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ABSTRACT

Distinctions exist in understanding helping behavior among peoples’ normative judgments about when they should help others, their stated willingness to help, and, in the final analysis, whether they actually do help others. The purpose of this experiment was to measure participants’ normative judgment and willingness to help a woman who is being assaulted by a man. Participants were asked to consider the relationship between the perpetrator and victim (married vs strangers) as well as the relationship between themselves and the victim (close friend vs strangers) before indicating their direct, indirect and non-intervention responses. The relationship between the perpetrator and the victim did influence participants’ direct, indirect and non-intervention responses on both normative judgment and willingness to help measures. When the quarreling pair were married, participants were less likely to say they should and would intervene directly or indirectly compared to a quarreling pair that were strangers. Participants were also more likely to say they should not and would not intervene when the quarreling pair were married than when they were strangers. The relationship between the participant and the victim influenced the participants’ normative and willingness
responses for both direct intervention and non-intervention; no influence was found for either normative or willingness responses on the indirect intervention scale. Participants responded that they should and would directly intervene more as well as ignore the situation less when the victim was their close friend than when the victim was a stranger. Participants' normative judgment and willingness to help responses varied by type of intervention. Participants stated that they should and would help indirectly most, followed by help directly, and were most unlikely to ignore the situation. Differences were found between participants' should and would responses. Participants responded that they should help indirectly with greater conviction than they actually would be willing to help indirectly. Participants also responded that they should not ignore the situation with greater conviction than their actual willingness to ignore the situation. Participants responded with equal conviction that they should and would help directly. Although participant gender was not a significant factor itself, an interaction showed that only males differentiated on would help directly between married vs strangers conditions. These findings may be used to increase the effectiveness of domestic violence...
intervention programs by instructing members to act as if a victim were their close friend, and emphasizing that married victims also need help.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Catherine Genovese

Catherine Genovese, a bar manager, was returning home from work at 3:15 A.M. As she walked from her car to her apartment building's front entrance, Winston Mosley approached and stabbed Kitty (as she was known). Kitty screamed and a brief struggle took place. Mosley fled and drove away when a neighbor yelled at him from a window to "Leave that girl alone" (Rosenthal, 1964, p. 68). Kitty was seriously wounded and struggled to the back entrance of the apartment building. Later it was estimated that about 20 minutes had passed before Mosley returned and followed her trail of blood to her new location. There he proceeded to rob, rape, and fatally stab her. One neighbor then called the police and two minutes later the police and an ambulance arrived. Kitty died en route to the hospital. While the crime itself was heinous, the fact that not one person came to Kitty's aid during the critical time between the initial attack and Mosley's second and fatal attack on Kitty, was found to be most disturbing to many Americans.
The newspaper headlines were necessarily sensationalized:

37 who saw murder didn’t call police. Apathy at stabbing of Queens woman shocks inspector. For more than half an hour thirty-eight respectable, law-abiding citizens in Queens watched a killer stalk and stab a woman in three separate attacks in Kew Gardens.

These were the headlines written by Martin Gansberg and published on March 27, 1964 in the New York Times that described the events surrounding the murder of Catherine Genovese (Gansberg, 1964, p. A1). The following investigation revealed that 38 people did hear or see part of the attack and did not intervene. Only one bystander of the 38 intervened indirectly and telephoned the police. One couple actually pulled up two chairs to a window and watched part of the attack. Intriguingly, most of the witnesses appeared to be concerned neighbors who said they would have called the police had they known someone was being attacked. Several bystanders stated that they didn’t help because they thought it was "a lover’s quarrel" (Rosenthal, 1964, p. 39). There was a clear dichotomy between people’s judgment that they should intervene and the reality that only one witness actually
did intervene indirectly by calling the police. The facts of the case were more complex as no one person had a view of the two locations where the attacks had occurred, the windows to the facing apartments were closed as it was cold that evening, and a nearby bar was often the source of loud commotion into the early hours of the morning. Nonetheless, the public was outraged and the bystander effect (Darley & Latané, 1968), as it was later termed, became a hot topic of study.

In the spirit of that initial vigorous research and the ongoing push to study helping behavior, this study examines questions regarding factors that may affect judgments regarding helping behavior in emergency situations. Specifically this study will assess participants' reported likelihood of whether they would intervene in a scenario depicting male on female violence and participants' normative judgment rating of whether or not they should intervene in the same scenarios. The likelihood and normative judgments are examined in a context in which the quarreling parties are married versus strangers as well as when the victim is a friend of versus a stranger to the participant.
Background on Domestic Violence

Violence against women is not a new phenomenon. Whereas public incidents such as the Catherine Genovese case receive most of the headlines, the sad fact is that much of the violence against women is committed in the home by a husband, boyfriend or acquaintance. Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) surveyed 2669 women victims of rape or physical assault and found that 76%, an overwhelming majority, were victimized by an intimate partner (current or former husband, cohabitating partner, or date). Many fewer women reported victimization by a stranger (14.1%). Domestic violence occurs in varying degrees in most societies. The pervasiveness is alarming. Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) also found that about 1 in 5 (22%) U.S. women and about 1 in 15 (7.4%) U.S. men have experienced physical assault by an intimate partner. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (1994) reports that each year 28% of all violence against women is perpetrated by intimates and only 4% of all violence against men is perpetrated by intimates. In 1993, approximately 575,000 men were arrested for committing violence against women compared to approximately 49,000 women arrested for committing violence against men (American Psychological Association [APA], 1996).
The recidivism rate of domestic violence perpetrators is high and demonstrates that battering tends to be a pattern of violence rather than a one-time occurrence. According to the American Medical Association (AMA) (1994), nearly half of the men that beat their wives do so three or more times a year. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (1986) found that 32% of battered women are victimized again within six months of a domestic violence episode. This battering behavior is resistant to change. The APA (1996) reported that short term batterer intervention programs have helped some batters reduce the immediate tendency towards violence but that these same programs are inadequate at stopping long-term abuse. Frighteningly, in some cases batterers applied more sophisticated forms of psychological abuse and intimidation after attending a batterer intervention program (APA, 1996).

Intimate abusers often show a tendency to escalate violence toward their wife, fiancé, girlfriend or acquaintance. The culmination of this escalating domestic violence may result in domestic homicide. In Florida, for instance, 88% of the domestic homicide victims were previously physically abused (Governor's task force, 1997). Half of these victims had previously received
threats by the killer to kill the victim or himself. In 30% of the cases, the police had been called to the residence while 17% of the victims had a protection order against their assailant.

Predictably, the majority of the victims in domestic homicide cases are women. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (1994) reported that 70% of intimate-partner homicide victims are women. While women are the perpetrators in 19% of domestic homicide cases, these women are typically the victims of an assault during which they may kill their abuser with the abuser’s own weapon (Browne, 1987). The propensity of violence toward women by their intimates is intensified by the dilemma of bystanders’ unwillingness to intervene in domestic violence incidents.

