

Automatic Associations and Conscious Attitudes Predict Different Aspects of Men's Intimate  
Partner Violence and Sexual Harassment Proclivities

Antonella L. Zapata-Calvente and Miguel Moya

University of Granada

Gerd Bohner

Universität Bielefeld

Jesús L. Megías

University of Granada

Author Note

Antonella L. Zapata-Calvente, Mind, Brain and Behavior Research Center (CIMCYC), University of Granada; Miguel Moya, Department of Social Psychology, University of Granada; Gerd Bohner, Abteilung für Psychologie, Universität Bielefeld; Jesús L. Megías, Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Granada.

The present study was performed as part of projects PSI2013-45041-P and PSI2016-79812-P funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness and as part of the Scholarship for Teacher Training University [FPU 2012, AP2012-2824] funded by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport to the first author. Gerd Bohner gratefully acknowledges support from the Gender Studies Program of the Ministry for Innovation, Science, and Research of the State of North-Rhine Westfalia, Germany. The authors would like to thank Luz María Saldarriaga and Miriam Seidel for their help with preparing materials and data collection, as well as Benjamin Liersch for technical and computing assistance, and Dr. Pedro Macizo for his expertise and assistance with the data analysis.

Correspondence concerning this manuscript should be addressed to Antonella L. Zapata-Calvente, Faculty of Psychology, University of Granada, Campus de Cartuja S/N, 18011 Granada, Spain. Email: antonellalzc@ugr.es

### Abstract

Intimate partner violence against women (IPV) and sexual harassment are both widespread. Research on their causes and attitudinal correlates has rarely examined implicit, automatic cognitive associations related to the partner (in IPV aggressors) or to women (in sexual harassment offenders). The aim of the present research was to study these implicit associations in 129 male German students. Participants completed scales of hostile sexism (HS), masculine gender role stress (MGRS), short-term (STMO) and long-term mating orientation (LTMO), and proclivity to both IPV and sexual harassment. Next they performed a primed lexical decision task that measured whether concepts of violence, power, hostility, and sexuality were differentially associated with representations of women, men, and the participant's own intimate partner. Results showed that implicit associations of own partner with violence as well as hostility were generally high but did not correlate strongly with the proclivity measures. Furthermore, the proclivity measures were positively predicted by HS, MGRS, and STMO, whereas LTMO negatively predicted IPV proclivity. Practice implications point to the need to address early socialization processes that may shape men's negative associations with female partners. Some strategies to prevent and reduce these types of implicit associations are discussed.

*Keywords:* intimate partner violence, implicit associations, implicit measures, lexical decision task, semantic priming, sexual harassment

Automatic Associations and Conscious Attitudes Predict Different Aspects of Men's Intimate Partner Violence and Sexual Harassment Proclivities

Violence against women negatively affects women throughout the world in all countries and societies (Ellsberg et al., 2015). In the present article we address two common forms of such violence: Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) and sexual harassment against women. The literature suggests that male IPV and sexual harassment offenders may have different mental associations than non-aggressive men do. However, it has not yet been explored whether the implicit associations in perpetrators of these two types of violence against women would be the same or if there would be specific implicit mental associations for each one of them. We first define both concepts and address related theorizing, and then we move on to outline research on their antecedents and attitudinal correlates.

IPV is both very common and severe in its dimensions and consequences (García-Moreno et al., 2013). It may be defined as any “behaviour within an intimate relationship that causes physical, sexual or psychological harm, including acts of physical aggression, sexual coercion, psychological abuse and controlling behaviours” (Butchart, García-Moreno, & Mikton, 2010, p. 11). Regarding the causes of IPV, broadly accepted ecological models suggest an interplay among personal, situational, and sociocultural factors (Heise, 1998). Research in psychology has consistently shown the relationship between certain personal variables (e.g., cognitive distortions and prejudicial attitudes) and the social perception, as well as perpetration, of IPV (Clements & Holtzworth-Munroe, 2007; Dobash & Dobash, 2011; Eckhardt & Dye, 2000; Stith, Smith, Penn, Ward, & Tritt, 2004).

Sexual harassment targeting women also is widespread and has documented negative consequences on women's mental and physical health (Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012; Rospenda,

Richman, & Shannon, 2009). It may be defined as comprising a variety of verbal or nonverbal interpersonal behaviors that are unwanted and perceived negatively by the target; such behaviors may be of a sexual nature (ranging from unwanted sexual attention to sexual coercion) or may derogate a person based on her gender (gender harassment; e.g. the telling of sexist jokes) (for a detailed classification, see Gelfand, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995). To explain the causes of sexual harassment, institutional factors (Stamarski & Hing, 2015), as well as an interplay of personal and situational variables (Pryor, 1987), have been suggested. Regarding personal dispositions, an evolutionary account emphasizes a sexual motive, which may be explained by men's evolved tendency to follow short-term mating strategies, whereas a sociocultural account emphasizes the motive of inter-gender hostility, whereby men strive to maintain dominance by disparaging and objectifying women (for an extended discussion, see Diehl, Rees, & Bohner, 2012).

However, a large proportion of research on both IPV and sexual harassment is based on explicit measures, usually self-reports using paper-and-pencil questionnaires (Eckhardt, Samper, Suhr, & Holtzworth-Munroe, 2012; Polaschek, Calvert, & Gannon, 2009; Ward, 2000). The explicit character of these methods makes them particularly vulnerable to response distortions and biases (Fazio & Olson, 2003), especially in relation to these sensitive topics (Bennett, Sullivan, & Lewis, 2006). Furthermore, self-reports may capture only post hoc representations of what respondents believe they think, but not how they process information in specific interpersonal contexts (Eckhardt & Crane, 2014). Assuming that such cognitive processes operate at a more implicit level and largely outside conscious awareness (Eckhardt & Dye, 2000), it is important to include specific tasks in research that allow researchers to analyze their role in IPV (Nosek & Smyth, 2007) and sexual harassment. To date, however, studies addressing

automatic and implicit cognitive processes underlying attitudes and cognitions related to IPV and sexual harassment are still scarce, although such approaches are gaining attention (e.g., Pornari, Dixon, & Humphreys, 2018).

### **Implicit Measures in Research on Violence Against Women**

Although the use of implicit measures in IPV is still emerging, research on other forms of violence against women has used them to a greater extent. Two highly used latency-based computer tasks in the study of implicit attitudes and associations in social cognition (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Ward, 2000) are the Lexical Decision Task (LDT; Meyer & Schvaneveldt, 1971) and the Implicit Association Test (IAT, Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). The LDT examines the time required for participants to respond to a target stimulus following a prime. When the target stimulus word appears, participants must decide if this stimulus is a real word or not (lexical decision). If the prime activates an associative network related to the concept of the target, participants' reaction times are faster than if the target word is unrelated to the prime. The shorter the reaction time to a particular target after a particular prime, the stronger the implicit association between these two concepts. The IAT measures the strength of cognitive associations between a bipolar target category (e.g., war vs. peace) and a bipolar evaluative attribute (e.g., negative vs. positive) by comparing reaction times to different pairings of concepts. Specifically, when two concepts that are strongly associated (e.g., war and negative) and share the same response key, reaction time is shorter than when less associated concepts share the same response key (e.g., war and positive).

These tasks have been used to analyze implicit mental associations in the area of sexual violence and sexual harassment against women, where it is well established that anti-victim attitudes may distort explicit judgments (Gerger, Kley, Bohner, & Siebler, 2007) and where male

offenders in particular are prone to denial and cognitive distortion of their offenses (Ward, Hudson, & Marshall, 1995). For example, research using the IAT with German students has shown that participants' implicit associations of a rape victim (versus perpetrator) explained unique variance in their assessment of a case vignette (Süssenbach, Albrecht, & Bohner, 2017). Research using the LDT paradigm has further shown that the sexuality-power association is stronger in men who molest children than in non-sexual aggressors or students (Kamphuis, De Ruiter, Janssen, & Spiering, 2005) and that its strength predicts sexual aggression (Zurbriggen, 2000). Also, experimental priming of sexuality facilitated men's aggression specifically toward a woman (and not toward another man) (Mussweiler & Förster, 2000). Finally, a stronger implicit association between women and sexuality, as indicated by LDT scores, has been found in more sexually aggressive men (Leibold & McConnell, 2004).

Because of explicit judgments' susceptibility to social desirability bias, researchers investigating the antecedents of sexual harassment have also used implicit measures. One important implicit association in this regard is the one between sexuality and power (Bargh, Raymond, Pryor, & Strack, 1995). Bargh et al. (1995) found this association with a pronunciation sequential priming task in men with high proclivity toward either sexual harassment or sexual aggression, suggesting that these men would think automatically about sexuality in situations where they experience power. Indeed, men with higher (vs. lower) rape proclivity were more attracted to a female confederate, and expressed a greater interest in getting to know her, if they had been primed with the concept of power. Priming techniques have also been used recently in research on the predictors of sexual harassment. In one study, where male participants could send harassing materials to a female chat partner, unobtrusive priming of male power increased the link between participants' hostile sexism and their perpetration of gender

harassment, whereas unobtrusive priming of sexuality increased the link between participants' short-term mating orientation and their displays of unwanted sexual attention (Diehl, Rees, & Bohner, 2018).

Nevertheless, research addressing the implicit associations of men who sexually harass is not extensive. Based on the literature we have discussed (see also Leibold & McConnell, 2004), it is plausible to assume that sexually harassing male perpetrators may hold implicit associations between the concepts of women and sexuality. Furthermore, given that sexually aggressive men and men who show gender harassment are more likely to hold hostile attitudes toward women than are non-aggressive men (Diehl et al., 2012, 2018; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995), these men may also hold stronger implicit associations between the concepts of women and hostility.

### **Implicit Measures and Intimate Partner Violence**

In the area of IPV, the literature of automatic cognitive associations with implicit measures is less abundant. For example, Eckhardt et al. (2012) used several IATs to compare attitudes toward women, attitudes toward violence, and associations between violence and gender (men/women) of men enrolled in an IPV treatment program with those of non-violent men. The offenders showed more positive implicit attitudes toward violence and stronger associations between violence and women. However, offenders and non-violent men did not differ in explicit measures of cognitive distortions (e.g., acceptance of interpersonal violence, beliefs about wife beating); this indicates that implicit measures could be more useful for understanding the cognitive processes involved in IPV. Indeed, explicit and implicit measures were correlated only in the offender sample.

Eckhardt and Crane (2014) used the same set of IATs to examine their relation to aggressive behavior shown by men attending anti-IPV interventions. The results showed that

only implicit attitudes toward violence were related to pre- and post-intervention behaviors. In the pre-intervention phase, faster associations between violence words and positive words were related to greater IPV perpetration (but also to greater victimization), whereas in the post-intervention phase these associations were related to greater treatment non-compliance and criminal recidivism. However, the explicit measures were not clearly related to these behaviors. Finally, a recent study, which evaluated IPV-related offense-supportive cognitions using several implicit tasks (IAT, go/no go association task, and a variant of the LDT), showed that compared with the non-violent group, the IPV group exhibited more stereotypical gender-role attitudes, more implicit positivity toward violence, more hostile attitudes toward women, a higher sense of relationship entitlement and general entitlement, as well as more approval of IPV (Pornari et al., 2018).

These results across studies suggest that IPV perpetrators hold automatic cognitions facilitating their aggressive behavior. We also note that, compared to sexual violence, the study of implicit associations in IPV aggressors has mostly relied on the IAT. Although the IAT is an empirically validated task, it is a relative measure that compares differences in associations between concept pairs. It thus has a more complex structure than the LDT and is difficult to implement when several different associations are to be measured (Cameron, Brown-Iannuzzi, & Payne, 2012).

