengers on the subway car. While on the subway, Brad and Emily begin arguing. Brad then punches Emily in the face. After getting punched in the face, Emily slaps Brad, and they both start hitting each other.

Note. (Modified vignettes are adapted from Sylaska & Walters, 2014)

Appendix B

Given the situation, are you responsible for intervening?
Yes No

If you were in this situation, would you know how to intervene or provide help?
Yes No

Would you intervene?
Yes No

Please describe what you would do to intervene and why in two or three sentences.

If you would not intervene, please describe why you would not intervene in two or three sentences.

In two or three sentences, please describe what would it take for you to intervene?

Have you ever been in a situation like this?
Yes No

If yes, indicate whether you intervened in the situation.

Yes No

If you intervened in the past situation, please describe how you intervene in two or three sentences.

How likely would you be to intervene?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all very much

Would you report the violence to authorities?
Yes No

How likely would you be to report the violence to authorities?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all very much

Appendix C

Rank order each of the following statements according to how likely you would be to do that behavior in response to what you just read. Include all behaviors whether you would do them immediately or later on in relation to this specific event. Use 1 to indicate the first choice of what you would do, 2 to indicate your second choice, etc. **Be sure to put a number next to each behavior. Use a "0" to indicate something that you would not do.** For the response of "Other," please describe how you would intervene in one or two sentences.

__ Do nothing.
__ Try to stop the fight by physically getting in between (victim's name) and (perpetrator's name).
__ Alert a police officer/call 911.
__ Alert train or station personnel.
__ Tell (perpetrator's name) to stop and encourage him/her to walk away.
__ Tell (victim's name) to stop and encourage him/her to walk away.
__ Help (victim's name) fight back against (perpetrator's name).
__ Ask for help from the passengers on the subway car.
__ Wait for the passengers on the subway car to do something.
__ Other ____

Please explain why you chose the intervention you ranked first in two or three sentences.

____

Note. (Instructions and items are adapted from Banyard et al. (2005) and were originally published by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), U.S. Department of Justice—all NIJ materials are in the Public Domain)

Appendix D

Is (perpetrator's name) responsible for what happened?

Yes No

How responsible is (perpetrator's name) for what happened?

1	2	3	4	5	6
not at all					entirely

Is (victim's name) responsible for what happened?

Yes No

How responsible is (victim's name) for what happened?

1	2	3	4	5	6
not at all					entirely

References

Ahrens, C. E., Rich, M. D., & Ullman, J. B. (2011). Rehearsing for real life: The impact of the InterACT Sexual Assault Prevention Program on self-reported likelihood of engaging in bystander interventions. *Violence Against Women*, *17*(6), 760-776. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801211410212

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). American Psychiatric Publishing. https://doi.org /10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596no access

Arriaga, X. B., & Foshee, V. A. (2004). Adolescent dating violence: Do adolescents follow their friends' or their parents' footsteps? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19,* 162-184. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260503260247

Bachman, R., & Coker, A. L. (1995). Police involvement in domestic violence: The interactive effects of victim injury, offender's history of violence, and race. *Violence and Victims*, *10*(2), 91-106. https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.10.2.91

Banyard, V. L. (2008). Measurement and correlates of prosocial bystander behavior: The case of interpersonal violence. *Violence and Victims*, *23*(1), 83-97. https://doi.org/ 10.1891/0886-6708.23.1.83

Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2011). Variation in bystander behavior related to sexual and intimate partner violence prevention: Correlates in a sample of college students. *Psychology of Violence*, *1*(4), 287-301. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023544

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2005). Rape prevention through bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *US Department of Justice*, 1-206.

Basile, K. C., Clayton, H. B., DeGue, S., Gilford, J. W., Vagi, K. J., Suarez, N. A., ... & Lowry, R. (2020). Interpersonal Violence Victimization Among High School Students—Youth Risk Behavior Survey, United States, 2019. *MMWR Supplements*, *69*(1), 28-37. http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.su6901a4

Baumer, E. P. (2002). Neighborhood disadvantage and police notification by victims of violence. *Criminology*, *40*(3), 579-616. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2002.tb00967.x

Becker-Haven, J. F., & Lindskold, S. (1978). Deindividuation manipulations, self-consciousness, and bystander intervention. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *105*(1), 113-121. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1978.9924097

Belsley, D. A., Kuh, E., & Welsch, R. E. (2004). *Regression diagnostics identifying influential data and sources of collinearity*. Wiley-Interscience.