Literature Review

Helping Behavior and the Relationship Between Perpetrator and Victim

Why do people, as part of a group of witnesses, not help others in clear need of help? Perhaps the strongest evidence found thus far regarding helping behavior is in regards to situational factors that inhibit people from helping others. Darley and Latané (1968) found that people do not help others because of “diffusion of responsibility” (p.301) and “evaluation apprehension”
Diffusion of responsibility occurs because as the number of bystanders present in an emergency situation increases, the greater the belief among each person that someone else will intervene so that he or she personally does not have to intervene. Additional bystanders allow each person to feel less responsibility for helping as well as less guilt or shame for not helping.

Also, bystanders do not intervene in emergency situations due to evaluation apprehension defined as the fear of being embarrassed or ridiculed, by other witnesses if the "emergency" turns out to be the result of a misinterpretation of a benign situation. This fear of ridicule may be due in part to the near universal sanctity and respect for privacy of the home and family unit. Additional potential costs for helping may include time, injury, legal claims against Samaritans, or even death. Furthermore, while social influence and situational factors have a strong impact on an individual's helping decisions, most people are not aware or do not acknowledge the presence of manipulated factors as a reason for their decision to not intervene in an emergency situation (Darley & Latané, 1968).

An emergency situation itself has unique qualities that contribute to a bystander's apprehension to
intervene. First, the life of the victim and the helper are potentially threatened. There are few positive rewards and considerable consequences in an emergency. Second, an emergency is an unusual event so most often people’s reactions are untrained and unrehearsed. Emergencies come without warning so bystanders do not have the benefits of practiced responses to the emergency (Pantin & Carver, 1982). Emergencies also put considerable stress on a bystander because they require immediate action.

People professionally trained and experienced on how to respond to emergencies appear to be less influenced by bystander effect. Cramer, McMaster, Bartell, and Dragna (1988) found that registered nurses responded to an emergency at the same rate whether alone (78.6%) or when in the presence of others (71.7%) whereas untrained participants showed expected bystander effects by responding much less while in the presence of another bystander (35.7%) than when alone (71.4%). The results suggest that confidence in one’s abilities, and about what steps to take to help, minimize the bystander effect.

Bystanders’ perceptions of ambiguous emergency situations also inhibit likelihood of intervention. Shotland and Straw (1976) found that bystanders are more likely to perceive a quarreling couple as dates, lovers,
or married couples rather than strangers, acquaintances, or friends. The uncertainty of the relationship (married, engaged, dating, acquaintances, or strangers) of the observed pair by the bystander adds to the ambiguity of the situation. Shotland and Straw (1976) found that bystanders are less willing to intervene when the quarreling parties are married (19%) versus when the parties are strangers (65%). When bystanders were later asked why they did not intervene in the married couple condition, several reasons were offered including that bystanders weren’t certain that their help was wanted and that the man was not really hurting the woman. The degree of relatedness of the quarreling pair matters in terms of bystanders’ willingness to help. Assumed stranger abuse promotes greater intervention than assumed spousal abuse, possibly because of the sanctity of the home in Western culture.

This western norm of the sanctity and privacy of the home appears strong enough to influence public policy. Police attitudes and responses to domestic disturbance calls mirrors the apathy displayed by participants in experiments on bystander intervention. Until recently, most police departments did not want to intervene in domestic violence disputes because of the attitude that it
was a private matter or a victimless crime (Browne, 1987). The current trend appears to encourage police to make mandatory arrests instead of offering advice or physical separation of the perpetrator. This shift in direct police intervention has lead to increases in assaults on police officers that may result in injury or sometimes death. In 2001, 10 police officers were murdered across the United States while answering domestic disturbance calls and underscores the reality that domestic disturbance responses are one of the most potentially dangerous situations for police officers (FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 2002).

Bystanders' assumptions as to the relationship of perpetrator and victim also have consequences in perceived costs for helping. When the emergency situation involves a quarreling man and woman, bystanders expect that if the male perpetrator is a stranger to the women then he will run away when confronted. However, if the man is intimate with the woman as in domestic violence disputes then the man will stay and fight (Shotland & Straw, 1976). All of these perceptions of bystanders upon viewing a quarreling man and women increase the potential costs for helping and act to decrease helping behavior among bystanders especially when the situation involves related persons.
Therefore, the first expected outcome is that participants will rate willingness to help responses ("would help") and normative responses ("should help") lower when the quarreling pair is married than the same condition where the quarreling pair are strangers.

Helping Behavior and the Relationship Between the Observer and Victim

Why do people help others? It appears that people help other people for a multitude of reasons. Two leading theories that offer explanations for helping behavior are social-exchange theory and social norms theory.

Social-exchange theory argues that interactions between individuals are subconsciously aimed at maximizing rewards and minimizing costs (Foa & Foa, 1975; Piliavin, 2003). Rewards can be external such as when seeking appreciation, friendship or image enhancement or internal when helping others serve to enhance one’s mood. The potential costs for helping are time, discomfort, personal injury, or in extreme cases death. Piliavin (2003) found that when youths volunteered for community service projects they were at less risk for delinquency, pregnancy or school dropout. Those that help others also benefit.

Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, and Clark (1981) extended social-exchange theory and created the arousal:
cost-reward model. According to this egoistic model, another person's distress causes physiological arousal in an observer which then initiates the process of deciding whether to help. Specifically, because people find prolonged physiological arousal aversive, they try to find ways to reduce it. The decision as to what course of arousal reduction to pursue involves weighing the perceived costs to the potential helper for helping (e.g., time, money, effort) and of not helping (e.g., guilt, criticism) and then choosing the response that incurs the smallest net cost. Thus an observer is most likely to offer assistance when the personal costs of helping are low, and the costs of not helping are high. Providing rewards also increases the probability of helping (Piliavin et al., 1981). A second prediction is that participants will respond higher on both willingness to help responses ("would help") and normative responses ("should help") by indirect intervention than by direct intervention.

Social norms also offer explanations for helping behavior via reciprocity and social responsibility. The reciprocity norm is a universal moral code that contends we should help, not hurt, those that help us (Gouldner, 1960). Politicians, for example, make use of this external
reward principle when they appropriate funds to a program because they expect support at a later date from the benefactors of the funding.

The reciprocity norm is strongest perhaps when combined with emotional closeness. Korchmaros and Kenny (2001) found that emotional closeness was a significant proximal influence on altruism. They found that emotional closeness influenced the total effect of genetic relatedness on willingness to act altruistically by about 33%. People were more willing to help kin that they were emotionally closer to than other kin who shared the same amount of genes. They further argued that perhaps emotional closeness is a better predictor of altruism as well as better explained by reciprocity as a social norm than as inclusive fitness. A third prediction is that Participants will respond higher on both the willingness to help responses ("would help") and normative responses ("should help") when the victim is a close friend of the participant than when they are strangers since friends share emotional closeness.

