



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

To Help or Not to Help? Reporting on Femicide and Its Influence on Bystander Behaviour

verfasst von / submitted by

Julia Martin

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science (MSc)

Wien, 2022 / Vienna 2022

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

UA 066 550

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Masterstudium Communication Science

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Univ.-Prof. Hajo Boomgaarden, PhD

Content

Introduction	3
Femicide.....	7
The Medias' Influence	8
Bystander Intervention as a Measure Against Femicide	9
Bystander Effect and Bystander Intervention Model	11
Influencing Factors	16
Gender	16
Attitudes	18
Awareness	20
Self-Efficacy	21
Methods	22
Procedure.....	23
Sampling	24
Measures	25
Manipulation Check	27
Results.....	28
Hypotheses Testing	29
Exploratory Analyses	31
Discussion and Conclusion.....	33
Literature	40
Appendix	64
Appendix A: Abstracts	64
Appendix B: Stimuli	66
Appendix C: Questionnaire	68

Introduction

The most dangerous place for women is not the dark alley or the unlit park – it is their own home. Each year, worldwide, 47,000 girls and women are killed by the person closest to them: Their male intimate partner (Cruschwitz & Haentjes, 2021; United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2021). This means that every 11 minutes, a woman becomes a victim of a so-called *femicide* (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2021). This term was firstly coined in the year 1992, with the purpose of drawing societal attention to the misogynistic killing of women by men (Corradi et al., 2016; Dawson & Carrigan, 2021; Gleirscher, 2017; Leuschner & Rausch, 2022; Radford & Russell, 1992). Although there still is an on-going debate about the exact definition of femicide (Dawson & Carrigan, 2021; Leuschner & Rausch, 2022), according to a widely acknowledged definition by the United Nations (2013) it can be referred to as “the killing of women and girls because of their gender” (p.2). This definition includes all different forms of gender-related killings of females, like for example honour killings, infanticides or cultural-related killings (United Nations, 2013). However, since “the murder of women as a result of intimate partner violence” (United Nations, 2013, p. 2) is the most common type of femicide, this study will lay its focus on that kind of crime (Backes & Bettoni, 2021; Leuschner & Rausch, 2022; Schröttle, 2017; World Health Organization., 2012a).

Femicides and their prevention are an issue that concerns the whole world (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2021). However, in various countries the importance of the topic has hardly reached the public agenda yet (Backes & Bettoni, 2021). This is also the case in Germany, where femicides are only rarely mentioned in the media and are mostly treated as private tragedies that do not have to be addressed publicly (Gender Equality Media, 2021; Meltzer, 2021). Despite this lack of public attention, femicides are a relevant societal issue also in Germany: Every day, one man tries to kill his female

partner, every third day, a femicide is completed (Backes & Bettoni, 2021; Bundeskriminalamt, 2020). Although, meanwhile, there are some starting points for a public and political debate about femicides with first attempts to come up with societal solutions to better prevent further killings in Germany (Zeit Online, 2022), more approaches to successfully avoid these crimes need to be found and followed (Backes & Bettoni, 2021). One promising attempt for this could be promoting the intervention of other people, so-called *bystanders*, who are witnessing situations in which women are in danger of being killed by their intimate partner (Gracia et al., 2018). This risk is predominantly present in situations of intimate partner violence (IPV), which can be defined as “any behaviour within an intimate relationship that causes physical, psychological or sexual harm to those in the relationship” (World Health Organization., 2012b, p. 1) and is one of the greatest risk factors for femicides (Monckton Smith, 2020; World Health Organisation, 2002; World Health Organization., 2012b). Therefore, in order to avert femicides, victims of IPV must be helped out of their situation (Dawson & Piscitelli, 2021; Gracia, 2014).

Bystander intervention in cases of IPV seems particularly important considering that these incidents are often not as private as it might seem: The majority of IPV cases are actually known to their social environment (Gracia et al., 2018; E. Taylor et al., 2019). Furthermore, an EU-wide survey showed that 52% of all European citizens personally know a victim of IPV – being their friends or family, neighbours or colleagues (European Commission, 2016). However, only few of these bystanders actually intervene and help the victims out of their situation, which would be very important, bearing in mind that it is very difficult for them to escape a violent relationship on their own (Frye et al., 2012; Kingsnorth & Macintosh, 2004). Consequently, enhancing bystander intervention in cases of IPV seems like a promising approach to prevent further femicides.

The most prominent explanation on how bystander intervention works and can be fostered is the so-called *bystander intervention model (BIM)* (Latané & Darley, 1970). Within this framework, Latané and Darley (1970) identified five subsequent stages, which a bystander undergoes, and that have to be completed before a person decides to intervene in a critical situation. Additionally, there often occur three psychological processes that interfere with the fulfilment of these stages. According to Latané and Darley (1970), facilitating the completion of the five stages while simultaneously reducing the interfering processes leads to increased bystander intervention behaviour. One possibility to do so could be the media (Nardi-Rodríguez & Paredes-López, 2021; Nickerson et al., 2017), given their power to influence their recipients' attitudes, emotions and behaviours (Entman, 1993; Hjarvard, 2008; McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Consequently, reporting on femicide containing cues that encourage bystander behaviour could contribute to the recipients' readiness to help in cases of IPV (Carlyle et al., 2014; Nickerson et al., 2017).

Although this assumption seems logical it has not yet been empirically investigated whether bystander intervention can be fostered with the help of media reporting, especially in the field of IPV and femicide, where media effect studies are still scarce. Therefore, this study will investigate the following research question:

RQ: In what ways can media reporting on femicide adhering to the bystander intervention model foster recipients' willingness to help in situations of IPV?

Thereby, this study contributes to the major lack of media effect studies in the area of femicide reporting, while at the same time addressing the research gap of whether the BIM also works through the media. Therefore, this study is beneficiary for the academic community, since on the one hand the area of application of an acknowledged

psychological model could be significantly expanded to another very important medium, which would open various new possibilities to foster and facilitate bystander behaviour. On the other hand, new insights into a quite unknown field of research, the effects of femicide reporting on its recipients, is generated, making it possible to gain a deeper understanding of whether and how this coverage influences its readers.

In order to investigate the research interest, an experimental study was conducted. The thesis focused on German reporting. Furthermore, since there are also other factors apart from the media posing an influence on bystanders' behaviour in cases of IPV (Flood & Pease, 2009), gender, attitudes and awareness towards IPV and femicides, as well as self-efficacy were integrated into the research interest.

Femicide

The reasons why femicide exists and women and girls are killed because of their gender, are deeply rooted in society (Leuschner & Rausch, 2022; Wischnewski, 2018; Yodanis, 2004). Violence against women in general, with femicide being the most extreme form, can be seen as an expression of patriarchal structures along which society is organised (Corradi et al., 2016; Gleirscher, 2017; Meltzer, 2021; Schröttle, 2017; United Nations, 2013; Walby, 2022; Wischnewski, 2018; Yllö, 1983; Yodanis, 2004). This means that society is constituted in a system, in which men are placed superior over women (Corradi et al., 2016; Dawson & Carrigan, 2021; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004; Yodanis, 2004). This dominance is being implemented by ascribing different characteristics to the two genders, in which masculinity is associated with qualities like rationality, strength, competence and assertiveness, that correspond with power and dominance. Femininity, on the other hand, is rather described as being emotional, warm, soft, empathetic, friendly and fragile, which is associated with subordination and passivity (Conway et al., 1996; Corradi et al., 2016; Dawson & Carrigan, 2021; Fiske et al., 2002; Gleirscher, 2017; Meltzer, 2021; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004; Schröttle, 2017; Schuchmann & Steinl, 2021; Wischnewski, 2018; Yllö, 1983; Yodanis, 2004). These gender roles become visible in psychological beliefs, self-identities, interpersonal behaviours and networks, distributions of power and cultural beliefs (Corradi et al., 2016; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). Examples for the further impact of these patriarchal structures on femicides and violence against women are manifold: It could be seen that there is a higher percentage of femicides, rapes, violence against women and sexual violence in countries with a highly patriarchal orientation, in which women are suppressed by men, compared to countries, in which a higher level of gender equality is present (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2021; Yodanis, 2004). It was also