Therefore, the study of implicit associations in IPV has not been extensive, even though it is very relevant to understand how aggressors process information about their victims (Leibold & McConnell, 2004). In this area, theoretical propositions indicate that IPV aggressors and non-aggressors may differ in the strength of their associations between the mental representation of their partner and concepts related to power, hostility, and violence. Regarding the possible

association of partner with power, feminist approaches posit that IPV is motivated by the desire of men to maintain power and control over women (Yllö, 1993). Some evidence from the perspective of implicit theories supports these hypotheses. Implicit theories may be defined as a network of beliefs and interpretations about the world that unconsciously influence thoughts, behaviors, and how one's own and others' behaviors are perceived (Ward, 2000). It has been found that implicit theories of IPV offenders may contain associations between partner and power. Specifically, their implicit theories about gender roles in intimate relationships maintain that men are superior to women, strong, dominant, assertive, and aggressive, whereas women should be dependent, passive, and emotional (Pornari, Dixon, & Humphreys, 2013).

A mental association between partner and hostility would also be predicted from feminist theories that highlight misogynistic beliefs as facilitators of the initiation and maintenance of violence in intimate relationships (Yllö & Straus, 1990). This association is also compatible with empirical evidence of the relation between hostile sexist attitudes and IPV (Valor-Segura, Expósito, & Moya, 2008, 2011) and the content of implicit theories in IPV offenders (Gilchrist, 2009; Pornari et al., 2013, 2018; Weldon & Gilchrist, 2012). Finally, a strong association between partner and violence would also be expected in IPV offenders based on the recent evidence that IPV aggressors showed more implicit positivity toward violence and more approval of IPV (Pornari et al., 2018). This association is consistent with the theories that maintain that this type of violence is intimately linked to processes of gender socialization that support the use of violence to obtain and maintain male domination over the female partner (Yllö & Straus, 1990).

In conclusion, IPV and sexual harassment offenders may have different mental associations than non-aggressive men. Nonetheless, there is not enough evidence to establish if

perpetrators of these two types of violence against women would share the same implicit mental associations or if they would present specific implicit mental associations.

### **Explicit Measures**

In addition to implicit measures, we will explore the possible relations of some explicit measures with IPV and sexual harassment. Specifically, we will measure ambivalent sexism, masculine gender role stress, and sociosexual orientations. The two facets of ambivalent sexism—hostile sexism (negative attitudes toward women viewed as inferior or challenging for men, such as business women or feminists) and benevolent sexism (“a set of interrelated attitudes toward women that are sexist in terms of viewing women stereotypically and in restricted roles but that are subjectively positive in feeling tone”; Glick & Fiske, 1996, p. 491)—have previously been studied in relation to IPV and sexual harassment. Several studies have revealed that individuals higher in hostile sexism showed more tolerant attitudes toward IPV and greater justification of the aggressor’s behavior (Valor-Segura, Expósito, & Moya, 2011). Hostile sexism is also an important predictor of sexual harassment (Diehl et al., 2012, 2018; Siebler, Sabelus, & Bohner, 2008). In addition, benevolent sexist beliefs are related to rape victim-blaming (Abrams, Viki, Masser, & Bohner, 2003; Durán, Moya, Megías, & Viki, 2010) and less intention to help the victim (Lila, Gracia, & García, 2010).

Masculine gender role stress (MGRS; Eisler, Skidmore, & Ward, 1988; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987), defined as the psychological and physiological discomfort that men experience in situations that challenge their traditional male role, has also been shown to predict IPV (Baugher & Gazmararian, 2015; Eisler, Franchina, & Moore, 2000; Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002; Moore et al., 2010). For example, Eisler et al. (2000) found that participants high in MGRS attributed more negative intentions; expressed more irritation, anger, and jealousy toward

their partners; and chose more aggressive responses to solve a partner conflict than did participants low in MGRS. In addition, MGRS is positively related to the perpetration of sexual harassment (Mellon, 2013).

Sociosexual orientations comprise two relatively independent dimensions: short-term mating orientation (STMO) and long-term mating orientation (LTMO) (Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007). Diehl and colleagues (2012, 2018) found that higher STMO in men (i.e., a tendency to enjoy uncommitted sexual encounters or short relationships without strong emotional bond; Buss & Schmitt, 1993) was associated with the perpetration of sexual harassment against women. The relationship of STMO and IPV has not been explored yet, but it seems worthwhile to examine if STMO also plays a role in this form of violence that not always includes a sexual component. Furthermore, although previous work has not addressed the relationship of IPV and LTMO, given that LTMO represents a tendency toward the establishment of intimate relationships with strong emotional links and long-term commitment (Buss & Schmitt, 1993) and that commitment is associated with less IPV (Gaertner & Foshee, 1999; Johnson, Manning, Giordano, & Longmore, 2015), we will examine whether LTMO might have a protective effect against IPV.

### **The Present Study**

The literature that we have reviewed suggests that men who perpetrate IPV may hold stronger cognitive associations between their partner on the one hand and violence, hostility, and power on the other hand. It also suggests that men who are more strongly prone to sexual harassment may show strong women–sexuality and women–hostility associations. With this in mind, the current study had two main aims: (a) to analyze if potential cognitive associations of men's mental representations of their own partner and the concepts of power, violence, and hostility are related to their self-reported IPV proclivity and (b) to assess if potential implicit

associations of men's mental representations of women and the concepts of sexuality and hostility are related to their self-reported sexual harassment proclivity. Extending the work of Leibold and McConnell (2004), we designed a LDT to evaluate these associations. Instead of pictures (as used by Leibold and McConnell), we used first names of men and women that had been piloted to prime representations of men and women.

Thus, in the LDT participants completed a series of trials that each presented one of four primes: the name of their own partner, another female name, a male name, or a neutral prime (a string of asterisks) in order to activate the respective mental representations of your partner, women, men, or no particular concept. Subsequently, a target stimulus appeared and participants had to decide if this stimulus was a word or not (lexical decision). The categories of the target stimulus were selected to evaluate the concepts hypothesized to be associated with partner in IPV aggressors and with women in sexual harassment offenders.

Based on our discussion of the literature, we formulated three hypotheses. (a) Stronger associations between one's partner and the concepts of power, violence, and hostility, as shown in the LDT, will be positively correlated with self-reported IPV proclivity as well as with explicit measures of sexism and MGRS (Hypothesis 1). (b) Stronger associations between women and the concepts of sexuality and hostility, as shown in the LDT, will be positively correlated with self-reported sexual harassment proclivity as well as with explicit measures of sexism and STMO (Hypothesis 2). (c) Finally, regarding the relation between explicit measures, given that different forms of violence against women have common predictors (Malamuth, 1983), we predicted that age and impression management will negatively predict IPV proclivity and sexual harassment (Hypothesis 3a), hostile sexism and MGRS will positively predict IPV proclivity and sexual harassment (Hypothesis 3b), STMO will positively predict sexual harassment proclivity

(Diehl et al., 2012, 2018) (Hypothesis 3c), and LTMO will negatively predict IPV proclivity (Hypothesis 3d).

## **Method**

### **Participants**

We recruited a convenience sample of 129 German male students (age:  $M = 25.18$  years,  $SD = 3.69$ ; range 17–35) from the University of Bielefeld (Germany), who volunteered to participate and met the inclusion criteria of being (a) first-language speakers of German, (b) 35 years or younger, and (c) currently in a heterosexual intimate relationship. Inclusion criteria were stated on flyers used for recruitment on campus. Data from 26 additional participants were excluded from analyses because they either did not provide the name of their partner (which was needed for the LDT,  $n = 3$ ), had an LDT error rate of more than 20% ( $n = 8$ ), did not complete the LDT as instructed ( $n = 4$ ), or turned out to be older than 35 years ( $n = 11$ ). All measures were completed in German. The mean relationship duration was 2.84 years.

### **Procedure and Materials**

Potential volunteers were informed that we were investigating perceptions of the ideal partner and relationships between men and women in college men. When they arrived at the lab, participants first gave their informed consent for our IRB-approved study. Then they were asked to complete several questionnaires that contained the explicit predictor variables as well as the measures of IPV and harassment proclivity. Subsequently, they performed a primed LDT to assess the implicit associations of interest. At the end of the session participants were thoroughly debriefed and received 5 Euros. An additional section of the study in which we assessed differences in the perception of one's real and ideal partner is not reported in the present paper.

**Explicit measures.** Participants first reported some demographics: their age, whether they were first-language speakers of German, whether they were in a heterosexual relationship, and if so, for how long. Then they moved on to the questionnaires in the following order.

***Ambivalent Sexism Inventory.*** The ASI (Glick & Fiske, 1996; German version by Eckes & Six-Materna, 1999) comprises two 11-item subscales that measure hostile sexism (e.g., “Women are too easily offended”; “Feminists are seeking for women to have more power than men”) and benevolent sexism (e.g., “No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman”; “In a disaster, women ought to be rescued before men”). Participants rated each item on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Responses across items were averaged for each subscale so that higher scores indicated higher hostile sexism and higher benevolent sexism, respectively. Both subscales of the German ASI had shown satisfactory reliability in previous studies (Cronbach's  $\alpha$  = .78–.87 for hostile sexism; Cronbach's  $\alpha$  = .75–.87 for benevolent sexism; Eckes & Six-Materna, 1999); in the current study Cronbach's alphas were .91 and .84, respectively. The two subscales' construct validity has been established extensively across cultures (Eckes & Six-Materna, 1999; Expósito, Moya & Glick, 1998; Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick et al., 2000).

***Masculine gender role stress.*** The Masculine Gender Role Stress scale (MGRS; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987; short version based on Jörg Richter, as used in Arrindell et al., 2013) measures the extent to which men experience stress in situations that challenge traditionally defined cultural standards of masculinity (e.g., “Being with a woman who is more successful than you”). Participants rated each item on a scale from 1 (*not at all stressful*) to 7 (*extremely stressful*). Responses across 15 items were averaged so that higher scores indicated stronger experience of masculine gender role stress. The scale's internal consistency ( $\alpha$ ) in this study

was .79, which is similar to the alphas found in other studies (in 13 countries between .74 and .87; Arrindell et al., 2013). The MGRS's construct validity has been supported by findings that men score higher on the MGRS than do women (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987) and by its positive association with men's self-reports of anger and anxiety (Eisler, Skidmore & Ward, 1988).

***Ratings of attractiveness of female names and own partner's name.*** As part of our cover story and to obtain the participant's partner's name for the LDT (see description in the following) without raising suspicion, participants were first asked to rate the attractiveness of five female names (selected from a pilot test) and then to write down and rate their own partner's name on a scale from 1 (*not attractive at all*) to 7 (*totally attractive*).

***Likelihood to perpetrate intimate partner violence against women.*** The structure of the IPV proclivity scale (Megías, Montañés, Romero-Sánchez & Durán, 2009) is similar to rape proclivity measures (cf. Bohner et al., 1998; Eyssel, Bohner, Süßenbach, & Schreiber, 2009). Participants read six hypothetical scenarios featuring a man who perpetrates an act of aggression against his female partner (two scenarios depicted psychological IPV, two physical IPV, and two sexual IPV). They are asked to imagine themselves in the role of the male protagonist and to answer three questions for each scenario: How aroused they would feel in this situation, whether they would behave like the protagonist, and whether they would enjoy getting their way in this situation, each on scales from 1 (*not at all aroused / likely*) to 7 (*very aroused / likely*). The final score was an average across the last two items per scenario, so that higher scores indicated a greater likelihood to perpetrate IPV. The scale's internal consistency ( $\alpha$ ) was .80, which is similar to previous studies ( $\alpha = .79$ ; Megías et al., 2009). The construct validity of the scale was shown by its positive correlation to hostile sexism, as well as by its positively correlated with self-

reported perpetration of intimate partner violence (Megías et al., 2009). (All scenarios in both English and German are available in the [online supplement](#).)