Bennett, S., Banyard, V. L., & Garnhart, L. (2014). To act or not to act, that is the question? Barriers and facilitators of bystander intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *29*(3), 476-496. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513505210

Bennett, S., Banyard, V. L., & Edwards, K. M. (2017). The impact of the bystander's relationship with the victim and the perpetrator on intent to help in situations involving sexual violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *32*(5), 682-702. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515586373

Berkowitz, A. (2009). *Response ability: Complete guide on bystander behavior*. Beck and Company.

Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha

and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American Economic Review*, *94*(4), 991-1013. https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828042002561

Bickman, L. (1972). Social influence and diffusion of responsibility in an emergency. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *8*(5), 438-445. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(72)90069-8

Black, D. (1983). Crime as social control. *American Sociological Review*, 34-45. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095143

Black, M., Basile, K., Breiding, M., Smith, S., Walters, M., Merrick, M., Chen, J., & Stevens, M. (2011). National intimate partner and sexual violence survey: 2010 summary report.

Blair, I. V., Judd, C. M., & Chapleau, K. M. (2004). The influence of Afrocentric facial features in criminal sentencing. *Psychological Science, 15*, 674–679. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00739.x

Bonomi, A., Nichols, E., Kammes, R., & Green, T. (2018). Sexual violence and intimate partner violence in college women with a mental health and/or behavior disability. Journal of Women's Health, 27(3), 359-368. https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2016.6279

Bourg, S., & Stock, H. V. (1994). A review of domestic violence arrest statistics in a police department using a pro-arrest policy: Are pro-arrest policies enough?. *Journal of Family Violence*, *9*(2), 177-189. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01531962

Breiding, M. J., & Armour, B. S. (2015). The association between disability and intimate partner violence in the United States. *Annals of Epidemiology*, *25*(6), 455–457. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2015.03.017

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

version 2.0. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Breiding, M. J., Black, M. C., & Ryan, G. W. (2008). Prevalence and risk factors of intimate partner violence in eighteen US states/territories, 2005. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *34*(2), 112-118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2007.10.001

Breiding, M. J., Chen, J., & Black, M. C. (2014). *Intimate partner violence in the United States—2010*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Basile, K. C., Walters, M. L., Chen, J., & Merrick, M. T. (2015). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization—National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, United States, 2011. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. *Surveillance Summaries (Washington, DC: 2002)*, *63*(8), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2015.302634

Brewster, M., & Tucker, J. M. (2016). Understanding bystander behavior: The influence of and interaction between bystander characteristics and situational factors. *Victims & Offenders, 11*(3), 455–481. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2015.1009593

Brice-Baker, J. R. (1994). Domestic violence in African-American and African-Caribbean families. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, *3*(1), 23-38. https://doi.org /10.1007/BF02087357

Brown, A. L., Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2014). College students as helpful bystanders against sexual violence: Gender, race, and year in college moderate the impact of perceived peer norms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *38*(3), 350-362. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684314526855

Burn, S.M. (2009). A Situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles, 60*, 779-792. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9581-5

Buzawa, E. S., & Buzawa, C. G. (1993). The impact of arrest on domestic violence: Introduction. *American Behavioral Scientist, 36*(5), 558-574. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764293036005002

Campbell, J. C. (2002). Health consequences of intimate partner violence. *The Lancet*, *359*(9314), 1331-1336. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(02)08336-8

Cappadocia, M. C., Pepler, D., Cummings, J. G., & Craig, W. (2012). Individual motivations and characteristics associated with bystander intervention during bullying episodes among children and youth. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 27*(3), 201–216. https://doi.org/10.1177/0829573512450567

Capezza, N. M., & Arriaga, X. B. (2008). Factors associated with acceptance of psychological aggression against women. *Violence against Women*, *14*(6), 612-633. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801208319004