shown that almost all perpetrators of violence against women and femicides share a patriarchal ideology, which places their female partner below themselves (Elisha et al., 2010; Heppner & Çelebi, 2020). Violence, and in extreme cases, femicide, can therefore be considered an appropriate and legitimate method for these patriarchal perpetrators to establish and maintain power and dominance over their female partners (Dawson & Carrigan, 2021; Elisha et al., 2010; Heppner & Çelebi, 2020; Wischniewski, 2018; Yodanis, 2004). Since in society patriarchal ideology is still present, which is the foundation for femicides, femicides can be considered as a structural societal problem (Backes & Bettoni, 2021). Therefore, in order to find a solution for femicides, society as a whole must be addressed (Corradi et al., 2016; Gracia, 2004; McDonnell et al., 2011). One possibility to achieve this are the media (Meltzer, 2021).

The Medias' Influence

The media hold great power in a society. By influencing what topics people think about and how they perceive these issues, the media have a considerable impact on public as well as interpersonal and individual attitudes and behaviours (Bidlo et al., 2012; Entman, 1993, 2007; Hjarvard, 2008; McCombs & Shaw, 1972; Molotch & Lester, 1974; Scheufele, 1999). Especially recipients without direct experience with the topic are prone to derive and adopt their attitudes and behaviours towards femicide and violence against women predominantly out of the media (Anastasio & Costa, 2004; Berns, 2001; Bullock & Cubert, 2002; Carlyle et al., 2008; Eastal et al., 2015; Heath et al., 1981; Meltzer, 2021; Richards et al., 2011; R. Taylor, 2009). As a consequence, how the media report on the topic could have an immense impact on what people think about femicide and how they behave towards the issue (Berns, 2001; Bullock & Cubert, 2002; Carlyle et al., 2014; Eastal et al., 2015; Meltzer, 2021; Richards et al., 2011, 2014; Sutherland et al., 2019;

R. Taylor, 2009). Therefore, media coverage on femicide has the potential to contribute to finding solutions to the problem (Meltzer, 2021).

However, the media tend to downplay the societal relevance of the topic by mostly depicting it as an individual, standalone problem, while also frequently blaming the victim and exonerating the perpetrator from his responsibility (Carll, 2003; Carlyle et al., 2008; Fairbairn & Dawson, 2013; Gillespie et al., 2013; Meltzer, 2021; Richards et al., 2011, 2014; Sutherland et al., 2019; R. Taylor, 2009). This kind of reporting has serious consequences: On the one hand, it inhibits a public discourse about femicides, which would acknowledge society's responsibility for these crimes. Thus, the development and implementation of public policies is inhibited, which would be necessary to overcome the problem (Carlyle et al., 2008; Gracia, 2006; Gracia & Herrero, 2006; Gracia & Tomás, 2014; Palazzolo & Roberto, 2011; Sutherland et al., 2019). On the other hand, this reporting style tends to reduce individual prosocial reactions towards the victims by decreasing recipients' perception of their personal responsibility (Carll, 2003; Carlyle et al., 2014; Easteal et al., 2015; Gracia & Herrero, 2006; Gracia & Tomás, 2014; Palazzolo & Roberto, 2011). This is extremely problematic considering the fact that this personal responsibility is an important precondition for bystander intervention in cases of violence against women, which is a very important approach to help victims out of their critical situation (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Burn, 2009; Gracia et al., 2009; Gracia & Herrero, 2006).

Bystander Intervention as a Measure Against Femicide

In order to prevent further femicides, a change in societal attitudes is necessary (Baldry & Pagliaro, 2014; Gracia, 2004; McDonnell et al., 2011; Voith, 2019). Considering the fact that violence against women and femicide root in patriarchal

structures of society, the problem can only be overcome when these structures and accompanying misogynistic attitudes like victim blaming of affected women are changed, for example with the help of public policies and communication (Gracia, 2014; Liang et al., 2005; McDonnell et al., 2011; Voith, 2019; Waltermaurer, 2012). However, in order to prevent further femicides, it is another crucial approach to foster bystanders' willingness to intervene in situations of IPV (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Gracia, 2004, 2014; Gracia et al., 2018; C. A. Taylor & Sorenson, 2005).

Bystanders of IPV can be defined as “third parties who witness dangerous or potentially dangerous interactions or receive disclosures from victims about incidents of IPV” (E. Taylor et al., 2019, p. 3916). On the one hand, their importance in preventing femicides and IPV relates to the fact that official authorities are only rarely able to detect cases of IPV themselves, given the situation that these incidents mostly happen in private environments, where officials like the police usually do not have access to (C. A. Taylor & Sorenson, 2005). On the other hand, previous research has shown that victims of IPV tend to firstly look for help at informal resources in their social environment like friends, family or neighbours instead of formal ones like the police, women shelters or health care providers (Ansara & Hindin, 2010; Liang et al., 2005; McDonnell et al., 2011; O'Campo et al., 2002). Since many women who are suffering from IPV have difficulties to escape their situation on their own, due to several factors like self-blaming, financial reasons, threats by their abusive partner or the presence of children, they need the support of bystanders (Burkitt & Larkin, 2008; Frye et al., 2012; Koepsell et al., 2006; Liang et al., 2005; McDonnell et al., 2011). The intervention of bystanders in situations of IPV does not only contribute to help the victims escape from their abusive relationships, but also has the potential to deter the perpetrators from further attempts to approach and abuse his victim again and is therefore very important (Voith, 2019).

Consequently, bystanders' willingness to intervene in cases of IPV must be fostered, especially when considering the fact that most cases of IPV are actually known to the victims' social environment, however, the majority of these bystanders chooses not to take action against it (Gracia, 2014; Gracia et al., 2018; Gracia & Lila, 2015). Reasons for these bystanders' decision not to help are manifold and a subject of high interest for several researchers of different disciplines (Baldry & Pagliaro, 2014; Karakashian et al., 2006). One of the most widely acknowledged approaches to explain bystander intervention behaviour that stems from the field of social psychology is the so-called *bystander effect* (Darley & Latané, 1968).

Bystander Effect and Bystander Intervention Model

The bystander effect can be defined as “the phenomenon that an individual's likelihood of helping decreases when passive bystanders are present in a critical situation” (Fischer et al., 2011, p. 517). Since this effect was firstly discovered by Darley and Latané (1968), further research was conducted on the processes of how bystanders' helping behaviour is actually working (Fischer et al., 2011, 2013; Latané & Darley, 1968; Latané & Nida, 1981; Latané & Rodin, 1969). Thereby, Latané and Darley (1970) developed the BIM, which describes five subsequent stages that have to be fulfilled until a person will intervene in a situation where someone else requires help. In order to show helping behaviour, a person firstly has to notice the situation (Stage 1), then has to identify the situation as an event where help is required (Stage 2), subsequently has to take the responsibility to help (Stage 3), then has to know how he or she could provide the required help (Stage 4), and finally has to actively decide whether to intervene or not by weighing the costs of helping versus its benefits (Stage 5) (Fischer et al., 2011, 2014; Latané & Darley, 1970; Nickerson et al., 2014). If there is any factor at any of the five stages, which

obstructs reaching the next stage, this leads to the situation that the person will not show helping behaviour (Fischer et al., 2014; Latané & Darley, 1970). Furthermore, Latané and Darley (1970) identified three psychological processes that are very likely to interfere with the fulfilment of the five steps. The first of these processes is the diffusion of responsibility, meaning that the responsibility to help is divided among all bystanders that could intervene in the situation. The second one is evaluation apprehension, which means that a person is afraid of being judged by others for their intervention. The third process is pluralistic ignorance, referring to the tendency to orientate one's own behaviour at the behaviour of other passive bystanders in this situation (Fischer et al., 2011, 2014; Latané & Darley, 1970; Latané & Nida, 1981). Therefore, in order to ensure and facilitate people's helping behaviour, the fulfilment of the five stages of the BIM has to be fostered, while at the same time the three interfering processes must be kept to a minimum (Fischer et al., 2014).