***Likelihood to Sexually Harass scale.*** The German LSH scale (Vanselow, Bohner, Becher, & Siebler, 2010; based on Pryor, 1987) comprises four critical scenarios in which a man has the opportunity to sexually harass a female subordinate with impunity, and five filler scenarios. (In the present study, we used only two of the filler scenarios to keep the length of the questionnaire manageable; specifically, the scenario about the head of the supermarket having problems with some employees and the one about the architect having disagreements with a colleague in a project.) Participants were asked to imagine themselves in the role of the protagonist in each scenario, and then to consider three behavioral alternatives: one neutral (e.g., to read a female acquaintance's manuscript), one representing severe sexual harassment (e.g., to read her manuscript in exchange for sexual favors), and one representing moderate sexual harassment (e.g., to read her manuscript if she agrees to a dinner date). Participants indicated their likelihood of engaging in each behavior on a scale from 1 (*not at all likely*) to 7 (*very likely*). The final score was an average of the two alternatives related to sexual harassment across the critical scenarios. The higher the score, the more likely an individual is to report a proclivity toward sexually exploitative behavior in these situations. The scale's internal consistency ( $\alpha$ ) in our study was .79, which is similar to the alphas found in other studies (between .72 and .79; Vanselow et al., 2010) and shows that dropping three of the filler items had no detrimental effect. In previous research, the scale's convergent validity has been established, for example, by showing high correlations with the acceptance of myths about sexual harassment ( $r = .59$ ) and adversarial sexual beliefs ( $r = .57$ ); discriminant validity from social desirability was also shown

(Vanselow et al., 2010). Furthermore, LSH scores predicted harassing behavior in a realistic laboratory setting (Siebler et al., 2008).

*Subtle measures of aggression in intimate relationships and sexual harassment.* To access social desirability bias as much as possible, we asked participants how likely it would be for them to show certain emotional responses, behaviors, and behavioral preferences related to IPV and sexual harassment instead of frequency of perpetration. Given this content and the fact that we did not ask for past behaviors directly, we decided to call these measures “subtle.” These items are available in the [online supplement](#).) The subtle IPV scale ( $\alpha = .75$ ) consisted of six items. Four items (partly adapted from Hamby, 1996) measured to what extent the participant would be angry in situations that challenged male dominance in the relationship (e.g., "My partner spends time with other men"); the response scale ranged from 1 (*not at all angry*) to 7 (*very angry*). On two further items (adapted from Díaz-Aguado Jalón, Martínez Arias, & Martínez Babarro, 2014), participants were asked to rate how much they would like to engage in controlling behaviors related to new technologies (e.g., "Control my partner through her mobile phone"); response scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). Responses across these six items were averaged so that higher scores indicated higher likelihood to perpetrate these acts of IPV.

For the subtle sexual harassment scale ( $\alpha = .71$ ), we adapted six items from the Sexual Experiences Questionnaires (SEQ-W; Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995) asking participants how likely it is that they would show certain harassing behaviors including gender harassment (e.g., "Making remarks like suggesting that women are not suited for some kinds of jobs") and unwanted sexual attention (e.g., "Looking at a woman's body"). The response scale went from 1 (*not likely at all*) to 7 (*very likely*). The final score was the mean across the six items, with higher scores representing a greater probability of showing subtle sexually harassing behaviors. (All

items are available in the [online supplement](#).)

***Sociosexual orientations.*** The Sociosexual Orientations Inventory (SOI, Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007; short version and German translation by Diehl et al., 2012) measures psychological orientations toward short-term mating (STMO; e.g., “Sex without love is OK”) and long-term mating (LTMO; e.g., “I hope to have a romantic relationship that lasts the rest of my life”); response scales from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Responses across items were averaged so that higher scores indicated stronger adherence to each mating orientation. Internal consistencies ( $\alpha$ s) were .92 for STMO (6 items) and .81 for LTMO (6 items), which is similar to alphas reported in recent studies ( $\alpha_{\text{STMO}} = .85$  and  $\alpha_{\text{LTMO}} = .80$ ; Murray, Jones, & Schaller, 2013). Jackson and Kirkpatrick (2007) have established the validity of the measure by showing, for example, that STMO was positively correlated with self-perceived mate value and male preference for attractiveness in a mate, whereas LTMO was negatively correlated with both constructs. Furthermore, the German STMO scale has been shown to predict unwanted sexual attention behavior in a realistic setting (Diehl et al., 2012, 2018).

***Impression management.*** The 10-item impression management subscale of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Paulhus, 1994; German version by Musch, Brockhaus, & Bröder, 2002) is a measure of socially desirable responding. It addresses the conscious dissimulation of item responses with the aim of making a favorable impression (e.g., “I never take things that don't belong to me”); its response scale ranges from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Because of low internal consistency of the 10-item scale, we selected four items that produced an acceptable internal consistency ( $\alpha$ ) of .68, which is similar to the alphas reported in three cross-validation studies (.65–.69) by Musch and colleagues (2002). Responses across items were averaged so that higher scores indicated more social desirability. The scale has

shown good convergent and discriminant validity, being highly correlated with other social desirability scales and uncorrelated with neuroticism and academic performance; also, the scale was sensitive to experimental instructions of making a good impression versus answering honestly (Musch et al., 2002).

**Lexical Decision Task (LDT).** A primed lexical decision task (designed with the computer programs MediaLab and DirectRT, 2012) served to examine if the concepts of power, violence, hostility, and sexuality were differentially associated with representations of one's own partner, women, men, and neutral.

**Primes.** We used four types of primes: own partner's name, a female name, a male name, and a string of asterisks (as a neutral prime). The male and female names (available in the [online supplement](#)) were matched for attractiveness and popularity.

**Target words and non-words.** Sixteen target words (four per concept) represented the four concepts of interest: power, violence, hostility, and sexuality. These words were selected based on ratings by 29 pilot participants who had rated each word as strongly associated with the relevant concept but not with the other three concepts. We also used a set of four neutral target words that pretesting had shown to be unrelated to the four critical concepts, and we created 20 non-words that each resembled one of the critical words (see the [online supplement](#) for all target words and non-words). The LDT thus featured equal numbers of words and non-words as targets. Because of a spelling error in one of the words of the hostility category ("ängerlich" instead of "ärgerlich"), analysis for this category was finally based on three target words.

In each LDT trial, a prime was presented for 500 ms, and then a blank screen appeared for 135 ms, followed by a target word (or non-word) that was presented until the participant responded with a key press. Participants were instructed to press a key marked “word” or a key

marked “non-word” in response to the target stimulus; they were told to make their judgments as quickly as possible while remaining accurate. The computer measured the response latency between target onset and participant's response. LDT trials were divided into five blocks: during an initial practice block, ten trials with neutral primes (e.g., a string of asterisks) and neutral targets not used in the critical blocks (e.g., building, shop) were presented, to ensure that participants understood the task. Then we presented four critical blocks, each with 40 trials, in which each target (16 critical words, 4 neutral words, and 20 matched non-words) was preceded once by own partner's name, once by a female name, once by a male name, and once by the neutral prime. The order of presentation within each block was randomized.

## Results

### **Implicit Measures: Lexical Decision Task**

To test if, as predicted in Hypothesis 1, stronger associations between one's partner and the concepts of violence, power, and hostility in the LDT were positively correlated with self-reported IPV proclivity, sexism, and MGRS, we had to follow two preliminary steps. In the first step, we calculated 20 means for each participant: the mean response latency for words from each of five target categories (Power, Violence, Hostility, Sexuality, Neutral) preceded by each of four primes (Partner's name, Female name, Male name, String of asterisks). These 20 mean reaction times (RTs) of correct word trial responses as a function of type of prime and target are available in the [online supplement](#). Trials with reaction times below or above 2.5 standard deviations from a participant's mean latency (2.52%) as well as trials in which participants made an incorrect lexical judgment (4.58%) were excluded from analyses. Thus, 95.42% (or 10618 responses) of the responses were retained for analyses.

In the second step, we calculated Partner-prime facilitation scores separately for each

target category relevant for Hypothesis 1 (Violence, Power, and Hostility). These were defined as mean response latency to trials with own partner's name as prime subtracted from mean response latency to trials with any other prime. These relative *partner facilitation scores* represented how much a partner prime, relative to a female-name, male-name, or neutral prime (combined) facilitated judgments for each target concept.

After these first two steps, we tested Hypothesis 1 by computing bivariate correlations between the mean partner-facilitation scores for violence, power, and hostility target words and explicit measures of IPV, sexism, MGRS, and ratings of attractiveness of partner's name (Table 1). As can be seen in Table 1, participants were generally faster recognizing violence-related and hostility-related targets when they had been primed with their partner's name, as indicated by facilitation scores that are greater than zero. However, in contrast with the predicted relations on Hypothesis 1, partner facilitation scores for violence, power and hostility words were not significantly correlated to IPV proclivity, sexism, or MGRS. Descriptively, the largest correlation among these was that of the Partner facilitation score with IPV proclivity ( $r = .17$ ), but it just failed to be significant ( $p = .051$ ).

Although Hypothesis 1 was not supported, we found other results that were consistent with the expected relations. The rating of partner's name's attractiveness was negatively correlated with the partner facilitation score for violence targets ( $r = -.19, p = .029$ ). Thus, men who more strongly associated their partner's name with violence also rated their partner's name more negatively; such ratings might thus be considered as an indirect indicator of proclivity to IPV, given the negative bivariate correlation found between attractiveness of partner name and IPV proclivity ( $r = -.31, p < .001$ ) (see the following section on explicit measures). Finally, the analysis of intercorrelations among the partner facilitation scores shows that men who exhibited

stronger associations between partner and violence also showed stronger associations between partner and hostility, but not between partner and power.

To test if, as stated in Hypothesis 2, stronger associations between women and the concepts of sexuality and hostility were positively correlated with self-reported sexual harassment proclivity, sexism and STMO, we intended to follow the same steps as previously, but calculating female-prime facilitation scores, separately for sexuality and hostility target categories. These scores represented how much a female name, relative to own partner's name, male-name, or neutral prime (combined), facilitated judgments for each of these two target concepts. However, none of these female-prime facilitation scores were different from zero, indicating that the female prime (in comparison to the other primes) did not generally facilitate the judgments of sexuality and hostility related concepts. Also, correlations between these female-prime facilitation scores and likelihood of harassment as well as related measures did not show a meaningful pattern, so Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

### **Explicit Measures**

Before testing the predicted relations in Hypothesis 3 between the explicit measures, we calculated their descriptive statistics and intercorrelations (see Table 2). In general, most of the variables were correlated in the predicted direction. Then, to evaluate if IPV proclivity and sexual harassment were negatively predicted by age and Impression Management (Hypothesis 3a) but positively predicted by Hostile Sexism and MGRS (Hypothesis 3b), and to test if STMO positively predicted sexual harassment proclivity (Hypothesis 3c) whereas LTMO negatively predicted IPV proclivity (Hypothesis 3d), we ran four hierarchical multiple regression analyses. Their dependent variables were IPV proclivity (see Table 3), subtle forms of IPV (see Table 4), Likelihood to Sexually Harass (LSH) (see Table 5), and Subtle forms of Sexual Harassment (see

Table 6), respectively. As predictors in the first step, we included participant's age and Impression Management; in the second step we included the attitudinal variables: Hostile Sexism, Benevolent Sexism, and MGRS; and in the third step we included the Mating Orientation Scales. Based on the correlation coefficients, we did not expect major multicollinearity issues. Tolerance values between .72 and .99, and VIFs below 1.627 discarded this possible problem.

As can be seen in Tables 3–6, age was not a significant predictor of IPV proclivity, LSH, neither of the subtle forms of IPV, or sexual harassment. Impression Management was negatively related to IPV proclivity and to subtle forms of sexual harassment. This partially supported Hypothesis 3a, which stated that age and Impression Management would be predictors of both forms of gender violence. Furthermore, Hypothesis 3b was strongly supported: Hostile Sexism positively predicted IPV proclivity, subtle IPV, and subtle forms of sexual harassment, whereas MGRS also predicted IPV proclivity, subtle IPV, and LSH. As expressed in Hypothesis 3c, Short-term Mating Orientation was a significant predictor of LSH and subtle forms of sexual harassment; unexpectedly, it also showed a positive relation with IPV proclivity. Finally, in line with Hypothesis 3d, Long-Term Mating Orientation negatively predicted IPV proclivity, showing a protective effect.