The social responsibility norm is the belief that people should help those who need help, regardless of future exchanges (Berkowitz, 1972). This intrinsically motivated belief is stronger among collectivist societies
than in individualistic oriented ones (Baron & Miller, 2000). Skitka and Tetlock (1993) found that people offer help to those in need mainly when the need is not due to the target's own negligence. Who among us can forget the world trade tower attacks on September 11, 2001, as well as the helping frenzy that followed? People across the nation flooded blood banks to donate blood. Clearly the volunteers determined that those in need were not culpable for their situation. People help most when they attribute need to an uncontrollable predicament.

Both the social-exchange theory and social responsibility theories form the basis for a fourth predicted outcome of this study. According to social norm theory people should help a person in need. However, this willingness to offer help is moderated by the potential costs for helping including time, discomfort, injury, lawsuits, or even death. The scenario created clearly demonstrates a person in need of assistance from an attacker so most participants are predicted to rate high on questions regarding that they should help the victim. However, actually helping involves risk of discomfort or injury so participants' ratings for questions regarding whether they would intervene are predicted to reflect these potential cost factor considerations especially in
the direct intervention questions and therefore will be lower than the same participant’s “should” intervene ratings. The fourth prediction is that participants will respond higher on the normative responses (“should help”) than on the willingness to help responses (“would help”). In general, the likelihood of intervening, across all conditions, should be lower than the normative judgment to intervene.

Gender and Helping Behavior

While the findings on when people help others appears quite robust, the evidence is less clear with regards to which individuals are likely to help others. Previous attempts by researchers to find an “altruistic personality” have focused on specific helping acts and have been inconclusive. Staub (1978) argues that certain individuals do possess a disposition to engage in prosocial action while Oliner and Oliner (1988) were unable to find any discernable altruistic personality traits.

The current evidence suggests that helping behavior can better be observed over extended periods of time. An individual with a helping personality disposition will manifest helping behavior, in varying degrees, over a lifetime. One poignant example of helping behavior is that
of Mother Teresa’s epic struggle to improve the living conditions and ease the suffering of impoverished people in India.

This new approach to observing helping behavior has lead to three findings. Some people are reliably more helpful than others and these individual differences in helpfulness are noticed by one’s peers (Penner, 2002). Second, a network of traits that predispose a person to helpfulness include high positive emotionality, empathy and self-efficacy (Krueger, Hicks, & McGue, 2001). Third, high self-monitors tend to be helpful in particular situations where helpfulness will be socially rewarded (White & Gerstein, 1987).

Gender is perhaps the most robust aspect of personality that predicts the type of help that an individual will offer in certain situations. Men help more often than women when the situation is potentially dangerous (Eagly & Crowley, 1986). This trend is demonstrated where 90% of the recipients of the Carnegie medal for heroism in saving human life have been men (Eagly & Crowley, 1986). Men help women more often than they help other men while women tend to offer help equally to both men and women (Penner, Dertke, & Achenbach 1973; Pomozal & Clore, 1973; West, Whitney, & Schnedler, 1975).
Also, men tend to help attractive women more often than unattractive women (Mims, Hartnett, & Nay, 1975). Women help slightly more often in safer situations such as volunteering. Also, women do spend more time and respond with greater empathy to a friend’s problems (George, Carroll, & Calderon, 1998).

It appears that men and women help at about the same rate. When the emergency situation is potentially dangerous, men help much more often than do women since direct intervention is more dangerous than calling the police. However, Borofsky, Stollack, and Messe (1971) found when the emergency situation specifically involves a male perpetrator and a female victim, males helped less often than did women whereas for all other combinations of perpetrator and victim, men helped more often than did women. However, this study is dated and the sample size was small. Based on gender differences across different types of helping behaviors, a fifth prediction is that women participants will choose indirect intervention more than men by stating that they would call the police more often whereas men should choose direct intervention more than women.
Summary

The knowledge gained by experiments measuring situational factors that effect helping behavior, such as the presence of others, is incorporated into this study. While the effects of multiple bystanders on an individual’s likeliness to intervene are not the focus of this study, they have been considered and manipulated in order to control for bystander effects. The scenarios created attempt to maximize helping behavior of the participant by creating an unambiguous emergency situation with no other bystanders around to diffuse responsibility and guilt. By controlling bystander effects to maximize intervention by limiting the bystanders to the participant only, the results of this study should, in theory, represent best-case conditions to measure participants’ willingness to help (“would help”) as well as normative judgments (“should help”) responses.

Hypotheses

As the literature demonstrates, much has been learned about helping behavior since that fateful night in 1963. This study seeks to extend knowledge regarding the discrepancies between an individual bystander’s normative judgments (“should”) and verbal willingness to help
(“would”) responses. There are five predictions:
1) participants will rate willingness to help responses (“would help”) and normative judgment responses (“should help”) lower when the quarreling pair are married than the same condition where the quarreling pair are strangers
2) participants will respond higher on both willingness to help responses (“would help”) and normative judgment responses (“should help”) by indirect intervention than by direct intervention 3) Participants will respond higher on both the willingness to help responses (“would help”) and normative judgment responses (“should help”) when the victim is a close friend of the participant than when they are strangers since friends share emotional closeness
4) participants will respond higher on the normative judgment responses (“should help”) than on the willingness to help responses (“would help”) and 5) women participants will choose indirect intervention more than men by stating that they would call the police more often whereas men will choose direct intervention more than women.
CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants were adults in the San Bernardino area with a mean age of 26.85 years (SD = 10.10 years). More women participated at 200 (80.3%) than did males at 49 (19.7%) for a total of 249 participants. The average education level of the participants was completion of high school and the average annual household income was $40,000. Most of the participants, 207 (82.8%), were students at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) while 25 (10.0%) participants were college students elsewhere and 18 (7.2%) of the participants were not students. Most of the participants were single at 144 (57.6%), 66 were married (26.4%), 27 were cohabitating (10.8%), 9 were divorced (3.6%), 2 were separated (.8%), and 1 participant was widowed (.4%). The ethnic background of the participants included 117 Caucasians (46.8%), 80 Latinos (32.0%), 31 African-Americans (12.4%), 13 Native Americans (5.2%), 5 Asians (2.0 %), and 3 Middle Easterners (1.2%).

Participants were solicited to participate in this experiment, conducted via an online survey, from
undergraduate psychology courses as well as from a participation board in the psychology building. Incentives in the form of extra credit were offered to CSUSB students for participation in this study. All participants were treated in accordance with the "Ethical principles of Psychologists and code of conduct" (APA, 2002).