The BIM has been applied to and validated for several critical situations, like for example bullying and cyberbullying (Gini et al., 2008; Machackova, 2020; Nickerson et al., 2014; Pöyhönen et al., 2010; Pozzoli & Gini, 2010, 2013b, 2013a), domestic child abuse (Hoefnagels & Zwikker, 2001), sexual violence (Banyard, 2011; Banyard et al., 2007, 2010, 2014; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Burn, 2009; Christensen & Harris, 2019; Labhardt et al., 2017) and also IPV (Baldry et al., 2015; Baldry & Pagliaro, 2014; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Cinquegrana et al., 2018). These latter studies showed that cases of IPV pose particular difficulties for bystanders to fulfil all stages of the bystander intervention model and to consequently show active helping behaviour (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Burn, 2009; Fischer et al., 2011; Wijaya et al., 2021).

Given the private environment, in which IPV usually occurs, a first challenge for bystanders is to actually notice the incident (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Burn, 2009;

Frye, 2007; Wijaya et al., 2021). However, detecting a critical situation is crucial for further helping behaviour (Greitemeyer et al., 2006; Nickerson et al., 2017). Subsequently, if bystanders noticed an incident of IPV, they would then need to interpret it as an emergency which requires their help (Latané & Darley, 1970). This is often difficult in cases of IPV, given the ambiguity of the situation (Burn, 2009). Bystanders often do not know whether the behaviour they are witnessing is critical and requires their help or whether it is a private matter between two partners of a relationship. This relates to the outcome of previous research which showed that people are less inclined to help a woman if they perceive that her perpetrator is in a relationship with her (Frye, 2007; Shotland & Straw, 1976). Due to the bystanders' insecurity in evaluating the situation, they tend to orientate their behaviour towards other bystanders that also witness the situation, which makes this stage very susceptible for pluralistic ignorance, hampering active intervention in a case of IPV (Burn, 2009; Latané & Darley, 1968; Nickerson et al., 2017).

The next stage, taking intervention responsibility, is very complex in situations of IPV (Burn, 2009). In society, victim blaming attitudes, which attribute at least some or even the entire responsibility for the situation to the victim herself, are still widespread (Gracia, 2014; Kilpatrick, 2004; R. Taylor, 2009). Several studies showed that holding these attitudes leads to a reduction in bystanders' perception of personal responsibility for helping the victim out of her situation, by transferring this responsibility to the victim herself (Baldry et al., 2015; Baldry & Pagliaro, 2014; Banyard, 2011; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Gracia, 2014; Pozzoli & Gini, 2013b; Weiner, 1979, 1980, 1995; Wijaya et al., 2021). Thus, this leads to a lower willingness to help (Cinquegrana et al., 2018; Gracia, 2014; Katz et al., 2015; Pagliaro et al., 2021; Wijaya et al., 2021). Furthermore, this relates to the diffusion of responsibility process, since the responsibility

for an intervention is not only shared between several bystanders of an IPV situation, but also with the victim herself, reducing potential helping behaviour even further (Burn, 2009; Greitemeyer et al., 2006; Nickerson et al., 2017).

At the fourth stage, bystanders of IPV situations often do not know how to intervene, due to a perceived lack of skills, which in turn also leads to a reduced willingness to help (Banyard, 2008; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Burn, 2009; Labhardt et al., 2017; Nickerson et al., 2014). This relates to the fifth stage of the model, where people need to actively decide to help, often by analysing perceived costs and benefits of intervening (Latané & Darley, 1970). This stage is often associated with the process of evaluation apprehension, since people are frequently insecure about how to help, fearing that they would embarrass themselves or make mistakes when intervening (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Burn, 2009; Greitemeyer et al., 2006; Karakashian et al., 2006; Latané & Nida, 1981). Furthermore, fear of being harmed themselves and perceived dangerousness of the situation often detains bystanders from helping in situations of IPV (Banyard, 2008; Burn, 2009; Fischer et al., 2011; Greitemeyer et al., 2006; Nickerson et al., 2017).

Therefore, it can be seen that IPV cases pose several challenges for bystanders to actually intervene in a critical situation (Burn, 2009). However, given the importance of bystander intervention in these cases, especially regarding the prevention of femicides, these points must be addressed and bystander intervention consequently must be fostered (Gracia, 2014). One approach for encouraging bystander intervention in IPV cases could be the media (Carlyle et al., 2014; Nardi-Rodríguez & Paredes-López, 2021; Nickerson et al., 2017).

The media have the potential to impose a powerful influence on people's attitudes towards femicide and IPV. Therefore, they could represent an important tool to foster recipients' willingness to intervene in situations of IPV (Carlyle et al., 2014; Cismaru et al., 2010; Easteal et al., 2021; Flood & Pease, 2009; Meltzer, 2021; Moreno Martín et al., 2020; Nardi-Rodríguez & Paredes-López, 2021; Nickerson et al., 2017; Richards et al., 2014; van Gelder et al., 2020). Consequently, it can be assumed that with the help of media reporting, which includes cues addressing the five steps of the BIM and the minimisation of the interfering processes, bystanders' willingness to intervene in cases of IPV could be fostered (Carlyle et al., 2014; Cismaru et al., 2010; Easteal et al., 2021; Geiger & Wolf, 2014; Nardi-Rodríguez & Paredes-López, 2021; Nickerson et al., 2017; van Gelder et al., 2020).

Since this has never been explored in previous research, the following hypotheses should be investigated in this study:

H1: Participants, who have been exposed to media reporting including cues of the bystander intervention model with a simultaneous reduction of the interfering processes, show a higher willingness to help in situations of IPV than participants who have been exposed to media reporting without the cues for reducing the interfering processes (H1a) or the article without any cues (H1b).

H2: Participants, who have been exposed to media reporting including cues of the bystander intervention model without the cues for reducing the interfering processes, show a higher willingness to help in situations of IPV than participants who have been exposed to the article without any cues.

Influencing Factors

Not only situational factors and media effects influence people's attitudes and behaviours. Personal factors that could have an impact on recipients' willingness to intervene in situations of IPV should be taken into consideration as well (Banyard, 2008; Fischer et al., 2011; Flood & Pease, 2009). Previous research has consistently shown that among others, particularly gender, attitudes and awareness towards IPV as well as femicide, and perceived self-efficacy in intervening play a crucial role in the recipients' decision whether to help in a case of IPV or not (Banyard, 2008; Flood & Pease, 2009; Labhardt et al., 2017).

Gender

Since femicide is a gender-based crime, it seems logical that the recipients' gender could exert a vital influence on their willingness to help in an IPV case (Flood & Pease, 2009; Wischniewski, 2018). There is a broad consensus among previous studies that women show greater support and empathy for victims of femicide and IPV, hold fewer victim-blaming attitudes, attribute less responsibility to the victims and show more intervention behaviour in cases of IPV and sexual assault (Baldry et al., 2015; Banyard, 2011; Banyard et al., 2007; Bryant & Spencer, 2003; Burn, 2009; Chabot et al., 2009; Chng & Burke, 1999; De Judicibus & McCabe, 2001; Gerber et al., 2004; Gracia et al., 2015; Jimenez & Abreu, 2003; Pagliaro et al., 2021; Shotland & Straw, 1976; West & Wandrei, 2002).