### **Discussion**

The current study tried to address two gaps in the literature of violence against women related to the lack of studies using implicit measures and investigating cognitive associations of potential aggressors related to their targets (the partner, in the case of IPV; women, in the case of sexual harassment). Specifically, the present research had two main aims: (a) to analyze if potential cognitive associations of men's mental representations of their own partner and the concepts of power, violence, and hostility were related to their self-reported IPV proclivity and

(b) to assess if potential implicit associations of men's mental representations of women and the concepts of sexuality and hostility were related to their self-reported sexual harassment proclivity.

In general, our results did not clearly support the expected relations in Hypothesis 1 (correlations between implicit associations of partner–violence, partner–power, and partner–hostility with proclivity to IPV) and Hypothesis 2 (correlations of implicit associations of women–sexuality and women–hostility with likelihood of sexual harassment). However, we did find some patterns that fitted with the expected relations of the first hypothesis. On the other hand, in line with our Hypothesis 3, our findings with explicit measures underlined that different forms of violence against women shared not only ideological predictors but also others such as mating orientations. In the following, we discuss these results in more detail.

Although implicit associations of partner–violence, partner–power and partner–hostility were not clearly related to self-reported proclivity to IPV, sexism, and MGRS (Hypothesis 1), we found other indicators in line with our predictions. First of all, in congruence with feminist theories (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Yllö & Straus, 1990) and assumptions about implicit theories in IPV aggressors (Gilchrist, 2009; Pornari et al., 2013, 2018; Weldon & Gilchrist, 2012), we found significantly positive facilitation scores for partner–violence and partner–hostility (but not for partner–power), which indicated that the name of a man's own partner facilitated his recognition of violence and hostility words in comparison with other primes. The first association (partner–violence) also seemed to be positively related to greater proclivity to IPV, at a descriptive level (although non-significant,  $p = .051$ ), and it was negatively related to explicit perception of attractiveness of the partner's name. Although our results do not allow us to make strong inferences, this finding at the descriptive level fit with our proposition that men with a tendency to exert IPV may have a stronger association in memory between partner and violence,

in line with theories holding that IPV is intimately related to the approval of using violence to get/maintain domination over the partner (Yllö & Straus, 1990) and with previous research in which IPV offenders presented a pattern of attitudinal activation that indicated stronger implicit associations between female gender and violent concepts (Eckhardt et al., 2012). Furthermore, it would also be consistent with recent evidence showing that IPV offenders (compared with a non-violent group) exhibited more implicit positivity toward violence and more approval of IPV (Pornari et al., 2018).

In addition, a more negative explicit evaluation of one's own partner's name appears to reflect a strong implicit association between partner and violence; in turn, the explicit evaluation of the attractiveness of the one's own partner's name was negatively associated with IPV proclivity in correlational analyses. This seems to suggest a use for evaluations of own partner's name as a subtle indicator of tendencies toward IPV. Furthermore, the attractiveness of participant's own partner's name was also significantly related to their mating orientations: The more attractive the participants considered their own partner's names, the higher the Long Term Mating Orientation and the lower the Short Term Mating Orientation they reported.

On the other hand, although we did not find a relation between partner-hostility and behavioral tendencies to IPV, we wonder if the strong association in memory between these two concepts that appeared in the whole sample could represent a precursor of the cognitive distortions of hostility toward women shown by IPV offenders (Pornari et al., 2018). Cárdenas, González, Calderón, and Lay (2009), using a task to assess implicit attitudes toward men and women, reported that male university students showed significantly more negative implicit attitudes toward women than did female students, supporting somehow our results (although they evaluated attitudes toward gender and not specifically towards the partner). From a sociocultural

feminist perspective, the partner–hostility association could reflect gender socialization in patriarchal societies, where gender roles socially defined and taught since childhood could result in unconscious learning of these types of associations by promoting a hegemonic traditional masculinity based on anti-femininity and violence (Cantera & Blanch, 2010). In this sense, we wonder if it is possible that rigid and dysfunctional learned gender schemata facilitate the establishment of negative implicit associations about women and intimate relations such as the ones found in our study. Additionally, findings where traditional roles emphasizing masculine superiority and hostility toward women encourage IPV (e.g., Leonard & Senchak, 1996; Smith, 1990) and where female objectification in videogames could prime sexual concepts and drive men to inappropriate behavior toward women in real life (Yao, Mahood, & Linz, 2010) make us wonder if the partner–hostility implicit association would facilitate the perpetration of IPV. However, the evidence from the current study is not enough to make strong inferences, so further research is required.

Hypothesis 2 was not supported. We did not find significant facilitation scores for women–sexuality or women–hostility, indicating that the female prime did not seem to facilitate the recognition of hostility- or sexuality-related words. In addition, we did not find a meaningful pattern of correlations between these female facilitation scores and the hypothesized explicit related measures (likelihood to sexual harassment, hostile sexism, or short term mating orientation). When discussing this lack of effects, the type of priming that we used should be considered: Whereas other studies that found these types of associations used pictures (Leibold & McConnell, 2004) or posters (Diehl et al., 2018), we used first names, whose impact could have been weaker than that of the pictorial stimuli.

The lack of support regarding the relations between implicit and explicit measures as proposed in Hypotheses 1 and 2 could be due to the fact that we used a convenience sample of university students, most of whom were probably non-violent. Other studies found significant relations between implicit and explicit measures in IPV offenders, but not in non-violent samples (Eckhardt et al., 2012). Along those lines, recent research using a university sample found a significant disparity between explicit and implicit measures assessing attitudes toward IPV (Sanchez-Prada, Delgado-Alvarez, Bosch-Fiol & Ferrer-Perez, 2018). However, it is also necessary to underline that the non-violent character of our sample is an assumption, given that we did not collect information about previous history of IPV. Other possible explanations for why we found only few relations between implicit and explicit measures could be related to the problem that self-reports provide a distorted image in socially sensitive topics, as shown in our own data, where IPV proclivity and other measures were negatively correlated with impression management. This bias is also suggested by previous research showing that delinquents presented lower empathy scores in implicit measures but higher scores in explicit measures than did non-delinquents (Kämpfe, Penzhorn, Schikora, Dunzl, & Schneidenbach, 2009). This possible distortion in self-reports makes it reasonable to expect null or negative correlations with implicit measures in this kind of content (e.g., racial attitudes; Fazio et al., 1995) but high correlations in neutral topics (e.g., consumer preferences).

In terms of explicit measures, our results mostly supported the predictions of Hypothesis 3. Specifically, Hypothesis 3a was partially confirmed: Although age was not significantly related to IPV proclivity (in contrast with previous findings; Stith et al., 2004) or sexual harassment (cf. Fineran & Bolen, 2006), perhaps because of the restricted age range of the

sample, impression management negatively predicted subtle sexual harassment and IPV proclivity as expected.

Hypothesis 3b was also partially supported. As expected, Hostile Sexism and MGRS positively predicted IPV (proclivity and subtle forms), Hostile Sexism predicted subtle sexual harassment (but not LSH), and MGRS predicted LSH (but not subtle forms). The relation among Hostile Sexism, MGRS, and IPV proclivity was in line with previous research in which this type of sexism was related to perpetration of psychological (Forbes, Adams-Curtis, & White, 2004) and sexual coercion against the partner (Lisco, Parrott, & Tharp, 2012), as well as studies that showed a relation between MGRS and IPV (Baugher & Gazmararian, 2015; Moore et al., 2010). Furthermore, consistent with the literature asserting that different forms of violence against women share predictors (Malamuth, 1983), Hostile Sexism and MGRS were also related to sexual harassment. These results reinforce previous findings that relate this type of sexism to sexual harassment perpetration (Diehl et al., 2012, 2018) and tolerance thereof (Russell & Trigg, 2004). They are also consistent with sociocultural theory, which affirms that misogynistic ideologies like hostile sexism predict sexual harassment because it is a phenomenon caused by hostility toward women as a group that serves to maintain male domination through discrimination of women (Samuels, 2004; for discussion, see Diehl et al., 2012, 2018). The finding that MGRS predicted sexual harassment proclivity was expected according to this theory and previous evidence (Mellon, 2013).

As predicted in Hypothesis 3c, STMO positively predicted sexual harassment (proclivity and subtle forms). This is in line with other studies (Diehl et al., 2012, 2018) and evolutionary theory (Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Schmitt, 2005), which holds that men exhibit more STMO and initiate more behaviors aimed at initiating sexual contacts that are perceived as transgressions by

women. In addition, STMO was also surprisingly related to more IPV proclivity, showing its role in forms of violence against women beyond sexual aggression. This was a novel result that had not been observed in previous research. Finally, higher LTMO predicted lower IPV proclivity, as predicted in Hypothesis 3d, which revealed a possible protective effect of a mating strategy based on commitment and long-term emotional ties. This was also a novel result because previous studies had not related both constructs, although it aligns well with data showing that commitment and satisfaction in intimate relationships goes along with less IPV (Gaertner & Foshee, 1999; Johnson et al., 2015).

### **Limitations and Future Research Directions**

Some limitations of the present research need to be mentioned. Our participants were university students, so we should be cautious extrapolating conclusions to general populations. Although the use of a convenience sample is a common and economical method, it often suffers from a number of biases such as the risk of obtaining a non-representative sample of the population being studied or the under-representation or over-representation of particular groups within the sample. In order to obtain more conclusive results, future studies should therefore use probability-sampling techniques to get more diverse and heterogeneous samples of men (in terms of their composition by age, level of education, and status). In addition, the choices of having employed a sample of university students and not of offenders to explore implicit associations related to IPV and sexual harassment, and of using proclivity measures instead of actual violent behavior, may have contributed to the lack of support for some hypotheses. The use of names instead of visual stimuli could also have decreased their impact in activating related concepts. These aspects should be addressed in future research by studying samples of men with police records of partner violence/sexual harassment, or by a selection of men who self-reported

previous violent behaviors. It would also be important to conduct studies with pictures or other visual material that may improve the mental activation of related concepts.

On the other hand, although we think that a priming effect of the explicit measures on LTD scores is highly unlikely, the design of the present study does not allow for ruling out this possibility. This aspect should be also addressed in future studies, where the explicit measures could be administered after the implicit task. Finally, although descriptively, data suggested a tendency consistent with the idea that men with IPV proclivity could have stronger associations in memory between partner and violence, this association did not reach statistical significance in our study.

### **Practice Implications**

In IPV literature, as we stated earlier, the majority of research has used explicit measures (Eckhardt et al., 2012; Gracia, Rodríguez, & Lila, 2015). Our results may encourage researchers to develop implicit measures in order to overcome the potential biases associated with self-reported measures. Implicit measures may also have a place in therapy as a potential tool to assess cognitive associations that are difficult to identify with explicit measures. Combining the use of explicit and implicit assessment could potentially lead to a more accurate understanding of the cognitive processes of IPV aggressors. Especially in a sensitive topic as IPV, respondents do not wish to report extreme and socially undesirable behaviors; furthermore, they could be even unaware of their own beliefs and attitudes, being thus unable to accurately report them (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Nisbett & Wilson, 1977). Indeed, evidence shows that even in male and female university students, implicit assessment was useful in detecting associations that were not observed explicitly (Cárdenas et al., 2009). The importance of developing such implicit

measurement for research and practical reasons is reflected in recent studies (Gracia et al., 2015; Pornari et al., 2018; Sánchez-Prada et al., 2018).

On the other hand, the strong associations found between partner–violence and partner–hostility across the whole sample of male university students suggests that we, as a society, should take a deeper look into early socialization processes. According to theorizing about subjective implicit theories, men could have developed negative schemata of women and their role in intimate relationships from an early age. Through repeated use, such implicit schemata would become well established, making the processing of information largely automatic and giving rise to cognitive distortions (Beck, 1996; Ward, 2000). Given that these types of associations forged in memory could influence perception, encoding, and behavior (e.g., Bruner, 1957), early education should avoid promoting these contents in traditional gender role socialization. It would be also important to take care of the representation of women/female partners in mass media because of its impact on the general population.