Materials

The materials used in this experiment consisted of an informed consent sheet, a demographic sheet, brief instructions, a survey, a debriefing sheet, and a computer with Internet access to http://www.dopox.com. The demographic sheet requested participant's gender, age, ethnicity, highest education level completed, relationship status, years in current relationship, annual household income, and student status. The survey included a scenario depicting a man and women arguing. The scenario read: "Suppose you are walking in a local park. There are no other people around and you happen to have a cell phone on you. You notice a man shouting and making threatening statements at a woman. Then you see him begin to hit her." For one condition the stimulus persons were described as either married or strangers. Participants were given two more factors to consider before selecting their responses.
In one condition the woman was a friend of the participant while in the other condition the woman was a stranger to the participant.

Following each scenario were a series of questions that were designed to measure normative judgments ("should intervene"), willingness to intervene ("would intervene"), and type of intervention including direct intervention, indirect intervention, and non-intervention. Normative judgment questions asked participants whether they should try to stop the violence, call the police, or ignore the situation. Willingness to intervene questions asked participants whether they would try to stop the violence (direct intervention), call the police (indirect intervention), or ignore the situation (non-intervention). Participants responded on a Likert type scale where 1 means definitely should (or would) not and 6 means definitely should (or would).

The scenarios were counter-balanced to avoid possible sequencing effects. There were four combinations of surveys. Packet one was ordered as follows: stimulus persons were married: victim and participant were friends; victim and participant were strangers. Stimulus persons were strangers: victim and participant were friends; victim and participant were strangers. Packet two varied
the order as such: Stimulus persons were married: victim was stranger to participant; victim was friend of participant. Stimulus persons were strangers: victim was stranger to participant; victim was friend of participant. Packet three order included: Stimulus persons were strangers: victim and participant were friends; victim and participant were strangers. Stimulus persons were married: victim and participant were friends; victim and participant were strangers. Packet four was ordered as follows: Stimulus persons were strangers: victim was stranger to participant; victim was friend of participant. Stimulus persons were married: victim was stranger to participant; victim was friend of participant. The dopox program randomly assigned one of the four surveys each time a participant logged onto the survey. Also, within each survey, the order of should and would questions was randomized per screen.

Procedure

Each participant logged on to http://www.dopox.xom and selected the experiment titled, "Judgments about intervention in violent situations." Next, participants read the informed consent and selected the consent option before continuing with the survey. Participants then read
brief instructions and completed one version of the survey individually. Each of the four screens of the survey proper included the scenario followed by specific conditions for consideration and then the six questions. Participants could only advance through the experiment and did not have access to previous screens. The screen following the last survey screen asked for demographic information followed by a screen with a participation confirmation form that students may printout for extra credit. The final screen included the debriefing statement with contact information should the participant desire further information regarding the study. There was no time limit for completion of the survey. The estimated time for completion of the survey was approximately 15 minutes.

Design and Statistical Analysis

The design of this study was a 2 X 2 X 2 factorial mixed repeated measures design. Two within-subject independent variables were relationship of stimulus persons (intimate couple vs strangers) and relationship of victim to the participant (friend vs stranger). Gender of the participant was a between-subjects independent variable. The dependent variables measured direct, indirect, and non-intervention for both participants'
normative judgment ("should help") and participants' willingness to help ("would help"). A repeated-measures ANOVA was used on SPSS software to analyze the data.
CHAPTER THREE
RESULTS

Mixed design ANOVAs were run on SPSS to analyze the data.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 stated that participants would rate normative judgment responses ("should help") and willingness to help responses ("would help") higher when the quarreling pair were described as strangers than when the quarreling pair were described as married.

Quarreling Pair Relationship

Normative Judgments - Should. There was a significant main effect for normative direct help as a function of whether the quarreling pair were married or strangers, $F(1, 241) = 4.83, p < .05$. Participants responded with greater conviction that they should help directly when the quarreling pair were strangers than when the quarreling pair were married (see Table 1).

The effect of the relationship between the perpetrator and victim was modified by a significant interaction in participants' normative judgment direct intervention scores between the relationship of the quarreling pair and the gender of the participant,
\( F(1, 241) = 14.07, p < .001 \). Men responded with greater conviction that they should help directly when the quarreling pair were strangers (\( M = 4.97 \)) than when the quarreling pair were married (\( M = 4.45 \)), \( t(47) = -3.43, p < .01 \). In contrast, women did not differ in the strength of their conviction that they should help directly when the quarreling pair were married (\( M = 3.33 \)) than when the quarreling pair were strangers (\( M = 3.20 \)), \( t(194) = 1.73, p > .05 \).

There was a significant main effect for normative indirect intervention scores as a function of whether the quarreling pair were married or strangers, \( F(1, 241) = 13.28, p < .001 \). Participants responded with greater conviction that they should help indirectly when the quarreling pair were strangers than when the quarreling pair were married (see Table 1).

There was also a significant main effect for normative non-intervention scores as a function of whether the quarreling pair were married or strangers, \( F(1, 241) = 8.42, p < .01 \). Participants stated with greater conviction that they should ignore the situation when the quarreling pair were married than when they were strangers (see Table 1). No interactions were significant for indirect and non-intervention scores.
Effect sizes also varied among the three types of intervention. The most robust effect size was for the indirect intervention condition followed by nonintervention. The smallest effect size was in the direct intervention condition (see Table 1).

Table 1. Normative Judgment Responses as a Function of the Relationship Between Quarreling Pair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Type</th>
<th>Quarreling pair’s relationship</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Strangers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non intervention</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Willingness to Help - Would. There was a significant main effect for willingness to help directly as a function of whether the quarreling pair were married or strangers, $F(1, 241) = 10.44, p < .01$. Participants responded with greater conviction that they would help directly when the quarreling pair were strangers than when the quarreling pair were married (see Table 2).
The effect of relationship of the quarreling pair on direct help was qualified by an interaction between gender of the participant and the relationship of the quarreling pair, \( F(1, 241) = 4.89, p < .05 \). Men responded with greater conviction that they would help directly when the quarreling pair were strangers \((M = 5.03)\) than when the quarreling pair were married \((M = 4.59)\), \( t(47) = -3.52, p < .01 \). Again, women did not differ in the strength of their conviction that they would help directly when the quarreling pair were strangers \((M = 3.43)\) than when the quarreling pair were married \((M = 3.35)\), \( t(194) = -1.11, p > .05 \).

There was a significant main effect for willingness to help indirect intervention scores as a function of whether the quarreling pair were married or strangers, \( F(1, 241) = 36.08, p < .001 \). Participants responded with greater conviction that they would help indirectly when the quarreling pair were strangers than when the quarreling pair were married.

There was a significant main effect for willingness to ignore the situation scores as a function of whether the quarreling pair were married or strangers, \( F(1, 241) = 7.26, p < .01 \). Participants stated with greater conviction that they would not ignore the
situation when the quarreling pair were strangers than when the quarreling pair were married (see Table 2). The effect sizes for willing to help showed a similar pattern as participant’s normative scores. The indirect condition was also the most robust effect size. The direct intervention response followed with a moderate effect size followed by non-intervention with a small effect size (see Table 2).