Carlson, M. (2008). I'd rather go along and be considered a man: Masculinity and bystander intervention. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, *16*(1), 3-17. https://doi.org/10.3149/jms.1601.3

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. https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000033

Cercone, J. J., Beach, S. R., & Arias, I. (2005). Gender symmetry in dating intimate partner violence: does similar behavior imply similar constructs? *Violence and Victims, 20*(2),

207. https://doi.org/10.1891/vivi.2005.20.2.207

Cho, H. (2012). Racial differences in the prevalence of intimate partner violence against women and associated factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *27*(2), 344-363. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511416469

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences, 2nd edition*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Coons, S. J., & Guy, M. C. (2009). Performing bystander CPR for sudden cardiac arrest: behavioral intentions among the general adult population in Arizona. *Resuscitation*, *80*(3), 334-340. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resuscitation.2008.11.024

Coker, A. L., Williams, C. M., Follingstad, D. R., & Jordan, C. E. (2011). Psychological, reproductive and maternal health, behavioral, and economic impact of intimate partner violence. In J. W. White, M. P. Koss, & A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), *Violence against women and children, Vol. 1. Mapping the terrain* (pp. 265-284). American Psychological Association.

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought.* Routledge.

Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., Wittenbrink, B., Sadler, M. S., & Keesee, T. (2007). Across the thin blue line: police officers and racial bias in the decision to shoot. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*(6), 1006-10023. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.1006

Correll, J., Wittenbrink, B., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Goyle, A. (2011). Dangerous enough: Moderating racial bias with contextual threat cues. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*(1), 184-189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.08.017

Crenshaw, K. (1992). Race, gender, and sexual harassment. *Southern California Law Review*,

65(3), 1467-1476.

Dardis, C. M., Dixon, K. J., Edwards, K. M., & Turchik, J. A. (2015). An examination of the factors related to dating violence perpetration among young men and women and associated theoretical explanations: A review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *16*(2), 136-152. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838013517559

Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8*(4), 377-383. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0025589

Deitch-Stackhouse, J., Kenneavy, K., Thayer, R., Berkowitz, A., & Mascari, J. (2015). The influence of social norms on advancement through bystander stages for preventing interpersonal violence. *Violence against Women*, *21*(10), 1284-1307. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801215592720

Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., Schroeder, D. A., & Penner, L. A. (2006). *The social psychology of prosocial behavior*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Dutton, M. A., & Goodman, L. A. (2005). Coercion in intimate partner violence: Toward a new conceptualization. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 52*(11-12), 743–756. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-4196-6

Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, *100*(3), 283-308. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.100.3.283

Eberhardt, J. L., Davies, P. G., Purdie-Vaughns, V. J., & Johnson, S. (2006). Looking deathworthy: Perceived stereotypicality of Black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. *Psychological Science, 17*, 383–386. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-

9280.2006.01716.x

Eberhardt, J. L., Goff, P. A., Purdie, V. J., & Davies, P. G. (2004). Seeing black: race, crime, and visual processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*(6), 876-893. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.6.876

Eigenberg, H., & Policastro, C. (2016). Blaming victims in cases of interpersonal violence: attitudes associated with assigning blame to female victims. *Women & Criminal Justice*, *26*(1), 37-54. https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2014.997417

Esqueda, C. W., & Harrison, L. A. (2005). The influence of gender role stereotypes, the woman's race, and level of provocation and resistance on domestic violence culpability attributions. *Sex Roles*, *53*(11-12), 821-834. https://doi.org/10.1007/11199s-005-8295-1

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

Fabiano, P. M., Perkins, H. W., Berkowitz, A., Linkenbach, J., & Stark, C. (2003). Engaging men as social justice allies in ending violence against women: Evidence for a social norms approach. *Journal of American College Health*, *52*(3), 105-112. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448480309595732

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G* Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*(2), 175-191. https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03193146

Felson, R. B., Messner, S. F., & Hoskin, A. (1999). The victim-offender relationship and calling the police in assaults. *Criminology*, *37*(4), 931-948. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1999.tb00510.x

Felson, R. B., Messner, S. F., Hoskin, A. W., & Deane, G. (2002). Reasons for reporting and not reporting domestic violence to the police. *Criminology*, *40*(3), 617-648. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2002.tb00968.x