In this sense, activists should continue advocating the reduction of media stimuli that reinforce negative cognitive associations of women. Such advocacy could aim at the removal of advertisements representing stereotyped female partners (e.g., where the woman of the couple is represented as someone unbearable who makes a thousand requests). At the same time, it would be worthwhile to promote more positive media contents. In this regard, recent studies have demonstrated that media portrayals of gendered aggression can indeed have a prosocial effect. Specifically, watching a film that depicted persistent pursuit as scary decreased levels of stalking myth endorsement (Lippman, 2018; see also Diehl, Glaser, & Bohner, 2014). In a similar line of prevention, policymakers should also take actions to regulate the display of videogames with violent contents against women because of the impact that these content could have on mental

representations of partner or women. For example, research has demonstrated that men exposed to stereotypical content made more tolerant judgments of a real-life situations of sexual harassment (compared to controls), while long-term exposure to video game violence was correlated with greater tolerance of sexual harassment and greater rape myth acceptance (Dill, Brown, & Collins, 2008).

### **Conclusions**

The current study presents some advancement in the use of implicit measures for the analysis of cognitions potentially underlying IPV, which had previously been addressed mainly through explicit measures. An implicit approach is important because these measures could predict violent behavior (Todorov & Bargh, 2002), having been related to behavioral consequences in IPV (Eckhardt & Crane, 2014) and sexual aggression (Mussweiler & Förster, 2000; Zurbriggen, 2000), as well as influencing judgments about rape cases (Süssenbach et al., 2017). In addition, we used a LDT that is not known to have been used before in studies about IPV in men, and we explored cognitive associations related to partner and women. These were innovative contents because most of the literature on IPV has focused on implicit attitudes toward violence (Gracia et al., 2015; Sanchez-Prada et al., 2018), gender, and gender–violence associations (Eckhard et al., 2012; Eckhardt & Crane, 2014), whereas studies in sexual violence have focused on implicit associations between sexuality and power (Bargh et al., 1995; Kamphuis et al., 2005; Zurbriggen, 2000). Studying how potentially aggressive men process and organize information is crucial for understanding their attitudes, beliefs, emotions, and behaviors toward women (Leibold & McConnell, 2004). A better understanding of men's cognitive biases will be essential for the development of evidence-based, effective interventions (Pornari et al., 2013). Our results also suggested that different forms of violence against women shared common

predictors and revealed that the subjective attractiveness of the partner's name may be a subtle indicator of IPV.

In summary, our study takes a step to address the gaps in the literature of IPV characterized for the need of research using implicit measurement, especially in the investigation of implicit cognitive associations related to the mental representation of the intimate partner. Although our findings were not conclusive in establishing a link between these cognitive associations and explicit measures of IPV proclivity, we have introduced an implicit assessment task that provided an approach to test theoretical concepts associated to IPV and sexual harassment, and we revealed some patterns that fit with our proposed predictions. In this sense, the present work represent a first step in the study of implicit cognitive associations related to the targets of violence (female partner, women in general) in potential aggressors.

## References

- Abrams, D., Viki, G. T., Masser, B., & Bohner, G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 111–125.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.111>
- Arrindell, W. A., Well, S. van Kolk, A. M., Barelds, D. P. H., Oei, T. P. S., Lau, P. Y., ... Group, C. C. P. S. (2013). Higher levels of masculine gender role stress in masculine than in feminine nations: A thirteen-nations study. *Cross-Cultural Research, 47*, 52-67.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1069397112470366>
- Bargh, J. A., Raymond, P., Pryor, J. B., & Strack, F. (1995). Attractiveness of the underling: An automatic power --> sex association and its consequences for sexual harassment and aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 768–781.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.68.5.768>
- Baughen, A. R., & Gazmararian, J. A. (2015). Masculine gender role stress and violence: A literature review and future directions. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 24*, 107–112.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.04.002>
- Beck, A. T. (1996). Beyond belief: A theory of modes, personality, and psychopathology. In P. M. Salkovskis (Ed.), *Frontiers of cognitive therapy* (pp. 1-25). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Bennett, D. S., Sullivan, M. W., & Lewis, M. (2006). Relations of parental report and observation of parenting to maltreatment history. *Child Maltreatment, 11*, 63–75.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559505283589>
- Bohner, G., Reinhard, M.-A., Rutz, S., Sturm, S., Kerschbaum, B., & Effler, D. (1998). Rape

- myths as neutralizing cognitions: Evidence for a causal impact of anti-victim attitudes on men's self-reported likelihood of raping. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 257-269. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0992\(199803/04\)28:2<257::AID-EJSP871>3.0.CO;2-1](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199803/04)28:2<257::AID-EJSP871>3.0.CO;2-1)
- Bruner, J. S. (1957). On perceptual readiness. *Psychological Review*, 64, 123–152. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0043805>
- Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, 100, 204–232. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.100.2.204>
- Butchart, A., García-Moreno, C., & Mikton, C. (2010). *Preventing intimate partner and sexual violence against women global trends and determinants of prevalence, safety, and acceptability*. Geneva: World Health Organization. Retrieved from [http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2010/9789241564007\\_eng.pdf](http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2010/9789241564007_eng.pdf)
- Cantera, L. M., & Blanch, J. M. (2010). Percepción social de la violencia en la pareja desde los estereotipos de género [Social perception through gender stereotypes of partner violence]. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 19, 121–127. <https://doi.org/10.593/in2010v19n2a3>
- Cameron, C. D., Brown-Iannuzzi, J. L., & Payne, B. K. (2012). Sequential priming measures of implicit social cognition: A meta-analysis of associations with behavior and explicit attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16, 330–350. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868312440047>
- Cárdenas, M., González, C., Calderón, C., & Lay, S. L. (2009). Medidas explícitas e implícitas de las actitudes hacia las mujeres [Explicit and implicit measurements of the attitudes toward women]. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology*, 43, 541–546.

- Clements, K., & Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (2007). Aggressive cognitions of violent versus nonviolent spouses. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *32*, 351–369.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-007-9139-9>
- Díaz-Aguado Jalón, M. J., Martínez Arias, R., & Martínez Babarro, J. (2014). *La evolución de la adolescencia española sobre la igualdad y la prevención de la violencia de género [The evolution of Spanish adolescence on gender equality and the prevention of gender based violence]*. Madrid: Ministerio de Sanidad, Política Social e Igualdad. Centro de Publicaciones. Retrieved from  
<http://www.violenciagenero.msssi.gob.es/violenciaEnCifras/estudios/colecciones/estudio/evolucion2014.htm>
- Diehl, C., Glaser, T., & Bohner, G. (2014). Face the consequences: Learning about victims' suffering reduces sexual harassment myth acceptance and men's likelihood to sexually harass. *Aggressive Behavior*, *40*, 489-503. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21553>
- Diehl, C., Rees, J., & Bohner, G. (2012). Flirting with disaster: Short-term mating orientation and hostile sexism predict different types of sexual harassment. *Aggressive Behavior*, *38*, 521–531. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21444>
- Diehl, C., Rees, J., & Bohner, G. (2018). Predicting sexual harassment from hostile sexism and short-term mating orientation: Relative strength of predictors depends on situational priming of power versus sex. *Violence Against Women*, *24*, 123-143.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801216678092>
- Dill, K. E., Brown, B. P., & Collins, M. A. (2008). Effects of exposure to sex-stereotyped video game characters on tolerance of sexual harassment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*, 1402-1408. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2008.06.002>

- Dobash, R., & Dobash, R. E. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York: Free Press.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (2011). What were they thinking? Men who murder an intimate partner. *Violence Against Women, 17*, 111–134.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801210391219>
- Durán, M., Moya, M., Megías, J. L., & Viki, G. T. (2010). Social perception of rape victims in dating and married relationships: The role of perpetrator's benevolent sexism. *Sex Roles, 62*, 505–519. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9676-7>
- Eckes, T., & Six-Materna, I. (1999). Hostilität und benevolenz: Eine skala zur erfassung des ambivalenten sexismus [Hostility and benevolence: A scale for assessing ambivalent sexism]. *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie, 30*, 211–228. <https://doi.org/10.1024//0044-3514.30.4.211>
- Eckhardt, C. I., & Crane, C. A. (2014). Male perpetrators of intimate partner violence and implicit attitudes toward violence: Associations with treatment outcomes. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 38*, 291–301. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-013-9593-5>
- Eckhardt, C. I., & Dye, M. L. (2000). The cognitive characteristics of maritally violent men: Theory and evidence. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 24*, 139–158.  
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005441924292>
- Eckhardt, C., Samper, R., Suhr, L., & Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (2012). Implicit attitudes toward violence among male perpetrators of intimate partner violence: A preliminary investigation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*, 471–491.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511421677>
- Eisler, R. M., Skidmore, J. R., & Ward, C. H. (1988). Masculine gender-role stress: Predictor of

- anger, anxiety, and health-risk behaviors. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52, 133–141. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5201\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_12)
- Eisler, R. M., Franchina, J. J., & Moore, T. M. (2000). Masculine gender role stress and intimate abuse: Effects of gender relevance of conflict situations on men's attributions and affective responses. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 2, 34–41. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.2.1.34>
- Eisler, R. M., & Skidmore, J. R. (1987). Masculine gender role stress scale development and component factors in the appraisal of stressful situations. *Behavior Modification*, 11, 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01454455870112001>
- Ellsberg, M., Arango, D. J., Morton, M., Gennari, F., Kiplesund, S., Contreras, M., ... Watts, C. (2015). Prevention of violence against women and girls: What does the evidence say? *The Lancet*, 385, 1555–1566. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)61703-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61703-7)
- Expósito, F., Moya, M. C., & Glick, P. (1998). Sexismo ambivalente: Medición y correlatos. *Revista de Psicología social*, 13, 159–169. <https://doi.org/10.1174/021347498760350641>
- Eyssel, F., Bohner, G., Süßenbach, P., & Schreiber, P. (2009). Neuentwicklung und Validierung eines szenariobasierten Verfahrens zur Erfassung der Neigung zu sexueller Aggression [New development and validation of a scenario-based measure of sexual aggression proclivity]. *Diagnostica*, 55, 117–127. <https://doi.org/10.1026/0012-1924.55.2.117>
- Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C., & Williams, C. J. (1995). Variability in automatic activation as an unobtrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 1013–1027. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.69.6.1013>
- Fazio, R. H., & Olson, M. A. (2003). Implicit measures in social cognition research: Their

- meaning and use. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *54*, 297–327.  
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145225>
- Fineran, S., & Bolen, R. M. (2006). Risk factors for peer sexual harassment in schools. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *21*, 1169–1190. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260506290422>
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *17*, 425–445. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834baspp1704\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834baspp1704_2)
- Forbes, G. B., Adams-Curtis, L. E., & White, K. B. (2004). First- and second-generation measures of sexism, rape myths and related beliefs, and hostility toward women: Their interrelationships and association with college students' experiences with dating aggression and sexual coercion. *Violence Against Women*, *10*, 236–261.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801203256002>
- Gaertner, L., & Foshee, V. (1999). Commitment and the perpetration of relationship violence. *Personal Relationships*, *6*, 227–239. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.1999.tb00189.x>
- García-Moreno, C., Pallitto, C., Devries, K., Stöckl, H., Watts, C., & Abrahams, N. (2013). *Global and regional estimates of violence against women: Prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.
- Gelfand, M. J., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1995). The structure of sexual harassment: A confirmatory analysis across cultures and settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *47*, 164–177. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1995.1033>
- Gerger, H., Kley, H., Bohner, G., & Siebler, F. (2007). The Acceptance of Modern Myths About Sexual Aggression (AMMSA) Scale: Development and validation in German and English.