Table 2. Willingness to Help Responses as a Function of the Relationship Between Quarreling Pair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quarreling persons’ relationship</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Strangers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Type</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-intervention</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 stated that participants would respond higher on both the willingness to help responses ("would help") and normative judgment responses ("should help")
when the victim is a close friend of the participant than when they are strangers.

**Participant-Victim Relationship**

**Normative Judgments - Should.** There was a significant main effect for normative direct intervention as a function of whether the participant was a close friend or a stranger to the victim, $F(1, 241) = 50.06, p < .001$. Participants responded with greater conviction that they should directly help when the victim was described as a close friend of the participant than when the victim was a stranger to the participant (see Table 3).

There was no significant main effect for normative indirect intervention as a function of whether the participant was a close friend or a stranger to the victim, $F(1, 241) = .34, p > .05$.

There was a significant main effect for normative non-intervention scores as a function of whether the participant was a close friend or a stranger to the victim, $F(1, 241) = 6.32, p < .05$. Participants stated with greater conviction that they should not ignore the situation when the victim was a close friend of the participant than when the victim was a stranger to the participant (see Table 3). The effect size for direct
intervention was much larger than that for non-intervention.

Table 3. Normative Judgment Responses as a Function of the Relationship Between Observer and Victim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Type</th>
<th>Observer - Victim Relationship</th>
<th>Close Friends</th>
<th>Strangers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non intervention</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. ***p < .001.

Willingness to Help - Would. There was a significant main effect for willingness to help direct intervention scores as a function of whether the participant was a close friend or a stranger to the victim, $F(1, 241) = 101.09$, $p < .001$. Participants responded with greater conviction that they would help directly when the victim was a close friend of the participant than when the victim and participant were strangers (see Table 4).

The effect of relationship of the victim to the observer was qualified by a significant interaction between participants' willingness to help directly as a
function of gender of the observer $F(1, 241) = 7.05$, $p < .05$. Men responded with greater conviction that they would help directly when the victim was their close friend ($M = 5.27$) than when the victim was a stranger to them the observer ($M = 4.35$), $t(47) = 5.01$, $p < .001$. Women also responded in the same direction but with a greater difference. Women responded with greater conviction that they would help directly when the victim is their close friend ($M = 4.17$) and were unlikely to help directly when the victim was a stranger to them the observer ($M = 2.60$), $t(194) = 13.78$, $p < .001$.

There was no significant main effect for willingness to help indirect intervention scores as a function of whether the participant was a close friend or a stranger to the victim, $F(1, 241) = .43$, $p > .05$ (see Table 4).

There was a significant main effect for willingness to ignore the situation scores as a function of whether the participant was a close friend or a stranger to the victim, $F(1, 241) = 23.90$, $p < .001$. Participants responded with greater conviction that they would not ignore the situation when the victim was a close friend of the observer than when the victim and observer were strangers (see Table 4). The effect size for willingness to help directly as a function of whether the participant
was a close friend or a stranger to the victim was much greater than the effect size for willingness to ignore the situation for the same condition and this was the largest effect size in general (see Table 4).

Table 4. Willingness to Help Responses as a Function of the Relationship Between Observer and Victim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer - Victim Relationship</th>
<th>Close friends</th>
<th>Strangers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non intervention</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .001.

Relationship of Perpetrator and Victim X Relationship of Observer and Victim

The effect of relationship between the victim and the observer was qualified by a significant interaction in participants’ normative judgment indirect intervention score as a function of whether the quarreling pair were married or were strangers, $F(1, 241) = 3.96, p < .05$. When the quarreling pair were married, participants responded with greater conviction that they should help indirectly when the victim was a stranger ($M = 5.46$) than when the
victim was a close friend \((M = 5.31)\), \(t(245) = -2.23, p < .05\). When the quarreling pair were strangers, participants responded with equal conviction that they should help indirectly regardless of whether the participant was a close friend of \((M = 5.68)\) or stranger to \((M = 5.61)\) the victim, \(t(247) = 1.43, p > .05\) (see Figure 1).

The effect of relationship of the victim to the observer was also qualified by a significant interaction in participants' willingness to help directly as a function of whether the quarreling pair were married or were strangers, \(F(1, 241) = 5.65, p < .05\). When the quarreling couple was married, participants responded with greater conviction that they would help directly when the victim was their close friend \((M = 4.40)\) than when the victim was a stranger \((M = 2.79)\), \(t(246) = 13.78, p < .001\). This difference was greater than when the quarreling pair were strangers. When the quarreling pair were strangers, participants responded with greater conviction that they would help directly when the victim was a close friend \((M = 4.40)\) than when the victim was a stranger \((M = 3.09)\), \(t(246) = 11.40, p < .001\) (see Figure 2).
Figure 1. Relationship of Perpetrator and Victim X Relationship of Observer and Victim Interaction for Normative Indirect Intervention
Figure 2. Relationship of Perpetrator and Victim X Relationship of Observer and Victim Interaction for Willingness to Directly Intervene

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that participants would give higher willingness to help responses ("would help") and normative judgment responses ("should help") by indirect intervention than by direct intervention.
There were significant mean differences in participants' normative responses to help indirectly, directly, and not at all. Participants responded with greater conviction that they should help indirectly than directly, $t(241) = -17.41, p < .001$. Participants also responded with greater conviction that they should help directly than ignore the situation, $t(240) = 19.81, p < .001$, and that they should help indirectly than ignore the situation, $t(239) = 45.84, p < .001$ (see Table 5).

There were significant mean differences in participants' willingness to help indirectly, directly, and not at all. Participants responded with greater conviction that they would help indirectly than directly, $t(241) = -16.93, p < .001$.

Participants responded with greater conviction that they would help directly than ignore the situation, $t(238) = 20.38, p < .001$. Participants also responded with greater conviction that they would help indirectly than ignore the situation, $t(238) = 42.33, p < .001$ (see Table 5).
Table 5. Normative Judgments and Willingness to Help

Responses as a Function of Type of Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct-</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>-17.41*</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>-16.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>19.81*</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>20.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonintervention</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect-</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>45.84*</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>42.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonintervention</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .001.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 stated that participants would respond higher on the normative judgment responses ("should help") than on the willingness to help responses ("would help").

There was not a significant difference in participants' direct intervention score between normative judgments and willingness to intervene conditions $F(1, 241) = 2.64, p > .05$. However, there was a significant mean difference in participants' indirect intervention score between normative judgments and willingness to intervene conditions $F(1, 241) = 5.63, p < .05$. Participants responded with greater conviction that they should help indirectly than would help indirectly (see Table 6).
There was also a significant main effect in participants non-intervention responses between normative judgments and willingness to intervene conditions, \( F(1, 241) = 7.54, p < .01 \). Participants responded with greater conviction that they should not ignore the situation than they would not ignore the situation. The effect sizes for should and would responses for indirect intervention and non-intervention were very close (see Table 6).