An explanation for this gender difference can be found within the framework of the Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1972; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), especially within the Social Categorisation Theory (Turner et al., 1987). Social identity refers to an individual's perception of belonging to a certain social group or category (Tajfel, 1972). According to

Social Categorisation Theory (Turner, 1985; Turner et al., 1987), people categorise themselves and others into in-groups, which they perceive similarities with, and out-groups, which they feel different from (Hogg & Reid, 2006; Hogg & Turner, 1987; Levine & Cassidy, 2010). Salience of this belonging to a certain social category then causes a process of depersonalisation, which means that a person sees him- or herself as a representative of the in-group rather than as an individual (Hogg & Turner, 1987; Turner, 1985). This then consequently leads to an increased perception of similarity within the in-group, adapted behaviour according to the in-group, and a higher feeling of responsibility, empathy and altruism towards other in-group members (Cialdini et al., 1997; Hogg & Terry, 2000; Levine & Crowther, 2008). Furthermore, it could be shown that a feeling of shared group membership influences people's willingness to help: There is an increased readiness to intervene in situations where a fellow in-group member is threatened compared to situations, where an out-group member is in danger (Bowes-Sperry & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005; Dovidio et al., 1997; Franklin et al., 2020; Levine, 1999; Levine et al., 2002, 2005; Levine & Cassidy, 2010; Levine & Crowther, 2008; Levine & Thompson, 2004). Transferred to bystander behaviour in cases of IPV, considering that belonging to a gender is one of the most significant social categories influencing each aspect of a person's life, and its special salience in situations of IPV and femicide, it seems logical that women tend to show a higher willingness to help the victims, being fellow in-group members, than men, which are part of the out-group (Bowes-Sperry & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005; Burn et al., 2000; Franklin et al., 2020; Levine & Crowther, 2008; Meltzer, 2021; Swan & Wyer, 1997).

Therefore, the following hypothesis should be tested:

H3: The effect of bystander intervention cues in media reporting on readiness to help in cases of IPV will be stronger for people identifying as female compared to people identifying as male.

Attitudes

Apart from gender, there is another important factor influencing recipients' willingness to intervene in situations of IPV: Their attitudes towards IPV and femicide (Flood & Pease, 2009; Gracia et al., 2020; Gracia & Herrero, 2006; Martín-Fernández et al., 2018; Suarez & Gadalla, 2010; Webster et al., 2019). Several researchers actually consider supportive attitudes towards IPV as the key influencing factor in a person's decision to intervene in a situation of IPV or not (Flood & Pease, 2009; Frese et al., 2004; Gracia et al., 2015, 2018; Gracia & Tomás, 2014; Nardi-Rodríguez & Paredes-López, 2021; Powell & Webster, 2018; West & Wandrei, 2002; Wijaya et al., 2021). Attitudes supportive of IPV can be defined as "attitudes that justify, excuse, trivialise or minimise violence or that shift blame for violence from perpetrator to victim" (Webster et al., 2019, p. 54). A core element of these attitudes is the belief in IPV myths (Baldry et al., 2015; Temkin et al., 2008). IPV myths "generally hold the victim responsible for the abuse [...], exonerate the perpetrator [...], and minimize the seriousness and scope of the problem." (Peters, 2008, p. 3). The basis for the development of a belief in such myths is on the one hand the support of violence in general and on the other hand the adherence to traditional gender roles, which place the man superior to the woman (Berkel et al., 2004; De Judicibus & McCabe, 2001; Flood & Pease, 2009; Frese et al., 2004; Frye, 2007; Gracia et al., 2018; Pagliaro et al., 2021; Temkin et al., 2008; Waltermaurer, 2012; Webster et al., 2019; Wijaya et al., 2021). Several studies could show that people who have a high tolerance of IPV rather tend to belief in such myths, hold higher victim blaming attitudes,

advocate for lenient penalties for the perpetrators, have less empathy with the victim, hold the perpetrator less responsible for his crime, and acknowledge less situations as IPV (Banyard, 2011; Berkel et al., 2004; Cohn et al., 2009; Flood & Pease, 2009; Franiuk et al., 2008; Gracia & Tomás, 2014; Nardi-Rodríguez & Paredes-López, 2021; Temkin et al., 2008). Furthermore, holding IPV-supportive attitudes and believes in IPV myths has serious consequences on people's willingness to intervene in situations of IPV: People with IPV-supportive attitudes show a lower readiness to help, are less likely to call the police in threatening situations of IPV and feel less personal responsibility for intervening, which is – according to the BIM (Latané & Darley, 1970) – a crucial precondition for successful bystander intervention (Banyard, 2011; Clarke & Lawson, 2009; Frye, 2007; Gracia et al., 2018; Gracia & Herrero, 2006; Gracia & Tomás, 2014; Katz et al., 2015; McMahon, 2010; Pavlou & Knowles, 2001; Powell & Webster, 2018; West & Wandrei, 2002). On the other hand, holding attitudes against IPV and not believing in IPV myths consequently goes along with less tolerance of IPV incidents, acknowledging IPV from an early level on, holding less victim blaming attitudes, highly blaming perpetrators and demanding strict penalties for them, and an elevated willingness to intervene in situations of IPV and readiness to call the police (Baldry et al., 2015; Banyard, 2008; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Flood & Pease, 2009; Gracia & Herrero, 2006; Labhardt et al., 2017; Nardi-Rodríguez & Paredes-López, 2021; Pavlou & Knowles, 2001; Powell & Webster, 2018). Unfortunately, IPV-supportive attitudes and especially deeply-rooted, underlying misogynistic beliefs are still wide-spread in society, whereby not only men, but also women can hold these attitudes (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; De Judicibus & McCabe, 2001; Flood & Pease, 2009; Gracia & Lila, 2015; McMahon, 2010; Temkin et al., 2008; Waltermaurer, 2012). Consequently, addressing these attitudes and the beliefs in these myths is a crucial point in preventing IPV and

femicides, particularly, since they pose a considerable influence on all five stages of the BIM (Banyard et al., 2007; Nickerson et al., 2014).

Therefore, the following hypothesis should be tested:

H4: The effect of bystander intervention cues in media reporting on readiness to help in cases of IPV will be stronger for recipients without IPV-supportive attitudes compared to recipients with IPV-supportive attitudes.

Awareness

Furthermore, recipients' awareness of IPV and femicide being a prevalent problem of society poses an influence on their willingness to help in situations of IPV (Banyard, 2008; Burn, 2009; Frye, 2007; McMahon, 2010). This awareness can be seen as the first step of intervention behaviour, considering the fact that according to the BIM (Latané & Darley, 1970), a bystander in order to provide help in a critical situation firstly has to notice the incident and interpret it as an emergency situation worthy of intervention (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2010). Consequently, it could be shown that people with higher awareness of IPV identified situations of IPV more easily, saw these situations less ambiguously, rather did not perceive it as a private issue and ascribed more severity to these incidents (Banyard, 2011; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Burn, 2009; Frese et al., 2004; Gracia, 2014; Gracia et al., 2009, 2018; Gracia & Herrero, 2006; Gracia & Tomás, 2014; McMahon, 2010; McMahon & Banyard, 2012; E. Taylor et al., 2019). Therefore, a higher awareness of IPV is connected with increased and earlier intervention behaviour and also more bystander prevention efforts (Banyard, 2008; Burn, 2009; Christensen, 2013; Christensen & Harris, 2019; Frye, 2007; McMahon, 2010; McMahon & Banyard, 2012). The development of such awareness is associated with higher knowledge of IPV

and also previous personal experiences with IPV (Banyard, 2008; Burn, 2009; Chng & Burke, 1999; Gracia et al., 2018; Gracia & Herrero, 2006; Nickerson et al., 2014).