- Aggressive Behavior*, 33, 422-440. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20195>
- Gilchrist, E. (2009). Implicit thinking about implicit theories in intimate partner violence. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 15, 131–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160802190863>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491>
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., ... Annetje, B. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 763-775. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.763>
- Gracia, E., Rodríguez, C. M., & Lila, M. (2015). Preliminary evaluation of an analog procedure to assess acceptability of intimate partner violence against women: The partner violence acceptability movie task. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 1567. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01567>
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102, 4–27. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.102.1.4>
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1464–1480. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1464>
- Hamby, S. L. (1996). The Dominance Scale: Preliminary psychometric properties. *Violence and Victims*, 11, 199-212.
- Heise, L. L. (1998). Violence against women: An integrated, ecological framework. *Violence*

- Against Women*, 4, 262–290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801298004003002>
- Jackson, J. J., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2007). The structure and measurement of human mating strategies: Toward a multidimensional model of sociosexuality. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 28, 382–391. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2007.04.005>
- Jakupcak, M., Lisak, D., & Roemer, L. (2002). The role of masculine ideology and masculine gender role stress in men's perpetration of relationship violence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 3, 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.3.2.97>
- Johnson, W. L., Manning, W. D., Giordano, P. C., & Longmore, M. A. (2015). Relationship context and intimate partner violence from adolescence to young adulthood. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 57, 631–636. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2015.08.014>
- Kämpfe, N., Penzhorn, J., Schikora, J., Dünzl, J., & Schneidenbach, J. (2009). Empathy and social desirability: A comparison of delinquent and non-delinquent participants using direct and indirect measures. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 15, 1–17.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160802010640>
- Kamphuis, J. H., De Ruiter, C., Janssen, B., & Spiering, M. (2005). Preliminary evidence for an automatic link between sex and power among men who molest children. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20, 1351–1365. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260505278719>
- Leibold, J. M., & McConnell, A. R. (2004). Women, sex, hostility, power, and suspicion: Sexually aggressive men's cognitive associations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 256–263. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031\(03\)00095-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031(03)00095-7)
- Leonard, K. E., & Senchak, M. (1996). Prospective prediction of husband marital aggression within newlywed couples. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 105, 369–380.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.105.3.369>

- Lila, M., Gracia, E., & García, F. (2010). Actitudes de la policía ante la intervención en casos de violencia contra la mujer en las relaciones de pareja: Influencia del sexismo y la empatía [Police attitudes toward intervention in cases of partner violence against women: The influence of sexism and empathy]. *Revista de Psicología Social*, *25*, 313–323.  
<https://doi.org/10.1174/021347410792675570>
- Lippman, J. R. (2018). I did it because I never stopped loving you: The effects of media portrayals of persistent pursuit on beliefs about stalking. *Communication Research*, *45*, 394–421. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650215570653>
- Lisco, C. G., Parrott, D. J., & Tharp, A. T. (2012). The role of heavy episodic drinking and hostile sexism in men's sexual aggression toward female intimate partners. *Addictive Behaviors*, *37*, 1264–1270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2012.06.010>
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1995). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: A theoretical and empirical reexamination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*, 704–711. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.704
- Malamuth, N. M. (1983). Factors associated with rape as predictors of laboratory aggression against women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *45*, 432–442.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.2.432>
- Megías, J. L., Montañés, P., Romero-Sánchez, M., & Durán, M. (2009). Proclividad a la violencia hacia la mujer en el ámbito familiar: Análisis preliminares de la creación de una escala de medida [Likelihood to intimate partner violence in the domestic context: preliminary analyses of a measurement scale]. In Congreso Nacional de Psicología Social. *Libro de actas del XI Congreso Nacional de Psicología Social*, volumen II, 8–466.
- Mellon, R. C. (2013). On the motivation of quid pro quo sexual harassment in men: Relation to

- masculine gender role stress. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *43*, 2287–2296.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12178>
- Meyer, D. E., & Schvaneveldt, R. W. (1971). Facilitation in recognizing pairs of words: Evidence of a dependence between retrieval operations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *90*, 227–234. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0031564>
- Moore, T. M., Stuart, G. L., McNulty, J. K., Addis, M. E., Cordova, J. V., & Temple, J. R. (2010). Domains of masculine gender role stress and intimate partner violence in a clinical sample of violent men. *Psychology of Violence*, *1*, 68–75.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/2152-0828.1.S.68>
- Murray, D. R., Jones, D. N., & Schaller, M. (2013). Perceived threat of infectious disease and its implications for sexual attitudes. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *54*, 103–108.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.08.021>
- Musch, J., Brockhaus, R., & Bröder, A. (2002). Ein Inventar zur Erfassung von zwei Faktoren sozialer Erwünschtheit [An inventory for the assessment of two factors of social desirability]. *Diagnostica*, *48*, 121–129. <https://doi.org/10.1026//0012-1924.48.3.121>
- Mussweiler, T., & Förster, J. (2000). The sex-->aggression link: a perception-behavior dissociation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 507–520.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.79.4.507>
- Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2012). Prospective relationships between workplace sexual harassment and psychological distress. *Occupational Medicine*, *62*, 226–228.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqs010>
- Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review*, *84*, 231–259. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033->

295X.84.3.231

- Nosek, B. A., & Smyth, F. L. (2007). A multitrait-multimethod validation of the Implicit Association Test: Implicit and explicit attitudes are related but distinct constructs. *Experimental Psychology, 54*, 14–29. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169.54.1.14>
- Paulhus, D. L. (1994). *Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding: Reference manual for the BIDR Version 6*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia at Vancouver.
- Polaschek, D. L. L., Calvert, S. W., & Gannon, T. A. (2009). Linking violent thinking: Implicit theory-based research with violent offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*, 75–96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508315781>
- Pornari, C. D., Dixon, L., & Humphreys, G. W. (2013). Systematically identifying implicit theories in male and female intimate partner violence perpetrators. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 18*, 496–505. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2013.07.005>
- Pornari, C. D., Dixon, L., & Humphreys, G. W. (2018). A preliminary investigation into a range of implicit and explicit offense supportive cognitions in perpetrators of physical intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518755487>
- Pryor, J. B. (1987). Sexual harassment proclivities in men. *Sex Roles, 17*, 269-290. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00288453>
- Rospenda, K. M., Richman, J. A., & Shannon, C. A. (2009). Prevalence and mental health correlates of harassment and discrimination in the workplace: Results from a national study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*, 819-843. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508317182>

- Russell, B. L., & Trigg, K. Y. (2004). Tolerance of sexual harassment: An examination of gender differences, ambivalent sexism, social dominance, and gender roles. *Sex Roles, 50*, 565–573. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SERS.0000023075.32252.fd>
- Sanchez-Prada, A., Delgado-Alvarez, C., Bosch-Fiol, E., & Ferrer-Perez, V. A. (2018). Implicit and explicit attitudes toward intimate partner violence against women: An exploratory study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518789903>
- Samuels, H. (2004). A defining moment: A feminist perspective on the law of sexual harassment in the workplace in the light of the equal treatment amendment directive. *Feminist Legal Studies, 12*, 181–211. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:FEST.0000043307.48041.64>
- Schmitt, D. P. (2005). Sociosexuality from Argentina to Zimbabwe: A 48- nation study of sex, culture, and strategies of human mating. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 28*, 247-275. <https://doi.org/10.1017/So14o525X05000051>
- Siebler, F., Sabelus, S., & Bohner, G. (2008). A refined computer harassment paradigm: Validation, and test of hypotheses about target characteristics. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*, 22–35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00404.x>
- Smith, M. D. (1990). Patriarchal ideology and wife beating: A test of a feminist hypothesis. *Violence and Victims, 5*, 257–273. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.5.4.257>
- Stamarski, C. S., & Hing, L. S. S. (2015). Gender inequalities in the workplace: The effects of organizational structures, processes, practices, and decision makers' sexism. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*, 1400. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01400>
- Stith, S. M., Smith, D. B., Penn, C. E., Ward, D. B., & Tritt, D. (2004). Intimate partner physical abuse perpetration and victimization risk factors: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and*

- Violent Behavior*, 10, 65–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2003.09.001>
- Süssenbach, P., Albrecht, S., & Bohner, G. (2017). Implicit judgments of rape cases: An experiment on the determinants and consequences of implicit evaluations in a rape case. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 23, 291-304.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2016.1247160>
- Todorov, A., & Bargh, J. A. (2002). Automatic sources of aggression. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7, 53–68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789\(00\)00036-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789(00)00036-7)
- Valor-Segura, I., Expósito, F., & Moya, M. (2011). Victim blaming and exoneration of the perpetrator in domestic violence: The role of beliefs in a just world and ambivalent sexism. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 14, 195–206.  
[https://doi.org/10.5209/rev\\_SJOP.2011.v14.n1.17](https://doi.org/10.5209/rev_SJOP.2011.v14.n1.17)
- Valor-Segura, I., Expósito, F., & Moya, M. C. (2008). Atribución del comportamiento del agresor y consejo a la víctima en un caso de violencia doméstica [Attribution of aggressor's behavior and advice to the victim in a case of domestic violence]. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 23, 171–180. <https://doi.org/10.1174/021347408784135896>
- Vanselow, N., Bohner, G., Becher, M., & Siebler, F. (2010). Die NSB-Skala: Vorstellung und Validierung eines deutschsprachigen Instruments zur Erfassung der Neigung zu sexueller Belästigung [The NSB Scale: Presentation and validation of a German-language instrument assessing sexual harassment proclivity]. *Diagnostica*, 56, 158–177.  
<https://doi.org/10.1026/0012-1924/a000012>
- Ward, T., Hudson, S. M., & Marshall, W. L. (1995). Cognitive distortions and affective deficits in sex offenders: A cognitive deconstructionist interpretation. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 7, 67-83. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02254874>

- Ward, T. (2000). Sexual offenders' cognitive distortions as implicit theories. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 5*, 491–507. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789\(98\)00036-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789(98)00036-6)
- Weldon, S., & Gilchrist, E. (2012). Implicit theories in intimate partner violence offenders. *Journal of Family Violence, 27*, 761–772. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-012-9465-x>
- Yao, M. Z., Mahood, C., & Linz, D. (2010). Sexual priming, gender stereotyping, and likelihood to sexually harass: Examining the cognitive effects of playing a sexually-explicit video game. *Sex Roles, 62*, 77–88. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9695-4>
- Yllö, K. (1993). Through a feminist lens: Gender, power and violence. In R. J. Gelles & D. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (pp. 47–62). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Yllö, K., & Straus, M. (1990). Patriarchy and violence against wives: The impact of structural and normative norms. In M. Strauss & R. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families* (pp. 383–398). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Zurbriggen, E. L. (2000). Social motives and cognitive power-sex associations: Predictors of aggressive sexual behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 559–581. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.3.559>

Table 1

*Correlations between Partner Facilitation Scores Derived from the Lexical Decision Task and Explicit Measures Related to Intimate Partner Violence Against Women*

Partner Facilitation Scores	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Correlations							
			Attractiveness Partner name	BS	HS	MGRS	IPV Proclivity	Subtle IPV	2.	3.
1. Violence target words	31**	125	-.19*	-.01	.09	.08	.17	-.00	-.05	.31**
2. Power target words	15	111	-.02	.06	-.12	-.05	-.04	-.09	--	-.11
3. Hostility target words	66**	231	-.05	.02	-.12	.09	.02	-.09	--	--

*Note.* Facilitation scores compare partner versus other primes for violence, power, and hostility target concepts. BS: benevolent sexism; HS:

hostile sexism; MGRS: masculine gender role stress; IPV: intimate partner violence against women. Sample of Male German University students

(*n* = 129)

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 2

*Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations of Principal Explicit Measures*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Correlations										
			2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.
1. Age	25.18	3.69	-.12	.03	-.17*	-.07	-.16	-.17	-.05	-.06	-.06	.04	.08
2. Attractiveness Partner name	5.81	1.19	--	.18*	.13	-.06	-.17	-.31***	-.06	-.10	-.10	-.27***	.24**
3. Impression management	4.05	1.28		--	-.00	-.13	-.21*	-.22*	.02	-.21*	-.24**	-.35***	.12
4. BS	4.15	1.09			--	.48***	.32***	.30**	.32***	.30**	.10	-.20*	.14
5. HS	3.58	1.22				--	.30**	.42***	.40***	.23**	.30***	.09	-.17
6. MGRS	3.88	.80					--	.37***	.35***	.35***	.17*	.23**	-.12
7. IPV	2.07	.79						--	.41***	.52***	.29**	.29**	-.30**
8. Subtle IPV	2.69	.95							--	.29***	.10	-.02	.07
9. LSH	2.50	1.08								--	.31***	.30***	-.16
10. Subtle SH	3.08	1.13									--	.47***	-.23**
11. STMO	4.31	1.72										--	-.28**
12. LTMO	6.25	.87											--

*Note.* BS: benevolent sexism; HS: hostile sexism; MGRS: masculine gender role stress; IPV: intimate partner violence against women; LSH: likelihood to sexual harassment; Subtle SH: subtle forms of sexual harassment; STMO: short-term mating orientation; LTMO: long-term mating orientation. Sample of Male German University students ( $n = 129$ ). The theoretical range for all scales (2–12) was from 1 to 7.