Table 6. Normative Judgments versus Willingness to Help Responses Among Direct, Indirect Intervention, and Non-intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Should Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Would Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>Eta^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>5.63*</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-intervention</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>7.54**</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *\( p < .05 \). **\( p < .01 \).

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 stated that women participants would choose indirect intervention more than men by stating that...
they would call the police more often whereas men would choose direct intervention more than women.

There was not a significant mean difference in participants' willingness to help directly as a function of gender, $F(1, 241) = .01$, $p > .05$. There was also no significant mean difference in participants' willingness to help indirectly as a function of gender, $F(1, 241) = .07; p > .05$, and no significant mean difference in participants' willingness to ignore the situation as a function of gender, $F(1, 234) = .14$, $p > .05$. 
The purpose of this experiment was to measure participants' normative judgment and willingness to help using direct, indirect and non-intervention responses regarding a fictitious scenario where a man began assaulting a woman. The prediction that the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim would influence participants' responses was supported by the findings.

The relationship between the perpetrator and the victim did influence participants' direct, indirect and non-intervention responses on both normative judgment and willingness to help measures. When the quarreling pair were married, participants were less likely to say they would help directly or indirectly compared to a quarreling pair that were strangers. Participants were also more likely to say they would not and should not intervene when the quarreling pair were married than when they were strangers. This pattern was consistent on both should and would responses.

The relationship of the quarreling pair matters in terms of actual observer intervention. Shotland and Straw (1976) found a similar pattern where bystanders were less
willing to intervene when the quarreling pair were married (19%) versus when the quarreling pair were strangers (65%). Even the perception of intimacy between the perpetrator and victim influences people to intervene less. Rosenthal (1964) reported that several observers in the Genovese murder stated that they didn’t intervene because they thought it might be “a lover’s quarrel” (p.38).

The sanctity of family and individual privacy in Western society may partially explain the observed phenomena. This belief in privacy is reflected in the political, religious and philosophical history of Western civilization. The Bill of Rights in the U.S. Constitution provides for many individual rights including privacy. Several Western religions emphasize, “Honor thy mother and father” and “Thou shall not covet thy neighbor’s wife,” both of which reflect the sanctity of the family.

Perhaps another factor influencing observer intervention is the near universal political organization of the patriarchal society. In some extreme examples, some cultures, in India, Pakistan and Egypt among others, actually believe that the patriarch owns his wife and children as property (Baron, 2006). The most ominous implication of this societal norm is that the patriarch
can justify the torture and killing of his wife for a variety of offenses, especially for dishonoring the family (Baron, 2006). While the 20th century has been coined the century of the woman due to the rights gained for women, there still exists inequality between genders. Perhaps the difference seen in intervention responses partly reflects the outdated belief that men can still be abusive to their wives and children.

Most likely a combination of the sanctity of the home, patriarchal views, and the added perceived costs of intervening when a quarreling pair are married best explains the findings that women being attacked by a perceived intimate partner would or should get less help than a woman attacked by a stranger. Shotland and Straw (1976) found that observers, viewing a quarreling pair whose relationship was unclear, believed that the quarreling pair were more likely to be intimately involved than strangers. Observers also believe that a married man will stand and fight when an observer intervenes whereas a stranger will run away (Shotland & Straw, 1976). People may also believe, falsely, that a man intimate with his victim will not hurt her since most men do not abuse their intimate partners. Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) found the opposite to be true where women are much more likely to be
abused by an intimate partner than by a stranger. The dangers of intervening in a domestic dispute are real because the assaulter can turn on the helper. A total of 10 police officers were killed while answering domestic violence calls in 2002 alone (FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 2002).

An interesting interaction occurred between the relationship of the quarreling pair and the gender of the participant. Men appear to be more influenced than women in both their normative judgment and willingness to help directly decision based on the relationship of the quarreling pair. Men were more likely to say they should and would help directly when the perpetrator and victim were strangers than a married couple, whereas women did not differ in their responses based on the relationship between perpetrator and victim. One explanation for the difference between genders can be in the costs of their decisions. Women responded with less conviction than men that they both should and would help directly so the saliency of actual costs may not influence their decision regardless of perpetrator-victim relationship. Men, however, reported that they both most likely should and would help directly more when the perpetrator and victim were strangers than when the perpetrator and victim were
married. Men’s greater conviction to help directly compared to women’s may increase the cost saliency enough to where men do consider the relationship of the quarreling pair. Men’s greater likelihood of directly intervening when the perpetrator and victim are strangers may reflect their perceived reduced cost if the perpetrator runs away once confronted. No interactions between gender and relationship of perpetrator and victim were found for indirect intervention or non-intervention on either should or would scales. Therefore, it appears that several factors may influence an observer’s normative judgments and willingness to intervene whether the quarreling pair were married or strangers.

The prediction that the relationship between the participant and the victim would influence participants’ responses was partially supported by the findings. Participants responded that they should help directly more as well as ignore the situation less when the victim was their close friend than when the victim was a stranger. It appears that the emotional closeness that close friends share influenced the participants’ decision to intervene. Korchmaros and Kenny (2001) also found emotional closeness to be a robust predictor of which family member gets helped first. They concluded that it is emotional
closeness above genetic relatedness that most influenced a
person's decision to help in an emergency situation.

In contrast to normative judgments of direct help, participants did not vary in their normative judgment indirect response between victims that were their close friends versus victims that were strangers to them. Participants responded that they should most likely indirectly help both a close friend and a stranger equally. Perhaps the less time and effort involved as well as the reduced potential costs for indirectly helping gave participants few excuses why they shouldn't help a stranger as much as a close friend.

Participants were also influenced by their relationship to the victim on their willingness to help directly as well as their willingness to ignore the situation responses. Participants' willingness to intervene responses closely mirrored their normative responses. When the victim was a close friend of the participant, participants responded that they would probably or most likely directly help more than when the victim was a stranger.

The difference in participants' willingness to help directly between whether the victim was a close friend versus a stranger to them was the strongest effect size
found among all conditions. Participants were willing to risk more and would help directly when the victim was a close friend versus when the victim was a stranger to them. Participants would also be less likely to ignore the situation when the victim was a close friend than when the victim was a stranger. According to the arousal-reward model (Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, & Clark, 1981) the emotional closeness between the victim and participant would produce a greater state of arousal than would strangers and would motivate the participant to take immediate and direct action to reduce their arousal state.

An interaction between the relationship of the victim to the participant and gender of the participant further emphasizes the considerable influence of emotional closeness on participants' intervention decisions. Both men and women responded that they would help directly more when the victim was a close friend rather than a stranger to them. However, women were much less willing to help directly than were men when the victim was a stranger to them. Women's considerably lower scores than men's scores probably accounted for this interaction. The reduced arousal produced and greater cost perceived inhibits people from directly intervening when the victim is a stranger to them. This combination may have been lethal
for Katherine Genovese and may partially explain why no one directly intervened that night.