Ferraro, K. J. (1989). Policing woman battering. *Social Problems*, *36*(1), 61-74. https://doi.org/10.2307/800550

Ferguson, C. J., & Negy, C. (2004). The influence of gender and ethnicity on judgments of culpability in a domestic violence scenario. *Violence and Victims*, *19*, 203-220. https://doi.org/10.1891/vivi.19.2.203.64103

Fischer, P., Krueger, J. I., Greitemeyer, T., Vogrincic, C., Kastenmüller, A., Frey, D., ... & Kainbacher, M. (2011). The bystander-effect: A meta-analytic review on bystander intervention in dangerous and non-dangerous emergencies. *Psychological Bulletin*, *137*(4), 517-537. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023304

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of 'acting white.'" *The Urban Review*, *18*(3), 176-206. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01112192

Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., Linder, F., Rice, J., & Wilcher, R. (2007). Typologies of adolescent dating violence: Identifying typologies of adolescent dating violence perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*, 498-519. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260506298829

Foubert, J. D., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Brasfield, H., & Hill, B. (2010). Effects of a rape awareness program on college women: Increasing bystander efficacy and willingness to intervene. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *38*(7), 813-827. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20397

Fryer Jr, R. G., & Torelli, P. (2010). An empirical analysis of 'acting white'. *Journal of Public*

Economics, *94*(5-6), 380-396. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2009.10.011

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1977). The subtlety of White racism, arousal, and helping behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*(10), 691-707. https://doi.org /10.1037/0022-3514.35.10.691

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., & Johnson, G. (1982). Race of victim, nonresponsive bystanders, and helping behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 117*(1), 69-77. https://doi.org /10.1080/00224545.1982.9713409

Gaetz, S. (2004). Safe streets for whom? Homeless youth, social exclusion, and criminal victimization. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 46, 423–455. https://doi.org/10.3138/ cjccj.46.4.423.

Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. *Violence against Women*, *17*(6), 720-742. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/1077801211409727

George, W. H., & Martínez, L. J. (2002). Victim blaming in rape: Effects of victim and perpetrator race, type of rape, and participant racism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *26*(2), 110-119. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.00049

Gillum, T. L. (2002). Exploring the link between stereotypic images and intimate partner violence in the African American community. *Violence Against Women*, *8*(1), 64-86. https://doi.org/10.1177/10778010222182946

Goff, P. A., Jackson, M. C., Di Leone, B. A. L., Culotta, C. M., & DiTomasso, N. A. (2014). The essence of innocence: consequences of dehumanizing Black children. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *106*(4), 526. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035663

Goldberg, N. G., & Meyer, I. H. (2013). Sexual orientation disparities in history of intimate partner violence: Results from the California Health Interview Survey. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *28*, 1109–1118. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512459384.

Goldenberg, T., Jadwin-Cakmak, L., & Harper, G. W. (2018). Intimate partner violence among transgender youth: Associations with intrapersonal and structural factors. *Violence and gender*, *5*(1), 19-25. https://doi.org/10.1089/vio.2017.0041.

Goodey, J. (1997). Boys don't cry: Masculinities, fear of crime and fearlessness. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *37*(3), 401-418. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a014177

Gottfredson, M. R., & Gottfredson, D. M. (1990). *Decision making in criminal justice: Toward the rational exercise of discretion*. Plenum Press.

Graziano, W. G., Habashi, M. M., Sheese, B. E., & Tobin, R. M. (2007). Agreeableness, empathy, and helping: a person × situation perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*(4), 583-599. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.4.583

Hamby, S., Weber, M. C., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. (2016). What difference do bystanders make? The association of bystander involvement with victim outcomes in a community sample. *Psychology of Violence*, *6*(1), 91-102. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039073

Hamberger, L. K., Larsen, S. E., & Lehrner, A. (2017). Coercive control in intimate partner violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 37*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.08.003

Harada, J. (1985). Bystander intervention: The effect of ambiguity of the helping situation and the interpersonal relationship between bystanders. *Japanese Psychological Research*. *27*(4), 177-184. https://doi.org/10.4992/psycholres1954.27.177