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

Table 3

*Hierarchical Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Proclivity to Intimate Partner Violence Against Women (IPV)*

Note. IM: impression management; BS: benevolent sexism; HS: hostile sexism; MGRS: masculine gender role stress; STMO:

Variables	Step 1			Step 2			Step 3		
	$\beta$	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	$\beta$	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	$\beta$	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>
Constant		3.48	6.86***		1.18	1.83		1.77	2.28*
Age	-.16	-.03	-1.88	-.09	-.02	-1.19	-.08	-.02	-1.10
IM	-.22	-.14	-2.56*	-.14	-.08	-1.72	-.07	-.04	-.84
BS				.08	.05	.84	.22	.16	2.31*
HS				.29	.19	3.29**	.20	.13	2.32*
MGRS				.22	.21	2.54*	.14	.14	1.70
STMO							.21	.09	2.46*
LTMO							-.20	-.19	-2.59*
<i>F</i>		5.19**			9.20***			9.51***	
<i>df</i>		2			5			7	
<i>df<sub>error</sub></i>		126			123			121	
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>		.08**			.27***			.36***	
$\Delta R^2$					.19***			.08**	

short-term mating orientation; LTMO: long-term mating orientation; *df* = degrees of freedom. Sample of Male German

University students (*n* = 129)

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

Table 4

*Hierarchical Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Proclivity to Subtle Forms of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women (Subtle IPV)*

Variables	Step 1			Step 2			Step 3		
	$\beta$	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	$\beta$	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	$\beta$	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>
Constant		3.06	4.82***		-.08	-.09		-.70	-.70
Age	-.05	-.01	-.53	.03	.01	-.40	.02	-.00	.29
IM	-.02	-.02	-.25	.07	.05	.81	.04	.03	.51
BS				.12	.11	1.30	.06	.05	.61
HS				.28	.22	3.00**	.32	.25	3.36**
MGRS				.25	.30	2.89**	.28	.33	3.12**
STMO							-.05	-.03	-.60
LTMO							.12	.14	1.45
<i>F</i>		.17			7.50***			5.81***	
<i>df</i>		2			5			7	
<i>df<sub>error</sub></i>		126			123			121	
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>		.00			.23***			.25***	
$\Delta R^2$					.23***			.02	

*Note.* IM: impression management; BS: benevolent sexism; HS: hostile sexism; MGRS: masculine gender role stress; STMO: short-term mating orientation; LTMO: long-term mating orientation; *df* = degrees of freedom. Sample of Male German University students (*n* = 129)

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

Table 5

*Hierarchical Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Likelihood to Sexual Harassment (LSH)*

Variables	Step 1			Step 2			Step 3		
	$\beta$	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	$\beta$	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	$\beta$	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>
Constant		3.66	5.84***		1.07	1.29		1.00	.99
Age	-.06	-.01	-.67	.02	.00	-.19	.02	.00	.19
IM	-.21	-.16	-2.39*	-.15	-.12	-1.82	-.07	-.05	-.80
BS				.21	.18	2.13*	.34	.30	3.41**
HS				.05	.04	.49	-.03	-.02	-.30
MGRS				.23	.27	2.53*	.15	.18	1.66
STMO							.29	.16	3.14**
LTMO							-.11	-.12	-1.32
<i>F</i>		3.13*			5.40***			6.14***	
<i>df</i>		2			5			7	
<i>df<sub>error</sub></i>		126			123			121	
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>		.05*			.18***			.26***	
$\Delta R^2$					.13***			.08**	

*Note.* IM: impression management; BS: benevolent sexism; HS: hostile sexism; MGRS: masculine gender role stress; STMO: short-term mating orientation; LTMO: long-term mating orientation; *df* = degrees of freedom. Sample of Male German University students (*n* = 129)

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

Table 6

*Hierarchical Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Subtle Sexual Harassment*

Variables	Step 1			Step 2			Step 3		
	$\beta$	$b$	$t$	$\beta$	$b$	$t$	$\beta$	$b$	$t$
Constant		4.35	5.97***		2.99	2.99**		2.19	1.91
Age	-.06	-.02	-.65	-.04	-.01	-.42	-.05	-.01	-.60
IM	-.24	-.21	-2.77**	-.19	-.17	-2.20*	-.06	-.05	-.75
BS				-.06	-.06	-.61	.12	.12	1.23
HS				.29	.27	2.95**	.20	.18	2.14*
MGRS				.06	.09	.68	-.05	-.07	-.62
STMO							.44	.29	5.04***
LTMO							-.08	-.11	-.99
$F$		4.09*			3.99**			7.64***	
$df$		2			5			7	
$df_{error}$		126			123			121	
$R^2$		.06*			.14**			.31***	
$\Delta R^2$					.08*			.17***	

Notes. IM: impression management; BS: benevolent sexism; HS: hostile sexism; MGRS: masculine gender role stress; STMO: short-term mating orientation; LTMO: long-term mating orientation;  $df$  = degrees of freedom

Sample of Male German University students ( $N = 129$ )

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

**Online supplement** for Zapata-Calvente, A., Moya, M., Bohner, G., and Megías, J. L. (2018). Automatic associations and conscious attitudes predict different aspects of men's intimate partner violence and sexual harassment proclivities. *Sex Roles*. Antonella L. Zapata-Calvente, University of Granada. Email: antonellalzc@ugr.es

Table 1s

*Mean Reaction Times of the Lexical Decision Task for Type of Prime and Target*

Type of Target	Type of Prime							
	Partner		Male		Female		Neutral	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Hostility	944.6	277.4	1002.4	291.0	1004.6	346.4	1033.2	300.3
Power	761.9	160.0	780.6	186.1	764.3	172.3	786.6	177.3
Violence	748.4	168.5	750.3	189.7	793.0	219.8	795.3	185.5
Sexuality	788.8	199.8	805.6	184.3	812.0	201.4	813.1	204.0
Neutral	709.2	150.8	719.5	155.5	696.0	152.6	715.3	145.3

*Note.* Reaction times are in milliseconds. Sample of Male German University students ( $n = 129$ )

### **Names (piloted) selected for the LDT and questionnaire**

25 male participants rated several names on attractiveness (from 1 = Gefällt mir überhaupt nicht [I do not like it at all] to 7 = Gefällt mir sehr gut [I like it very much]) and popularity (from 1 = Überhaupt nicht häufig/beliebt [Not common/popular at all] to 7 = Sehr häufig/ beliebt [Very common/popular]). They also rated their own partner's name on both dimensions.

Table 2s

*Descriptive Statistics of the Female and Male Names Selected during the Pilot for the LDT and the Questionnaire*

	Attractiveness		Popularity	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Partner's name in the pilot	5.75	1.67	3.84	1.74
<i>LDT selected names</i>				
Hanna	4.42	1.55	4.43	1.44
Jonas	3.60	1.48	4.10	1.39
<i>Questionnaire selected names</i>				
Lea	4.24	1.47	4.24	1.58
Johanna	3.96	1.67	4.32	1.64
Vanessa	3.76	1.58	4.36	1.46
Anna	4.56	1.22	5.20	1.63
Lisa	3.88	1.39	4.88	1.61

## Target words (piloted)

29 male participants rated several words following this instruction:

Please indicate how much the word in the first column is associated with each of the four categories listed below (Power, Violence, Sex, Hostility) by ticking a number between 1 and 7. Where 1 = "not at all associated with the category" and 7 = "strongly associated with the category".

Please be sure to evaluate each word for each of the four categories. So you should put exactly four crosses in each row (see the example below).

Wörter [Words]	Kategorien																												
	Macht [Power]							Gewalt [Violence]							Sex [Sexuality]							Feindseligkeit [Hostility]							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Baum [Tree]	X							X							X								X						
Bett [Bed]	X							X									X						X						

In Table 3 we summarized the mean and standard deviation of the selected target words, which were more strongly associated with the relevant concept but not with the other three concepts.

Table 3s

### *Descriptive Statistics of the Target Words for the Lexical Decision Task*

Words	Violence		Power		Hostility		Sexuality	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Violence category</i>								
Kampf (fight)	6.80	.55	6.03	1.21	5.80	1.56	2.10	1.24
Angriff (attack),	6.53	.86	5.06	1.52	6.00	1.50	1.83	1.48
Gewalt (violence),	6.96	.18	3.98	1.61	5.79	1.20	1.68	1.19
Schlag (hit)	6.00	1.36	4.27	1.66	4.75	1.68	2.13	1.38
<i>Power category</i>								
Macht (power),	4.20	1.63	6.63	1.30	3.31	1.89	2.86	1.65
Befehl (command)	4.20	1.93	6.47	.97	3.48	1.93	2.16	1.26
Chef (boss),	2.65	1.77	6.17	.97	2.79	1.67	1.75	1.55
Dominanz (dominance)	3.86	1.64	6.17	1.10	3.92	1.74	3.42	1.95
<i>Hostility category</i>								
Feindseligkeit (hostility)	5.60	1.42	3.83	1.78	6.80	.76	1.36	.55
Antipathie (antipathy)	3.35	2.09	2.71	1.71	5.07	2.32	1.32	1.15
Verachtung (contempt)	4.20	1.63	3	1.83	5.28	1.99	1.25	.84
Ärgerlich (angry)	3.51	1.99	2.68	1.89	4.15	1.99	1.34	.97
<i>Sexuality</i>								
Erregung (arousal),	2.93	1.94	3.06	1.83	2.43	1.83	6.76	.50
Erotik (eroticism),	2.03	1.35	2.93	1.76	1.23	.82	6.76	.50
Orgasmus (orgasm),	1.34	.76	2.27	1.81	1.10	.40	6.79	.67
Nackt (naked)	1.86	1.38	2.26	1.85	1.40	1.06	6.63	.61
<i>Neutral</i>								
Sitzen (sit),	1.41	.98	2.13	1.68	1.41	1.15	1.96	1.40
Raum (space),	1.65	1.23	2.13	1.52	1.86	1.35	2.20	1.63
Kreide (chalk),	1.27	.84	1.72	1.38	1.34	.93	1.17	.75
Sehen (see)	1.93	1.57	2.83	1.68	2.20	1.76	3.06	2.25

We created the following non-words based on the critical targets:

- Similar to violence words: knapf, angrief, gewald, schlarg
- Similar to power words: mascht, befleh, cheff, donimanz
- Similar to hostility words: feintesligkeit, anthipatie, varechtung, ärgarlich
- Similar to sexuality words: eregung, erotick, orgasnus, nakt
- Similar to neutral words: sizen, raun, kraide, sechen

## Likelihood to perpetrate intimate partner violence against women

All the scenarios included the three items listed under Scenario 1. For the sake of brevity, we included them only once here. The material includes the German version of each scenario and the English translation.

Im Folgenden stellen wir Ihnen einige Szenarien vor. Bitte lesen Sie diese aufmerksam, da Sie im Anschluss jeweils einige Fragen dazu beantworten sollen.