Therefore, the following hypothesis was formulated:

H5: The effect of the bystander intervention cues in media reporting on readiness to help in cases of IPV will be stronger for people who show high awareness for IPV and femicide compared to those with low awareness towards the topic.

Self-Efficacy

Yet another key factor that has the potential to impact recipients' willingness to help in situations of IPV is the bystanders' perceived self-efficacy (Anderson & Danis, 2007; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Frye, 2007; Gini et al., 2008; Pozzoli & Gini, 2013a).

Self-efficacy refers to

people's judgment of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances. It is concerned not with the skills one has but with the judgments of what one can do with whatever skills one possesses. (Bandura, 1986, p. 31).

The basic assumption beyond self-efficacy is that people have efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Outcome expectations mean that a person thinks that a certain behaviour will produce a certain outcome. Efficacy expectations refer to the perception that a person is convinced that he or she can execute a behaviour, which is necessary to successfully reach an anticipated outcome. People can therefore believe that a certain behaviour will lead to a certain outcome, however, be convinced that they are not able to produce said outcome and will consequently not engage in any behaviour (Bandura, 1977a, 1982, 1986). Self-efficacy is dependent on specific situations and is influenced by several different factors, like previous experiences with being able to manage a certain situation, watching experiences of others, being persuaded by others or

being emotionally aroused (Bandura, 1977b, 1977a). The concept of self-efficacy has been applied to several different areas, and was also used to explain bystander behaviour in IPV cases (Bandura, 1982, 2001; Banyard, 2008; MacNab & Worthley, 2008; Mudde et al., 2006). In accordance with Bandura's self-efficacy concept (Bandura, 1977a, 1986), previous studies could show that people with a high self-efficacy had a higher willingness to intervene in cases of IPV and also put this will into practice more frequently (Banyard, 2008, 2011; Banyard et al., 2007, 2014; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Caprara et al., 2003; Frye, 2007; Gini et al., 2008; Labhardt et al., 2017; Laner et al., 2001; Pöyhönen et al., 2010). Analogously, people with a low self-efficacy showed less readiness to intervene (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Nickerson et al., 2014).

Consequently, the following hypothesis should be tested:

H6: The effect of the bystander intervention cues in media reporting on readiness to help in cases of IPV will be stronger for people with high self-efficacy compared to those with low efficacy.

Methods

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether media reporting on IPV and femicide would have an impact on participants' willingness to help in these situations, while considering the moderating effects of gender, attitudes and awareness towards IPV and femicide as well as participants' self-efficacy. In order to answer this research question, a quantitative online experiment with three conditions, namely news articles on femicide, containing cues for bystander intervention and simultaneous reduction of interfering processes (stimulus 1), only cues for bystander intervention (stimulus 2) and no cues (stimulus 3), was conducted. The study was implemented in Qualtrics and fielded

with the help of the survey provider Marketagent. The data collection took place between 12th May 2022 – 27th May 2022. Before the start of the field phase, a pre-test with five participants was conducted, in order to test the stimulus material and to check the questionnaire's general functioning (Brosius et al., 2016).

Procedure

Firstly, participants were presented with a short introduction, disclosing to them that this study deals with the topic of IPV and femicide and providing them with information about their data protection rights. Subsequently, they were confronted with a trigger warning and offered information on support services for people affected by IPV, in order to align with thorough ethical standards (Gainsburg & Earl, 2018). Afterwards, the sociodemographic data gender, age, education and political orientation were assessed. Since this study's dependent variable is the willingness to intervene in cases of IPV, and behavioural intention is often subject to social desirability effects, social desirability was evaluated as a control variable (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; Vilar et al., 2020). Afterwards, the moderator variables attitudes and awareness towards IPV and femicide as well as bystander efficacy were assessed.

Subsequently, participants were randomly presented with one of the three stimulus articles. Each article provided the participants with information on femicides and IPV, which was kept consistent over the three conditions. Furthermore, as much wording as possible stayed equal in each of the three articles. However, two of the three stimuli additionally contained cues that were addressing and applying the five stages of the BIM to media reporting (Latané & Darley, 1970). Thereby, the suggestions by Nickerson and colleagues (2017), on how to implement cues of the BIM into media reporting were followed. The two articles therefore contained direct appeals to the recipients to increase

the likelihood that the recipients notice the situation, interpret it as an emergency, take personal responsibility to intervene, know how to help and finally decide to intervene. In addition to that, one article also contained cues to reduce the interfering processes diffusion of responsibility, evaluation apprehension and pluralistic ignorance (Latané & Darley, 1970). However, one of the articles did not include any cues of the BIM, nevertheless, offered the recipients information on the importance of bystander intervention in cases of IPV.

After exposure to the stimuli, recipients were then asked to answer an attention check question, in order to evaluate whether they thoroughly read the article, followed by the assessment of the dependent variable of this study, the willingness to intervene in situations of IPV. Afterwards, a manipulation check was conducted, in order to ensure that the stimuli were distinguished as intended. Finally, the participants were presented with a thorough debriefing, informing them closely about the purpose of the experiment and offering them further information for help services for people affected by IPV.

The stimuli and questionnaire can be found in appendix B and C.

Sampling

All in all, 302 participants completed the experiment. 42 of them had to be excluded from further analysis for failing the attention check or answering the questionnaire too quickly. On average, it took the participants approximately 17.09 minutes to complete the experiment, whereby participants with a duration below 5.69 minutes were removed from further analysis. The final sample consisted of 260 participants. 126 of these were male (48.50%) and 134 female (51.50%), 127 below 55, and 133 above 55 (18-34: 24, 9.20%, 35-44: 30, 11.5%, 45-54: 73, 28.1%, 55+: 133,

51.2%), 224 (86.2%) formally low educated and 36 (13.9%) formally high educated. In terms of political leaning, the sample can be predominantly located in the political centre ($N = 124$), with a slight skew to the left ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 0.96$).

In order to ensure that the randomisation of the stimuli worked as intended, chi-square tests with the three conditions and gender, age and education were conducted. Results showed that the three groups did not significantly differ in terms of gender ($\chi^2(2) = 0.20$, $p = .904$) or education ($\chi^2(6) = 5.56$, $p = .474$). However, there were significant differences in terms of age ($\chi^2(6) = 21.69$, $p = .001$). To check whether the randomisation had worked in terms of political leaning, a one-way analysis of variance with the three conditions as the independent variable and political orientation as the dependent variable was conducted. Results showed that there were no significant differences between the three stimuli regarding participants political orientation ($F(2,239) = 0.30$, $p = .738$, $\eta^2 = .003$).

Therefore, the randomisation did work for gender, education and political leaning, however, age, was included as a control variable into the further analysis, considering the insufficient results of its randomisation check.

Measures

If not indicated otherwise, all variables were measured on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *Completely disagree* to 7 = *Completely agree*. The order described here reflects the order in the questionnaire.

Social Desirability. In order to assess this construct, the Social Desirability Scale by Crowne & Marlowe (1960) was used. The scale consists of five items, for example “I

have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings". The reliability of the scale was good ($\alpha = .76$, $M = 4.92$, $SD = 1.08$).

Attitudes towards IPV and femicide. This construct was measured with the help of the Domestic Violence Myth Acceptance Scale by Peters (2008), which consists of 15 items, for example "Not many women are affected by intimate partner violence." The items were then averaged into an index with a high reliability ($\alpha = .84$, $M = 2.98$, $SD = 0.88$).

Awareness towards IPV and femicide. In order to assess this variable, a scale by Banyard et al., (2010) was used. It consists of 11 items – "I don't think that IPV and femicide are problems of great societal relevance" –, which were transformed into an acceptably reliable index ($\alpha = .74$, $M = 3.15$, $SD = 0.88$).