Again, similar to the normative scores, participants showed no difference in their willingness to help indirectly between a victim that was a close friend to, or a stranger of, the participant. Participants stated that they would most likely help a victim indirectly regardless of whether they were a close friend of or stranger to the victim. When the costs of helping are greatly reduced, from direct to indirect intervention, people are equally willing to help both a close friend and a stranger.

Two more interactions were found that demonstrate the complex dynamics that observers face when making intervention decisions. The effect of relationship of the victim to the observer on normative indirect response was qualified by a significant interaction as a function of whether the quarreling pair were married or were strangers. When the quarreling pair were married, participants responded with greater conviction that they should help indirectly when the victim was a stranger than a close friend. When the quarreling pair were strangers, participants responded with equal conviction that they should help indirectly regardless of whether the
participant was a close friend of or stranger to the victim.

Here again the sanctity of the family, emotional closeness and cost of intervention appear to influence a participant’s normative judgment response to indirectly intervene. When the perpetrator and victim were married, participants believe that they should help indirectly more when they were strangers to the victim than when they were close friends to the victim. It appears that participants consider the privacy of family matters as more important than the emotional closeness they may feel toward the victim. Also, the cost of intervening indirectly is higher when the victim was a close friend since an observer may believe that the victim would not want them to call the police. A participant might consider the possibility that the close friend may get upset with them for involving the police. People are hesitant to intervene in a close friend’s intimate relationship as all too often the support is viewed as intrusive by one or both partners and may lead to a diminished or broken friendship. A participant would most likely care less what a stranger would think than what a friend would think of them for calling the police.
In addition to the interaction for the normative indirect response, the effect of relationship of the victim to the observer was also qualified by a significant interaction in participants' willingness to help directly as a function of whether the quarreling pair were married or were strangers. The interaction did not completely modify the main effect of the observer-victim relationship. The main effect of the observer-victim relationship remained strong over both conditions of the perpetrator-victim relationship. The interaction demonstrates that when the victim was a stranger to the observer, the effect of the perpetrator-victim relationship was similar to the main effect; less intervention when the perpetrator-victim were married than when they were strangers. When the perpetrator and victim were married, the tendency not to intervene was balanced by the closeness of the victim to the observer, resulting in no difference.

Interestingly, participants reversed their response as to which victim would receive more help between the two interactions above for indirect normative judgment versus direct willingness to help. Perhaps the participants weigh the potential costs of intervention, including violation of privacy, more than other factors such as emotional
closeness. In participants' normative indirect judgment response, a stranger to the participant should more likely get more help than when the victim was a close friend of the participant. The potential costs for calling the police for a stranger are less than for a friend. Anonymity of calling the police may be easier to maintain to a stranger than to a close friend. Conversely, participants responded that a close friend would get more direct help than would a stranger. Perhaps the participants' response reflect a choice when the costs are high as in directly intervening, then participants are more willing to take risks for a close friend versus a stranger. This interpretation should be considered cautiously as several factors could account for this interaction.

The third prediction that participants would respond with greater conviction for indirect intervention than for direct intervention was supported. Participants' normative judgment responses varied by type of intervention. Participants believed that they should help indirectly most followed by direct intervention and then non-intervention. Participants' willingness to intervene responses also varied by type of intervention and in the same pattern as normative judgment responses. Participants
responded that they would help indirectly most followed by direct intervention with willingness to ignore the situation having a low response. These patterns of intervention appear to support the arousal: cost-reward model of Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, and Clark (1981). The participants were aroused by reading the scenario depicting male on female violence. Participants were then given choices that helped to either reduce their arousal by direct or indirect intervention or not reducing their arousal by ignoring the situation (and potentially increasing arousal level through guilt for not helping). While both the indirect and direct intervention scales helped to reduce arousal, they did not have equal potential costs. Participants' cost assessment can be seen between the differences in responses between indirect and direct intervention. Participants responded highest on indirect intervention since this reduces arousal with the least risk or cost. Direct intervention also reduces arousal at greater costs and was chosen second in terms of strength of conviction. Ignoring the situation does not reduce arousal and was seldom chosen as demonstrated by the low mean.

Prediction four stated that participants would respond with greater conviction that they should intervene
than they would intervene and was partially supported. Participants’ responses were different between their normative judgments and willingness to intervene on the indirect intervention scale. Participants responded that they should help indirectly with greater conviction than they actually would be willing to help. This finding may reflect the combined influence of societal norms and cost consideration for helping by the participants. The social responsibility norm is the belief that people should help those who need help (Berkowitz, 1972). These norms are handed down through religious teachings and political ideologies. Both Christianity and Judaism emphasize helping others as part of the path to salvation or righteousness. The Good Samaritan is a timeless tale of how people ought to act toward one another. These religious teachings also form the basis of political thought. Most countries would not prosecute a citizen for injuring a victim during an attempted rescue. Even in litigious California, current statues offer protection to a citizen that acts in good faith to help someone even if the victim is injured during the attempted rescue.

The lower response for participants’ willingness to help indirectly may be due to the perceived costs of actually helping. Even though indirect intervention of
calling the police seems easy and safe, participants may have considered the time involved of a police interview, anxiety of identifying a suspect in a future police line-up, or even concern about future retaliation by the perpetrator. This interpretation should be considered with caution since the effect size was small.

Participants showed a similar pattern in their responses for non-intervention. Participants responded that they should not ignore the situation stronger than their willingness to ignore the situation. The same arguments from their indirect responses also apply here. There was however a slightly stronger effect size in this condition. Perhaps the feeling of guilt for ignoring the situation influenced participants’ response.

Interestingly, there was no difference in participant’s responses between should and would directly intervene. This finding is somewhat surprising since it would seem that the salient immediate costs of direct intervention would influence participants’ responses to be lower than their normative judgment that they should directly intervene. This finding suggests that participants differentiate less between their normative judgments and willingness to help responses when the costs are high as in direct intervention.
The final prediction that gender would influence the type of help offered was not supported by the findings. Participant gender was not a main effect factor in participants' responses to intervene directly, indirectly or ignore the situation altogether. The only significant finding regarding gender was the interaction on willingness to help directly between the relationship of the quarreling pair and gender of the participant. Only men made a distinction in their responses; for men, but not women, a married victim would receive less help than a victim who was a stranger to the perpetrator. Eagly and Crowley (1986) found that the majority of Carnegie medal recipients were male and concluded that men help much more often than do women when the emergency situation is potentially dangerous. Recent studies suggest a more complex interpretation. Becker and Eagly (2004) compared helping behavior between men and women in the extremely dangerous act of rescuing Jews during the holocaust and found single women helped more often than did single men. Also, when other acts of heroism were measured such as living organ donations or volunteering for the Peace Corps or Doctors of the World, Becker and Eagly (2004) found that women volunteer as much as or more than do men for these risky but less dangerous prosocial actions.
Regardless of gender differences in types of helping behavior found elsewhere, the current findings did not detect differences between the genders in their willingness to intervene or their normative judgments about whether they should intervene. Perhaps the lack of mundane realism in reading about a scenario versus experiencing an actual event was a factor that influenced the lack of differences found between genders.