Harrison, L. A., & Esqueda, C. W. (1999). Myths and stereotypes of actors involved in domestic violence: Implications for domestic violence culpability attributions. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *4*(2), 129-138. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789(97)00026-8

Hart, B. (1993). Battered women and the criminal justice system. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *36*(5), 624-638. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764293036005007

Hart, T. C., & Rennison, C. M. (2003). *Reporting crime to the police, 1992-2000* (p. 1). Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Harvard Institute of Politics. (2015). *Harvard Youth Poll*. [Data set]. https://iop.harvard.edu/no-front-runner-among-prospective-republican-candidates-hillary-clinton-control-democratic-primary

Hayes, A. F. (2012). PROCESS: A versatile computational tool for observed variable mediation, mod- eration, and conditional process modeling [White paper]. http://www.afhayes.com/ public/process2012.pdf on March 7, 2021.

Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Methodology in the social sciences. Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach.* Guilford Press.

Henriques, J. B., & Davidson, R. J. (2000). Decreased responsiveness to reward in depression. *Cognition & Emotion*, *14*(5), 711-724. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/02699930050117684

Hines, D. A., & Saudino, K. J. (2003). Gender differences in psychological, physical, and sexual aggression among college students using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales. *Violence and Victims, 18*(2), 197-217. https://doi.org/10.1891/vivi.2003.18.2.197

Hullenaar, K. L., & Ruback, R. B. (2020). Gender interaction effects on reporting assaults to the

police. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *00(0)*, 1-31. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520903134

Iverson, K. M., Litwack, S. D., Pineles, S. L., Suvak, M. K., Vaughn, R. A., & Resick, P. A. (2013). Predictors of intimate partner violence revictimization: The relative impact of distinct PTSD symptoms, dissociation, and coping strategies. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, *26*(1), 102-110. https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.21781

Johnson, W. L., Giordano, P. C., Manning, W. D., & Longmore, M. A. (2015). The age–IPV curve: Changes in the perpetration of intimate partner violence during adolescence and young adulthood. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *44*(3), 708-726. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s10964-014-0158-z

Juvonen, J., & Gross, E. F. (2008). Extending the school grounds? Bullying experiences in cyberspace. *Journal of School Health, 78*(8), 496–505. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2008.00335.x

Kahn, K. B., Goff, P. A., Lee, J. K., & Motamed, D. (2016). Protecting whiteness: White phenotypic racial stereotypicality reduces police use of force. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *7*(5), 403-411. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550616633505

Karakashian, L. M., Walter, M. I., Christopher, A. N., & Lucas, T. (2006). Fear of negative evaluation affects helping behavior: The bystander effect revisited. *North American Journal of Psychology*, *8*(1). 13-32.

Katz, J., Merrilees, C., Hoxmeier, J. C., & Motisi, M. (2017). White female bystanders' responses to a black woman at risk for incapacitated sexual assault. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *41*(2), 273-285. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684316689367

Kidd, S. A., Howison, M., Pilling, M., Ross, L. E., & McKenzie, K. (2016). Severe mental

illness in LGBT populations: A scoping review. *Psychiatric Services*, *67*(7), 779-783. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201500209

Klein, A. R. (2004). *The criminal justice response to domestic violence*. Cengage Learning.

Klein, R. (2012). *Responding to intimate violence against women: The role of informal networks*. Cambridge University Press.

Kline, R.B. (2011). *Principles and practices of structural equation modeling (2nd ed.)*. Guilford.

Kuijpers, K. F., van der Knaap, L. M., & Winkel, F. W. (2012). Risk of revictimization of intimate partner violence: The role of attachment, anger and violent behavior of the victim. *Journal of Family Violence*, *27*(1), 33-44. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-011-9399-8

Kuramoto, N., Morimoto, T., Kubota, Y., Maeda, Y., Seki, S., Takada, K., & Hiraide, A. (2008). Public perception of and willingness to perform bystander CPR in Japan. *Resuscitation*, *79*(3), 475-481. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resuscitation.2008.07.005

Landrine, H. (1985). Race x class stereotypes of women. *Sex Roles, 13*, 65–75.