Bystander Efficacy. This construct was measured with the help of the Slaby Bystander Efficacy Scale by Slaby et al. (1994), consisting of ten items, for example: „I can contribute to the prevention of IPV in my social environment“. The then formed index has a high reliability ($\alpha = .80$, $M = 4.33$, $SD = 5.30$).

Attention Check. After exposure to the stimulus, participants had to indicate on a nominal scale which topic the just read article dealt with, choosing between the options femicide, Covid-19, climate change or white-collar crime. Only participants indicating the first option were included in the sample.

Willingness to intervene in situations of IPV and femicide. To assess this construct, the Willingness to Intervene in Cases of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women Scale by Gracia et al. (2018) was used, consisting of 25 items, for example „If a woman in a bar tells me that her partner beats her, I would advise her to call the police." The items were averaged into an index with high reliability ($\alpha = .93$, $M = 4.92$, $SD = 0.97$).

Manipulation Check. In order to assess whether the manipulation between the three articles worked as intended, participants were presented four statements, referring to the cues of the BIM and the reduction of the interfering processes. Two statements thereby addressed the cues of the BIM, which were mentioned in the first two stimuli, and were not present in the third stimulus (“The article directly addressed you to intervene in a case of IPV”, “The article mentioned that many women affected by IPV reported that they were only able to escape their situation with the help of bystanders.”), merging them to an index ($\alpha = .51$, $M = 5.05$, $SD = 1.50$). The other two statements tied to elements of the interfering processes, which were only present in the first stimulus: “The article mentioned that you as a bystander can’t do anything wrong – except not helping at all.”, “The article explicitly told you that it’s your personal responsibility to intervene in cases of IPV and help the victim.”, which were averaged into an index ($\alpha = .54$, $M = 5.22$, $SD = 1.39$).

Manipulation Check

To check that the manipulation of the stimuli worked as intended, two one-way ANOVAs with the three conditions as the independent variable, and the two manipulation check indices were conducted.

Results showed that participants significantly identified more bystander intervention cues in the first ($M = 5.47$, $SD = 1.49$), compared to the third stimulus ($M = 4.63$, $SD = 1.46$, $p = .001$). However, there were no significant differences in perception of the bystander intervention cues in the second stimulus compared to the third one ($M = 5.07$, $SD = 1.43$, $p = .148$), ($F(2,257) = 7.23$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .053$).

Furthermore, no significant differences regarding the perception of the interfering processes could be found between the first ($M = 5.54$, $SD = 1.37$) and the second stimulus ($M = 5.18$, $SD = 1.42$, $p = .257$), ($F(2,257) = 4.15$, $p = .017$, $\eta^2 = .031$).

When taking a look at these outcomes, first of all it has to be said that the basic aim of the stimuli was to induce different levels of personal willingness to help in cases of IPV, with the help of addressing the different stages of the BIM and the interfering psychological processes. Since this was the key research interest of this study and could consequently not be inquired as a manipulation check, the questions of the manipulation check, which were interested in whether the participants could identify bystander intervention or interfering processes cues in the text, can only display an approximation to whether the manipulation of the stimuli worked as intended. Furthermore, when taking a closer look at the mean values of the three stimuli in the manipulation check, it can be seen that participants identified most bystander intervention and interfering processes cues in the first condition, less in the second, and least in the third. Consequently, it can be concluded that participants did notice a difference between the stimuli regarding the manipulation of the bystander intervention and interfering processes cues, although not all these differences were significant. Taking all these deliberations into consideration, the analysis with the three stimuli should be continued, although the manipulation check did not show the intended results.

Results

In the following section, the hypotheses of this study should be analysed, using IBM SPSS Statistics 27. In order to analyse the moderator hypotheses, the PROCESS macro for SPSS was used.

Hypotheses Testing

In order to answer the first two hypotheses, namely whether the participants show more willingness to intervene in situations of IPV and femicide being exposed to the first condition, compared to the second or third one (H1) and whether they will be more ready to intervene in the second compared to the third condition (H2), a one-way ANOVA was conducted, with the three conditions as independent variable and the willingness to intervene as the dependent variable.

Results showed that there was no significant difference between the first ($M = 4.92$, $SD = 1.05$), the second ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 0.87$) and the third ($M = 4.84$, $SD = 0.98$) condition regarding participants' willingness to intervene in cases of IPV and femicide ($F(2,257) = 0.60$, $p = .550$, $\eta^2 = .005$). Therefore, the first two hypotheses must be rejected.

In order to answer the third hypothesis, analysing whether there is a moderating effect of gender on the relationship between the three conditions and willingness to intervene, a moderation analysis with the help of Process Model Nr.1 (5,000 bootstraps) was conducted. Thereby, the conditions were used as the independent variable, gender as the moderator variable and the willingness to intervene as the dependent variable. Control variables were age, education, political orientation, and social desirability. Considering that the independent variable was scaled multi-categorically, each moderation analyses in this study was conducted twice, with different conditions as reference group, making it possible to gain insights into the relationships between all three stimulus conditions. The first analysis used the first stimulus as the reference group, in order to be able to obtain the results for the relationships between the first and the second stimulus and the first and the third stimulus. The second analysis used the second condition as the reference group, in order to gain insights into the association between the second and the third condition.

According to the results, no significant moderating effect of gender on differences in the participants' willingness to help between the first and second condition ($b = -0.38$, 95% CI $[-0.989, 0.226]$, $t = -1.24$, $p = .217$), the first and third condition ($b = -0.46$, 95% CI $[-1.043, 0.127]$, $t = -1.54$, $p = .124$), and the second and third condition ($b = 0.08$, 95% CI $[-0.514, 0.667]$, $t = 0.26$, $p = .798$) could be obtained. When taking a look at the control variables, there is a significant effect for social desirability ($b = 0.23$, 95% CI $[0.120, 0.341]$, $t = 3.84$, $p < .001$). Consequently, the third hypothesis must be rejected.

Addressing the analysis of the fourth hypothesis, regarding a moderating effect of attitudes towards IPV on the association between the stimuli and participants' willingness to intervene, another moderation analysis was conducted, with the three conditions as the independent, attitudes towards IPV as the moderating and willingness to intervene as dependent variable. Results showed no significant moderating effects of participants' attitudes towards IPV on the relationship between the conditions and their willingness to intervene (first vs. second: $b = -0.05$, 95% CI $[-0.404, 0.308]$, $t = -0.27$, $p = .791$, first vs. third: $b = 0.11$, 95% CI $[-0.208, 0.427]$, $t = 0.68$, $p = .497$), second vs. third: $b = -0.16$, 95% CI $[-0.491, 0.176]$, $t = -0.93$, $p = .353$). Social desirability had a significant effect on the relationship ($b = 0.24$, 95% CI $[0.127, 0.355]$, $t = 4.18$, $p < .001$). Considering the results, the fourth hypothesis has to be rejected.

The fifth hypothesis, whether awareness towards IPV moderates the association between condition and willingness to help, was again calculated with a moderation analysis, with the conditions as independent variable, awareness towards IPV as moderator, and willingness to help as dependent variable. According to the results, there is a significant interaction effect of awareness regarding the relationship between the first and the second stimulus in participants' willingness to help in cases of IPV: participants,

who score relatively low on awareness (2.27) show more willingness to help in the first ($M = 4.84$) compared to the second ($M = 4.43$) condition ($b = -0.36$, 95% CI [- 0.674, 0.039], $t = -2.21$, $p = .028$). Apart from that, no further significant interaction effects of awareness could be obtained (first vs. third: $b = -0.12$, 95% CI [- 0.434, 0.185], $t = -0.79$, $p = .430$), second vs. third: $b = -0.23$, 95% CI [- 0.544, 0.80], $t = -1.46$, $p = .144$). Regarding the control variables, age ($b = 0.12$, 95% CI [0.002, 0.233], $t = 1.20$, $p = .047$) and social desirability ($b = 0.21$, 95% CI [0.105, 0.317], $t = 3.92$, $p < .001$) showed significant effects. All in all, the fifth hypothesis can be partly accepted for the association between the first and the second stimulus but has to be rejected for the associations between the first and the third and the second and the third stimulus.