[In the following, we present several scenarios. Please read them carefully because then you will subsequently have to answer a series of questions related to them]

### **Szenario Nr. 1 (was 2)**

*Clara und Stefan haben vor sechs Jahren geheiratet. Clara hat die Kontakte zu ihren Schulfreundinnen aufrechterhalten. Die persönliche Situation von Clara unterscheidet sich sehr von der ihrer Freundinnen, denn vier von ihnen sind Singles und eine lebt von ihrem Mann getrennt. Claras Freundinnen gehen abends gern in die Disko, um zu feiern und zu flirten. Clara liebt es, mit ihren Freundinnen auszugehen. Dies ist tatsächlich der einzige Grund, warum Clara und Stefan oft streiten. Jedes Mal, wenn sie sagt, dass sie mit ihren Freundinnen ausgehen wird, gibt es Streit. Stefan möchte nicht, dass sie mit ihnen ausgeht, weil er diese Freundinnen für keine gute Gesellschaft für seine Frau hält und sie jedes Mal, wenn sie mit ihnen ausgeht, betrunken nach Hause kommt.*

[Clara and Stefan have got married six years ago. Clara has maintained contacts with her school friends. The personal situation of Clara is very different from that of her friends, because four of them are singles and one is separated from her husband. Clara's friends like to go to the disco in the evenings to party and flirt. Clara loves to go out with her friends. This is actually the only reason why Clara and Stefan often quarrel. Every time she says she is going out with her friends, there is an argument. Stefan does not want her going out with them because he considers these friends are no good company for his wife, and because she comes home drunk every time she goes out with them.]

Nun interessiert uns Ihre Meinung zu dieser Geschichte. Wir bitten Sie, jede der folgenden Aussagen anhand der vorgegebenen Antwortskala ehrlich zu beantworten. Dabei gibt es keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten. Bitte lassen Sie keine Antwort aus.

[Now we are interested in your opinion on this story. We ask you to answer each of the following statements honestly based on the given response scale. There are no right or wrong answers. Please do not leave any question unanswered.]

Stellen Sie sich vor, Sie wären in der gleichen Situation wie die männliche Person in dem Szenario:

[Imagine being in the same situation as the male character in the scenario:]

1. Wie erregt wären Sie in dieser Situation?

[How infuriated would you feel if you were in the situation described?]

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
überhaupt nicht erregt [Not at all infuriated]						sehr erregt [Very infuriated]

2. Würden Sie sich in dieser Situation so verhalten wie der Mann in dem Szenario?

[In a similar situation, would you behave like the man in the scenario?]

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hätte mich bestimmt nicht so verhalten [I would definitely not have behaved like that]						Hätte mich ganz sicher so verhalten [I would certainly have behaved like that]

3. Wie viel Spaß würde es Ihnen machen, in dieser Situation Ihren Willen durchzusetzen?

[How much would you enjoy getting your way in this situation?]

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
überhaupt keinen Spaß [I would not enjoy it at all]						sehr viel Spaß [I would enjoy it a lot]

### **Szenario Nr. 2 (was 5)**

*Nicole und Andreas sind seit sechs Jahren verheiratet. Beide arbeiten außer Haus und kommen gegen 18 Uhr nach Hause. Als Nicole am Mittwoch nach Hause kam, schaute sich Andreas im Fernsehen ein Fußballspiel an, auf das er sich schon lange gefreut hatte. Nicole setzte sich neben Andreas aufs Sofa und fing an, mit ihrer Freundin zu telefonieren. Andreas wurde wütend, weil er den Fernsehkommentar nicht hören konnte, aber Nicole telefonierte weiter mit ihrer Freundin. Plötzlich stand Andreas auf, legte das Telefon auf und fing an, Nicole zu beleidigen. Nicole bekam Angst und stand schweigend auf, um das Wohnzimmer zu verlassen, aber Andreas ging ihr nach und schubste sie gegen die Tür.*

[Nicole and Andreas have been married for six years. Both work outside the house and come home around 6 pm. When Nicole came home on Wednesday, Andreas was watching a soccer match on television that he had been looking forward to for a long time. Nicole sat next to Andreas on the sofa and started talking on the phone with her friend. Andreas got angry because he could not hear the TV comments, but Nicole kept talking on the phone with her friend. Suddenly, Andreas got up, put down the phone and began to insult Nicole. Nicole got scared and got up silently to leave the living room, but Andreas followed her and pushed her against the door.]

**Szenario Nr. 3 (was 6)**

*Tim und Anna sind seit sechs Jahren zusammen und haben regelmäßig Sex miteinander. Aus beruflichen Gründen hat Tim einen Monat in den USA verbracht. Am Tag seiner Rückkehr fängt er an, Anna zu küssen und zu streicheln. Auch Anna küsst ihn und umarmt ihn, sagt ihm aber, dass sie keine Lust hat, Sex zu haben, weil sie am Vortag bis spät am Abend gearbeitet hat und sehr müde ist. Tim küsst und streichelt Anna jedoch immer intensiver, bis Anna schließlich aufgibt und er in sie eindringt, obwohl sie das nicht wollte.*

[Tim and Anna have been together for six years and have sex regularly. For professional reasons, Tim spent a month in the US. On the day he returns, he starts kissing and caressing Anna. Anna also kisses him and hugs him, but tells him that she does not feel like having sex because she has worked late the day before and is very tired. However, Tim kisses and strokes Anna more and more intensely, until Anna finally gives up and he penetrates her, although she did not want that.]

**Szenario Nr. 4 (was 3)**

*Nina und Lars sind ein verheiratetes Paar, und beide kommen normalerweise zur selben Uhrzeit, gegen 19 Uhr, von der Arbeit nach Hause. Letzten Dienstag war Lars zur gewohnten Uhrzeit zu Hause, aber Nina war noch nicht da. Als er bis 21.30 Uhr noch nichts von Nina gehört hatte, rief Lars sie an, aber ihr Handy ist ausgeschaltet. Lars war sehr besorgt. Als Nina schließlich gegen 22 Uhr nach Hause kam, war Lars sehr sauer; er fragte sie, wo sie gewesen sei und warum sie nicht angerufen habe. Sie antwortete, dass sie eine alte Kommilitonin getroffen und mit ihr einen Kaffee trinken war. Sie habe nicht anrufen können, weil ihr Akku leer gewesen sei. Lars war empört, weil Nina nicht angerufen hatte. Nina sagte ihm, dass das doch nicht so schlimm sei, und wollte ihn küssen. Da gab Lars ihr eine Ohrfeige.*

[Nina and Lars are a married couple, and they usually come home from work at about the same time, around 7 pm. Lars was home at the usual time last Tuesday, but Nina was not there. When he had not heard from Nina until 9:30 pm, Lars called her, but her phone was off. Lars was very worried. When Nina finally came home around 10:00 pm, Lars was very angry; he asked her where she had been and why she had not called. She replied that she had met an old classmate and had a coffee with her. She could not call because her battery was empty. Lars was outraged because Nina had not called. Nina told him that was not so bad and wanted to kiss him. But Lars slapped her in the face.]

**Szenario Nr. 5 (was 4)**

*Miriam und Simon gehen zum jährlichen Mitarbeiter-Abendessen von Simons Firma, wie sie es schon seit ihrer Heirat vor sechs Jahren tun. Simon, sein Chef und die meisten von Simons Arbeitskollegen haben eine politische Einstellung, die sich von der Miriams unterscheidet. Während des Essens fangen sie an, über die aktuelle politische Situation zu reden. Simon stupst Miriam mehrmals unauffällig an, damit sie still ist. Sie aber vertritt vehement ihre Ideen (die denen Simons und der meisten Anwesenden widersprechen). Simon sagt nun, für alle hörbar, dass Miriam immer über Dinge rede, von denen sie nichts verstehe, und dass sie den Mund halten solle. Als sie nach Hause kommen, macht Miriam Simon Vorwürfe wegen der Dinge, die er zu ihr gesagt hat, aber Simon sagt, er habe so handeln müssen, weil sie ihn vor seinen Arbeitskollegen in eine unmögliche Lage gebracht habe.*

[Miriam and Simon went to the annual staff dinner of Simon's company, as they have been doing since their marriage six years ago. Simon, his boss, and most of Simon's co-workers have a political opinion that is different from Miriam's. During the meal, they begin to talk about the current political situation. Simon nudges Miriam several times to keep her quiet. But she vehemently represents her ideas (which contradict those of Simon and most of those present). Simon now says, audible to all, that Miriam always talks about things she does not understand, and that she should shut up. When they return home, Miriam blames Simon for what he has said to her, but Simon says he had to act that way because she put him in an impossible position in front of his co-workers.]

***Szenario Nr. 6 (was 1)***

*Hanna und Christian sind seit sechs Jahren verheiratet. Sie haben regelmäßig Geschlechtsverkehr. Eines Tages sagt Christian, dass er gerne Analverkehr mit Hanna haben würde. Hanna ist sich nicht sicher, ob sie Analsex haben möchte, bespricht ihre Bedenken mit Christian und sagt ihm schließlich, dass sie sich darüber nicht sicher sei. Am nächsten Abend haben die beiden Geschlechtsverkehr und Christian erwähnt wieder seinen Wunsch, Analverkehr zu praktizieren. Hanna sagt wieder, dass sie sich damit nicht wohl fühlen würde, aber trotz ihrer Weigerung hält Christian sie fest und dringt anal in sie ein.*

[Hanna and Christian have been married for six years. They have intercourse on a regular basis. One day, Christian says that he would like to have anal intercourse with Hanna. Hanna is not sure if she wants to have anal sex, discusses her concerns with Christian and finally tells him that she is not sure about it. The next evening, the two have intercourse and Christian mentions again his desire to practice anal intercourse. Hanna says again that she would not feel comfortable with that, but despite her refusal, Christian holds her tight and penetrates her anally.]

## Subtle measures of aggression in intimate relationships and sexual harassment

### Subtle measure of aggression in intimate relationships:

Bitte beantworten Sie die folgenden Fragen.

[Please, answer the following questions.]

Wie wütend wären Sie in den folgenden Situationen?

[How angry would you be in the following situations?]

	<i>Gar nicht wütend</i> [Not at all angry]						<i>Sehr wütend</i> [Very angry]
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>
Meine Partnerin verbringt Zeit mit anderen Männern [My partner spends time with other men]							
Nicht immer zu wissen, wo sich meine Partnerin aufhält. [Not always knowing where my partner is]							
Meine Partnerin tut etwas, von dem sie weiß, dass ich es nicht möchte. [My partner does something she knows I do not like her to do]							
Meine Partnerin antwortet nicht so schnell wie ich hoffe, wenn ich ihr eine WhatsApp- Nachricht schicke. [My partner does not answer as fast as I hope when I send her a whatsapp message]							

### Wie gerne tun Sie die folgenden Dinge...?

[How much do you like to do the following things...?]

	<i>Mag ich überhaupt nicht</i> [I do not like at all]						<i>Mag ich sehr gern</i> [I like very much]
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>
Meine Partnerin über ihr Mobiltelefon kontrollieren [Control my partner through her mobile phone]							
Ihre WhatsApp-Nachrichten oder ihre Nachrichten in sozialen Netzwerken kontrollieren [Check her whatsapp messages or her social network messages]							

### Subtle measure of sexual harassment:

Bitte beantworten Sie die folgenden Fragen in Bezug auf Frauen im Allgemeinen.

[Please, answer the following questions related to women in general.]

Wie wahrscheinlich ist es, dass Sie daran denken, die folgenden Dinge zu tun?

[How likely is it that you consider doing the following things...?]

	<i>Überhaupt nicht wahrscheinlich</i> [Not likely at all]						<i>Sehr wahrscheinlich</i> [Very likely]
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sexuelle Geschichten oder Witze über Frauen erzählen, wenn Frauen anwesend sind. [Telling sexual stories or jokes about women when women are present]							
Frauen gegenüber plumpe sexuelle Bemerkungen machen [Making crude sexual remarks to women]							
Bemerkungen machen wie z.B., dass Frauen für manche Arten von Jobs nicht geeignet sind [Making remarks like suggesting that women are not suited for some kinds of jobs]							
Den Körper einer Frau mustern [Eying a woman's body]							
Irgendeine Art von Körperkontakt herstellen, wie zum Beispiel eine Frau streicheln oder berühren, um Ihr Interesse an ihr zu zeigen [Making some physical contact, such as stroking or touching a woman, to show your interest in her]							
Eine Frau weiterhin um Verabredungen bitten, obwohl sie bereits „nein“ gesagt hat [Continue asking a woman for dates even though she has said “no”?]							