Laner, M. R., Benin, M. H., & Ventrone, N. A. (2001). bystander attitudes toward victims of violence: who's worth helping?. *Deviant Behavior*, *22*(1), 23-42. https://doi.org/10.1080/016396201750065793

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Misra, T. A., Selwyn, C., & Rohling, M. L. (2012). Rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional intimate partner violence across samples, sexual orientations, and race/ethnicities: A comprehensive review. *Partner Abuse*, *3*(2), 199-230. https://doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.3.2.199

Langton, L., Berzofsky, M., Krebs, C., & Smiley-McDonald, H. (2012). Victimizations not

reported to police, 2006-2010 (NCJ 238536). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics. Office of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice. http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/ pdf/vnrp0610.pdf

Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10*(3), 215-221. https://doi.org/10.1037 /h0026570

Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* Meredith Corporation.

Latané, B., & Nida, S. (1981). Ten years of research on group size and helping. *Psychological Bulletin*, *89*(2), 308-324. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.89.2.308.

Leen, E., Sorbring, 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 Behaviour*, 18(1), 159-174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.11.015

Lenhart, A., Madden, M., Smith, A., Purcell, K., Zickurh, K., & Rainie, L. (2011). Teens, kindness and cruelty on social network sites. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center's Internet and American Life Project.

Leone, R. M., Parrott, D. J., Swartout, K. M., & Tharp, A. T. (2016). Masculinity and bystander attitudes: Moderating effects of masculine gender role stress. *Psychology of Violence*, *6*(1), 82-90. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038926.

Levy, B. (1990). Abusive teen dating relationships: An emerging issue for the 90s. Response to the Victimization of Women & Children, *13*(1), 5.

Loewenstein, G., & Small, D. A. (2007). The scarecrow and the tin man: The vicissitudes of

human sympathy and caring. *Review of General Psychology*, *11*(2), 112-126. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.11.2.11

Ma, D. S., Correll, J., & Wittenbrink, B. (2015). The Chicago face database: A free stimulus set of faces and norming data. *Behavior Research Methods*, *47*(4), 1122-1135. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-014-0532-5

Martin-Storey, A. (2015). Prevalence of dating violence among sexual minority youth: Variation across gender, sexual minority identity and gender of sexual partners. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 44*, 211–214. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-0089-0.

McMahon, S. (2010). Rape myth beliefs and bystander attitudes among incoming college students. *Journal of American College Health*, *59*(1), 3-11. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/07448481.2010.483715.

McMahon, S., & Banyard, V. L. (2012). When can I help? A conceptual framework for the prevention of sexual violence through bystander intervention. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *13*(1), 3-14. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838011426015

McMahon, S., Postmus, J. L., & Koenick, R. A. (2011). Conceptualizing the engaging bystander approach to sexual violence prevention on college campuses. *Journal of College Student Development*, *52*(1), 115-130. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2011.0002

Mears, D. P., Pickett, J., Golden, K., Chiricos, T., & Gertz, M. (2013). The effect of interracial contact on whites' perceptions of victimization risk and black criminality. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *50*(2), 272-299. https://doi.org/10.1177 /0022427811431156

Merrilees, C. E., Katz, J., DuBois, N., & Grant, C. (2018). White female bystanders' responses to a black woman at risk for sexual assault. *Violence and Victims*, *33*(4), 739-754.

https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-17-00062

Molidor, C., & Tolman, R. M. (1998). Gender and contextual factors in adolescent dating violence. *Violence Against Women, 4*, 180-194. https://doi.org/0.1177/1077801298004002004

Moynihan, M. M., Banyard, V. L., Arnold, J. S., Eckstein, R. P., & Stapleton, J. G. (2011). Sisterhood may be powerful for reducing sexual and intimate partner violence: An evaluation of the bringing in the bystander in-person program with sorority members. *Violence Against Women, 17*(6), 703-719. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801211409726

Niemann, Y. F., Jennings, L., Rozelle, R. M., Baxter, J. C., & Sullivan, E. (1994). Use of free responses and cluster analysis to determine stereotypes of eight groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*, 379–390. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167294204005