In order to test the sixth hypothesis, regarding moderating effects of bystander efficacy on the relationship between the conditions and the participants' willingness to intervene, another moderation analysis was conducted. The conditions were used as the independent, bystander efficacy as the moderating, and willingness to intervene as the dependent variable. Results showed no significant interaction effects for bystander efficacy (first vs. second: $b = -0.15$, 95% CI [-0.370, 0.073], $t = -1.32$, $p = .188$, first vs. third: $b = -0.06$, 95% CI [-0.286, 0.165], $t = -0.53$, $p = .597$), second vs. third: $b = -0.09$, 95% CI [-0.318, 0.142], $t = -0.75$, $p = .453$). There were no significant effects of the control variables. Consequently, also the sixth hypothesis has to be rejected.

Exploratory Analyses

Since the analysis of the previously formulated hypotheses that have been deduced from theoretical assumptions, did hardly show the expected results, further exploratory analyses were conducted.

Considering the significant effects social desirability had as a control variable on almost all analysed moderated relationships, it was investigated whether it posed a moderating effect of itself as well. Therefore, a moderation analysis with the three experimental conditions as independent, social desirability as moderating and bystander intervention as dependent variable was conducted. Results showed that participants with a rather low level of social desirability (3.80) showed a significantly higher willingness to intervene when being exposed to the first condition ($M = 4.74$) than to the third one ($M = 4.30$) ($b = 0.48$, 95% CI [0.053, 0.914], $t = 2.21$, $p = .028$). The same could be obtained for the second condition ($M = 5.0$), when compared to the third one ($b = 0.74$, 95% CI [0.300, 1.182], $t = 3.31$, $p = .001$). Only between the first and the second condition, no significant effects could be found ($b = -0.16$, 95% CI [-0.450, 0.128], $t = 1.10$, $p = .274$).

Subsequently, it seemed of interest whether a direct connection between social desirability and willingness to intervene could be obtained. Therefore, a linear regression with social desirability as the independent and willingness to intervene as the dependent variable was conducted. Results showed that people with higher social desirability also showed more readiness to help ($\beta = .24$, $t(258) = 4.04$, $p < .001$).

Furthermore, it was analysed whether the moderating variables gender, attitudes and awareness towards IPV and femicide as well as bystander efficacy, representing important preliminary attitudes and identities, have the potential to directly elicit effects in participants' willingness to intervene, independently from the three stimulus conditions. Therefore, first of all, a t-test with gender as independent and willingness to intervene as dependent variable was conducted. It could be shown that there are no significant differences between the genders, regarding their willingness to intervene in cases of IPV and femicide ($t(258) = -0.33$, $p = .743$, women: $M = 4.94$, $SD = 1.01$, men:

$M = 4.90$, $SD = 0.93$). Next, three linear regressions were conducted, with willingness to intervene as the dependent variable and attitudes, awareness and bystander efficacy as independent variables. Thereby, it could be obtained that participants without IPV-supporting attitudes showed a significantly higher willingness to intervene ($\beta = -0.18$, $t(258) = -2.87$, $p = .004$). Furthermore, participants with a higher awareness towards the topic were more ready to help ($\beta = .38$, $t(258) = 6.68$, $p < .001$). Also, participants with a higher perceived self-efficacy showed more willingness to intervene ($\beta = .61$, $t(258) = 12.23$, $p < .001$).

Discussion and Conclusion

This study's goal was to investigate whether media reporting on IPV and femicide, which contains cues addressing the five stages of the BIM by Latané and Darley (1970) while reducing the interfering psychological processes, that could impede the completion of the stages, can influence recipients' willingness to intervene in cases of IPV. Thereby, it should be detected whether media reporting has the potential to increase people's readiness to help victims of IPV, which is of great importance considering the crucial role bystanders' have in helping victims of IPV escape their situation and thus prevent further femicides (Gracia et al., 2018). Subsequently, it should be shown whether the BIM also works when transmitted through media reporting. Thereby, an important research gap should be addressed, given the lack of media effect studies in the area of femicide research. Since not only media reporting but also attitudes and group identities have the potential to influence people's willingness to intervene, gender, attitudes and awareness towards IPV and femicide, and self-efficacy were included into the research as moderating factors (Banyard, 2008; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Flood & Pease, 2009).

Results showed that media reporting on IPV and femicide containing cues for fostering bystander intervention did not significantly increase participants' willingness to intervene in such situations. These outcomes contradict previous theoretical assumptions which suggested that the media could play an important role in fostering bystanders' readiness to help, when addressing all five steps of the BIM that could keep people from intervening (Latané & Darley, 1970; Nardi-Rodríguez & Paredes-López, 2021; Nickerson et al., 2017). Furthermore, only a moderating effect for low levels of awareness could be obtained, all other factors did not pose any influence on the associations between the articles and the willingness to intervene.

One approach to explain these results could be that although participants were directly addressed in the articles and pointed towards being personally responsible for intervening, diffusion of responsibility, meaning the knowledge that several other recipients also read the coverage and could help as well, might overweigh the appeals in the reporting and consequently the taking over of responsibility and the fulfilment of the five steps of the BIM. However, this assumption has to be examined in further research, in order to find out whether and how fostering bystander intervention with the help of the media could work, for example by taking diffusion of responsibility into close consideration.

Furthermore, this study's dependent variable was the willingness to show a certain behaviour, namely intervening in situations of IPV, and not the behaviour itself. Self-reported behaviour intentions often deviate from real behaviour – due to, among others, social desirability effects (Paulhus, 1991). This means that people want to be seen positively by themselves and by others and therefore answer in a way they think is expected of them and makes them look favourably (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; Paulhus, 1991; Vilar et al., 2020). Since it is approved in society to help others, social desirability

effects could have had a decisive impact on the results of this study (Berkowitz, 1972; Fischer et al., 2014). This is on the one hand supported by the fact that willingness to help was in general quite pronounced in the sample, independent of the three conditions, suggesting that participants rather tended to indicate the socially acknowledged option. Furthermore, this is corroborated by the outcomes of the exploratory analyses of this thesis: A highly significant impact of social desirability on participants' willingness to help could be observed. This means that the more participants answered in a socially desirable way, the more they indicated that they would intervene in a situation of IPV. This is further supported by the outcomes of the exploratory moderation analysis: The articles containing bystander intervention cues have a stronger impact regarding participants' willingness to help on the participants that scored rather lowly on the social desirability scale. Therefore, this allows the assumption that if participants would not answer in a socially desirable way, the articles could pose a higher influence on their readiness to intervene. However, to investigate whether this assumption pertains, conducting an experiment in the tradition of classic bystander intervention experiments would be the best possibility: Real intervention behaviour in situations of IPV should be observed, in order to be able to make reliable statements about the impact of media coverage on bystander intervention behaviour, considering that it is very difficult to separate behavioural intentions from social desirability effects (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011).