Some limitations of the study were related to the assumptions made about how the participants would perceive the situation. One assumption was about the anonymity of the observer. It was assumed that the scenario characters would not see the observer. In this context, it was assumed that the scenario characters would not know if a call to the police was made. However, if the scenario characters had been aware of the observer, the phone call to the police would not have been anonymous. Future versions of the survey could include a statement such as, "While you can see the quarreling pair, they can not see you."

A second assumption was that the participant did not know the perpetrator in all conditions. This situation is difficult to imagine when the participant is a close friend of the victim and the victim is married to the
perpetrator. Many people know their close friend's husband. A final limitation may be reflected in the small effect sizes between should help and would help responses. Possibly, the within-subjects design gave participants the opportunity to be consistent on whether they should and whether they would help. A future version of this study could include a between-subjects design for should and would measures.

Conclusion

Domestic violence rates continue to be high and of public concern. While societies appear to be moving towards equality, many people consider the pace of change unacceptably slow. While educating men to stop abusing women would be a worthwhile ultimate goal of prevention, more immediate action can also be implemented to deter current abusers. This study sought to measure people's normative judgments as well as willingness to intervene in a situation where they alone observed a man hitting a woman.

A single observer to a violent situation considers many factors when deciding how to respond. Applying the findings from this study to a domestic violence awareness program could increase its effectiveness. While the
findings are numerous and varied some general guidelines for an observer of domestic violence are 1) Always assume you are the only observer 2) Assume that your help is wanted and necessary even if quarreling pair are married 3) Commit to intervene indirectly and if necessary directly 4) Act as if it were your close friend being assaulted and 5) Practice the role of rescuer to increase preparedness.
APPENDIX A

ONSCREEN INSTRUCTIONS
Questionnaire Instructions

You will read a scenario four different times. While all four scenarios are similar, the descriptions of the relationship between the people in the scenario will differ as will the relationship between the woman in the scenario and you the observer.

- These situations are hypothetical and we would like to know:
  - How you think you would respond?
  - How you think you should respond to these different situations if they actually occurred.
APPENDIX B

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE QUESTIONNAIRE
Questionnaire 1

Suppose you are walking in a local park. There are no other people around and you happen to have a cell phone on you. You notice a man shouting and making threatening statements at a woman. You overhear the woman shout, “I don’t know why I ever married you!” Then you see him begin to hit her.

Please assume the following:

They are clearly a married couple.

The woman being attacked is your close friend:
Sample Rating Scale

For the following questions, please indicate the number that best describes your response.

1. Should you try to stop the violence yourself?
   Definitely Should Not  1  2  3  4  5  6  Definitely Should

2. Should you call the police?
   Definitely Should Not  1  2  3  4  5  6  Definitely Should

3. Should you ignore the situation?
   Definitely Should Not  1  2  3  4  5  6  Definitely Should

1. Would you try to stop the violence yourself?
   Definitely Would Not  1  2  3  4  5  6  Definitely Would

2. Would you call the police?
   Definitely Would Not  1  2  3  4  5  6  Definitely Would

3. Would you ignore the situation?
   Definitely Would Not  1  2  3  4  5  6  Definitely Would
Questionnaire 2

Suppose you are walking in a local park. There are no other people around and you happen to have a cell phone on you. You notice a man shouting and making threatening statements at a woman. You overhear the woman shout, “I don’t know why I ever married you!” Then you see him begin to hit her.

Please assume the following:

They are clearly a married couple.

The woman being attacked is a stranger to you.
Sample Rating Scale

For the following questions, please indicate the number that best describes your response.

1. Would you try to stop the violence yourself?
   Definitely Would Not ◯ 1 ◯ 2 ◯ 3 ◯ 4 ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Definitely Would

2. Would you call the police?
   Definitely Would Not ◯ 1 ◯ 2 ◯ 3 ◯ 4 ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Definitely Would

3. Would you ignore the situation?
   Definitely Would Not ◯ 1 ◯ 2 ◯ 3 ◯ 4 ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Definitely Would

1. Should you try to stop the violence yourself?
   Definitely Should Not ◯ 1 ◯ 2 ◯ 3 ◯ 4 ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Definitely Should

2. Should you call the police?
   Definitely Should Not ◯ 1 ◯ 2 ◯ 3 ◯ 4 ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Definitely Should

3. Should you ignore the situation?
   Definitely Should Not ◯ 1 ◯ 2 ◯ 3 ◯ 4 ◯ 5 ◯ 6 Definitely Should
Questionnaire 3

Suppose you are walking in a local park. There are no other people around and you happen to have a cell phone on you. You notice a man shouting and making threatening statements at a woman. You overhear the woman shout, “Get away from me! I don’t know you!” Then you see him begin to hit her.

Please assume the following:

They are clearly *strangers*.

The woman being attacked is *your close friend*.
Sample Rating Scale

For the following questions, please indicate the number that best describes your response.

1. Should you try to stop the violence yourself?
   Definitely Should Not [1] 2 3 4 5 6 Definitely Should

2. Should you call the police?
   Definitely Should Not [1] 2 3 4 5 6 Definitely Should

3. Should you ignore the situation?
   Definitely Should Not [1] 2 3 4 5 6 Definitely Should

1. Would you try to stop the violence yourself?
   Definitely Would Not [1] 2 3 4 5 6 Definitely Would

2. Would you call the police?
   Definitely Would Not [1] 2 3 4 5 6 Definitely Would

3. Would you ignore the situation?
   Definitely Would Not [1] 2 3 4 5 6 Definitely Would
Questionnaire 4

Suppose you are walking in a local park. There are no other people around and you happen to have a cell phone on you. You notice a man shouting and making threatening statements at a woman. You overhear the woman shout, “Get away from me! I don’t know you!” Then you see him begin to hit her.

Please assume the following:

They are clearly **strangers**.

The woman being attacked is a **stranger to you**.
Sample Rating Scale

For the following questions, please indicate the number that best describes your
response.

1. Would you try to stop the violence yourself?
   Definitely Would Not 1 2 3 4 5 6 Definitely Would

2. Would you call the police?
   Definitely Would Not 1 2 3 4 5 6 Definitely Would

3. Would you ignore the situation?
   Definitely Would Not 1 2 3 4 5 6 Definitely Would

1. Should you try to stop the violence yourself?
   Definitely Should Not 1 2 3 4 5 6 Definitely Should

2. Should you call the police?
   Definitely Should Not 1 2 3 4 5 6 Definitely Should

3. Should you ignore the situation?
   Definitely Should Not 1 2 3 4 5 6 Definitely Should

Thank you for participating!

If you are a CSUSB student, you will receive instructions on how to receive extra
credit for participating.
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