Ogbu, J. U. (2004). Collective identity and the burden of "acting White" in Black history, community, and education. *The Urban Review*, *36*(1), 1-35. https://doi.org/ 10.1023/B:URRE.0000042734.83194.f6

Ocampo, B. W., Shelley, G. A., & Jaycox, L. H. (2007). Latino teens talk about help seeking and help giving in relation to dating violence. *Violence against Women*, *13*(2), 172-189. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801206296982

Palmer, J. E., Nicksa, S. C., & McMahon, S. (2018). Does who you know affect how you act? The impact of relationships on bystander intervention in interpersonal violence situations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*(17), 2623-2642. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/0886260516628292

Paluck, E. L. (2009). What's in a norm? Sources and processes of norm change. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 96(3), 594-600. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014688

Patton, D. U., Hong, J. S., Ranney, M., Patel, S., Kelley, C., Eschmann, R., & Washington, T. (2014). Social media as a vector for youth violence: A review of the literature. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *35*, 548-553. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.02.043

Petering, R., Rice, E., Rhoades, H., & Winetrobe, H. (2014). The social networks of homeless youth experiencing intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *29*(12), 2172-2191. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513516864

Payne, B. K. (2001). Prejudice and perception: The role of automatic and controlled processes in misperceiving a weapon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*(2), 181-192. https://doi.org/10.I037//0O22-3514.81.2.181

Planty, M. (2002). *Third-party involvement in violent crime, 1993-99*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Posick, C. (2014). Victimization and reporting to the police: The role of negative emotionality. *Psychology of Violence*, *4*(2), 210-223. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031770

Potter, S. J., Moynihan, M. M., Stapleton, J. G., & Banyard, V. L. (2009). Empowering bystanders to prevent campus violence against women: A preliminary evaluation of a poster campaign. *Violence Against Women*, *15*(1), 106-121. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801208327482

Rennison, C. M., & Welchans, S. (2000). Intimate Partner Violence: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. *Bureau of Justice Statistics, Special Report*. https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=1002

Rennison, C. M. (2007). Reporting to the police by Hispanic victims of violence. *Violence and*

Victims, *22*(6), 754-772. https://doi.org/10.1891/088667007782793110

Rhoades, H., Rusow, J. A., Bond, D., Lanteigne, A., Fulginiti, A., & Goldbach, J. T. (2018). Homelessness, mental health and suicidality among LGBTQ youth accessing crisis services. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, *49*(4), 643-651. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-018-0780-1

Robinson, A. L., & Chandek, M. S. (2000). The domestic violence arrest decision: Examining demographic, attitudinal, and situational variables. *Crime & Delinquency*, *46*(1), 18-37. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128700046001002

Rocque, M. (2011). Racial disparities in the criminal justice system and perceptions of legitimacy: A theoretical linkage. *Race and Justice*, *1*(3), 292-315. https://doi.org/10.1177/2153368711409758

Rome, D. (2004). *Black demons: The medias depiction of the African American male criminal stereotype*. Praeger.

Rueda, H. A., Lindsay, M., & Williams, L. R. (2015). "She posted it on Facebook" Mexican American adolescents' experiences with technology and romantic relationship conflict. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *30*(4), 419-445. https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558414565236

Rutkowski, G. K., Gruder, C. L., & Romer, D. (1983). Group cohesiveness, social norms, and bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *44*(3), 545-552. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.44.3.545

Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, *277*(5328), 918-924. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.277.5328.918

Sandstrom, M., Makover, H., & Bartini, M. (2013). Social context of bullying: Do misperceptions of group norms influence children's responses to witnessed episodes? *Social Influence, 8*(2-3), 196–215. https://doi.org/10.1080/15534510.2011.651302

Schafran, L. H. (1997). Credibility in the courts: Why is there a gender gap? In N. V. Benokraitis (Ed.), *Subtle sexism: Current practice and prospects for change.* (pp. 216–225). Sage Publications, Inc.

Scheer, J. R., & Baams, L. (2019). Help-seeking patterns among LGBTQ young adults exposed to intimate partner violence victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 886260519848785. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519848785

Scheer, J. R., Martin-Storey, A., & Baams, L. (2020). Help-Seeking barriers among sexual and gender minority individuals who experience intimate partner violence victimization. In: Russell B. (eds) *Intimate Partner Violence and the LGBT+ Community*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44762-5_8

Shorey, R. C., Cornelius, T. L., & Bell, K. M. (2008). A critical review of theoretical frameworks for dating violence: Comparing the dating and marital fields. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 13*(3), 185-194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2008.03.003

Silverman, J. G., Raj, A., & Clements, K. (2004). Dating violence and associated sexual risk and pregnancy among adolescent girls in the United States. *Pediatrics*, *114*(2), e220-E225. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.114.2.e220

Stalder, D. R. (2008). Revisiting the issue of safety in numbers: The likelihood of receiving help from a group. *Social Influence*, *3*(1), 24-33. https://doi.org/10.1080/15534510701766181

Stein, J. L. (2007). Peer educators and close friends as predictors of male college students'

willingness to prevent rape. *Journal of College Student Development*, *48*(1), 75-89. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2007.0008

Stewart, C., Moore, T., Crone, T., DeFreitas, S. C., & Rhatigan, D. (2012). Who gets blamed for intimate partner violence? The relative contributions of perpetrator sex category, victim confrontation, and observer attitudes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *27*(18), 3739-3754. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512447571

Sylaska, K.M., 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

Taft, C. T., Bryant-Davis, T., Woodward, H. E., Tillman, S., & Torres, S. E. (2009). Intimate partner violence against African American women: An examination of the socio-cultural context. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *14*(1), 50-58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2008.10.001

Tice, D. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (1985). Masculinity inhibits helping in emergencies: Personality does predict the bystander effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *49*(2), 420-428. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.49.2.420

Tonizzo, S., Howells, K., Day, A., Reidpath, D., & Froyland, I. (2000). Attributions of negative partner behavior by men who physically abuse their partners. *Journal of Family Violence*, *15*(2), 155-167. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007590827696

Tyler, K. A., & Beal, M. R. (2010). The high-risk environment of homeless young adults: Consequences for physical and sexual victimization. *Violence and Victims, 25*, 101–115. https://doi.org/10.1891/ 0886-6708.25.1.101.

Tyler, K. A., Melander, L. A., & Noel, H. (2009). Bidirectional partner violence among

homeless young adults: Risk factors and outcomes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *24*(6), 1014-1035. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508319364

Tyler, T. R. (2004). Enhancing police legitimacy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *593*(1), 84-99. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716203262627

Walls, N. E., & Bell, S. (2011). Correlates of engaging in survival sex among homeless youth and young adults. *Journal of Sex Research, 48*, 423–436. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/00224499.2010.501916

Warnken, H., & Lauritsen, J. (2019). Who experiences violent victimization and who accesses services? Findings from the National Crime Victimization Survey for Expanding Our Reach.

Welch, K. (2007). Black criminal stereotypes and racial profiling. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *23*(3), 276-288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986207306870

Weisz, A. N., & Black, B. M. (2008). Peer intervention in dating violence: Beliefs of African-American middle school adolescents. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, *17*(2), 177-196. https://doi.org/10.1080/15313200801947223

West, C. M. (2004). Black women and intimate partner violence: New directions for research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *19*(12), 1487-1493. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260504269700

White, D. G. (1985). *Ar'n't I a woman: Female slaves in the plantation South*. Norton and Company.

Willis, C. E., Hallinan, M. N., & Melby, J. (1996). Effects of sex role stereotyping among European American students on domestic violence culpability attributions. *Sex Roles*, *34*(7-8), 475-491. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01545027

Wilson, J. P., Hugenberg, K., & Rule, N. O. (2017). Racial bias in judgments of physical size and formidability: From size to threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 113*(1), 59–80. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000092

Wolf, M. E., Ly, U., Hobart, M. A., & Kernic, M. A. (2003). Barriers to seeking police help for intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, *18*(2), 121-129. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022893231951

Wolitzky-Taylor, K. B., Horowitz, J. D., Powers, M. B., & Telch, M. J. (2008). Psychological approaches in the treatment of specific phobias: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *28*(6), 1021-1037. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2008.02.007

Zweig, J. M., 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