Furthermore, all moderating variables did hardly show a moderating effect on the relationship between media reporting and willingness to help, but, apart from gender, did indeed pose direct effects on readiness to intervene. This prompts the assumption that media do have an important impact on people's behaviour, however, apparently not as strong as preliminary attitudes towards the topic that have been intrinsically embedded

into the participants and therefore pose a greater power to influence their behaviour than media coverage. Additionally, keeping in mind that according to EU-wide studies, more than half of the respondents know and have personal contact to a victim of IPV, it can be assumed that actually the majority of recipients has had personal experience with victims of IPV (European Commission, 2016). Personal experience usually tends to influence attitudes and behaviours more strongly than media reporting (Allport, 1954; Gerbner & Gross, 1976). This could therefore be an explanation why these attitudes posed a stronger effect on the participants' behaviour than a news article on femicide did. Furthermore, according to Banyard (2011), situational factors as proposed in the BIM by Latané and Darley (1970), are only one of several factors influencing bystander intervention behaviour in cases of sexual violence, with other aspects like personal characteristics and attitudes or emotional factors posing a strong impact as well. This would also contribute to the explanation why the attitudinal factors did show such strong direct effects on participants' willingness to intervene.

Gender, however, did not significantly influence participants' behavioural intentions. This could be explained by the findings of Flood & Pease (2009): Not gender itself but attitudes towards gender issues are the decisive factor in forming people's behaviour. This is corroborated by the outcome that attitudes towards IPV actually did pose a significant effect on participants' willingness to intervene. Therefore, it can be assumed that attitudes actually outweigh people's gender-based self-categorisation.

Furthermore, results showed that for participants with low awareness towards IPV and femicide, the first stimulus, containing cues for bystander intervention with a simultaneous reduction of the interfering processes, posed a significant influence on their willingness to help, compared to the second stimulus. Maybe especially the reduction of the interfering processes is of particular importance for participants with only little

awareness about IPV. Furthermore, it could also be suggested that participants who were just made aware of the problem are more susceptible for the manipulation of the bystander cues, given the relatively new confrontation with the topic. However, the reason for this specific outcome should be subject to further research.

This study has several limitations, which have to be pointed out. First of all, analyses showed that the three stimuli were not randomly distributed regarding age. Age was then, as a consequence, included into all analyses as a control variable, in order to minimise any interfering effects. However, it is still possible that this limited the outcomes of this study.

Furthermore, the second and third stimulus did not elicit the intended effects in the manipulation check. Although, due to theoretical and conceptional reasons, the analyses with these stimuli were continued it cannot be ruled out completely whether the manipulation worked as intended, which could further limit this study's results. In order to ensure a sufficient manipulation effect of the stimuli in further media effect studies in the area of femicide reporting, it should be tried to use different media outlets and designs. For example, further studies could use a multiple message design with different forms of media reporting like social media posts or videos, checking whether these are better suited to elicit successful manipulation effects in their participants than a newspaper article.

Additionally, the sample was rather lowly educated, which could have also had an impact on the outcomes of this study, although there are no theoretical assumptions proposing an effect of education on the perception of femicide reporting (Backes & Bettoni, 2021). Finally, as was already mentioned, the study measured behavioural intentions rather than factual behaviour, due to ethical and research economic reasons. However, this limits making assumptions of how participants would have really behaved

in an incident of IPV rather than only making statements about how they think they would act in a certain situation.

This limitation prompts the first approach for further research: A study that tests real behaviour in situations of IPV, after the exposure of media articles with bystander intervention cues, should be conducted – of course in adherence to ethical standards. Furthermore, this study only tested news articles on their potential to foster bystander intervention – this should be expanded to other forms of media that also have the potential to influence people's attitudes and behaviours. Examples for that could be social media posts, videos, films, podcasts, or awareness campaigns, that each approach recipients in a unique way and therefore pose the possibility to influence people differently than news articles do. Additionally, considering the prevalence of people's personal experience with IPV victims, this should be included into further research as well, investigating how experience has an impact on people's attitudes, behaviours and also awareness towards IPV. This leads to another important research approach: As it was suggested by Banyard (2011), a stronger focus on other factors, which could impact bystander behaviour, like attitudes, personal experience, social environment or emotions should be laid.

All in all, this study made an important contribution to the field of IPV and femicide reporting research, considering that it was one of the first studies which investigated media effects of coverage on these topics. Furthermore, it has laid the foundation for further work in this area, especially with a focus on bystander behaviour and whether and how it can be fostered with the help of the media. Further research is necessary in any case in order to better understand how bystander intervention can be increased in cases of IPV, considering its importance in preventing and inhibiting further cases of IPV and femicide. The media have the potential to play an important role in that, considering the powerful role they have in a society. Consequently, with more research

the development of guidelines on how to report on IPV and femicide in a way that increases bystander intervention can be fostered and promoted. Thereby, this could bring the most important goal one step closer: Inhibiting IPV, preventing further femicides and consequently saving the lives of more women.

Literature

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.

Anastasio, P. A., & Costa, D. M. (2004). Twice Hurt: How Newspaper Coverage May Reduce Empathy and Engender Blame for Female Victims of Crime. *Sex Roles*, 51(9–10), 535–542. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-004-5463-7>

Anderson, K. M., & Danis, F. S. (2007). Collegiate Sororities and Dating Violence: An Exploratory Study of Informal and Formal Helping Strategies. *Violence Against Women*, 13(1), 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801206294808>

Ansara, D. L., & Hindin, M. J. (2010). Formal and informal help-seeking associated with women's and men's experiences of intimate partner violence in Canada. *Social Science & Medicine*, 70(7), 1011–1018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.12.009>

Backes, L., & Bettoni, M. (2021). *Alle Drei Tage. Warum Männer Frauen töten und was wir dagegen tun müssen*. Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.

Baldry, A. C., Pacilli, M. G., & Pagliaro, S. (2015). She's Not a Person. . . She's Just a Woman! Infra-Humanization and Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(9), 1567–1582. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514540801>

Baldry, A. C., & Pagliaro, S. (2014). Helping victims of intimate partner violence: The influence of group norms among lay people and the police. *Psychology of Violence*, 4(3), 334–347. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034844>

Bandura, A. (1977a). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>

Bandura, A. (1977b). *Social learning theory*. Prentice Hall.

- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122–147. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social Cognitive Theory of Mass Communication. *Media Psychology*, 3(3), 265–299. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532785XMEP0303_03
- Banyard, V. L. (2008). Measurement and Correlates of Prosocial Bystander Behavior: The Case of Interpersonal Violence. *Violence and Victims*, 23(1), 83–97. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.23.1.83>
- Banyard, V. L. (2011). Who will help prevent sexual violence: Creating an ecological model of bystander intervention. *Psychology of Violence*, 1(3), 216–229. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023739>
- Banyard, V. L., Eckstein, R. P., & Moynihan, M. M. (2010). Sexual Violence Prevention: The Role of Stages of Change. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(1), 111–135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508329123>
- Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2011). Variation in bystander behavior related to sexual and intimate partner violence prevention: Correlates in a sample of college students. *Psychology of Violence*, 1(4), 287–301. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023544>
- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., Cares, A. C., & Warner, R. (2014). How do we know if it works? Measuring outcomes in bystander-focused abuse prevention on campuses. *Psychology of Violence*, 4(1), 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033470>

- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35(4), 463–481. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20159>
- Berkel, L. A., Vandiver, B. J., & Bahner, A. D. (2004). Gender Role Attitudes, Religion, and Spirituality as Predictors of Domestic Violence Attitudes in White College Students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(2), 119–133.
- Berkowitz, L. (1972). Social Norms, Feelings, and Other Factors Affecting Helping and Altruism. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 6, pp. 63–108). Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60025-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60025-8)
- Berns, N. (2001). Degendering the Problem and Gendering the Blame. Political Discourse on Women and Violence. *Sociologist for Women in Society*, 15(2), 262–281.
- Bidlo, O., Englert, C. J., & Reichertz, J. (Eds.). (2012). *Tat-Ort Medien: Die Medien als Akteure und unterhaltsame Aktivierer*. Springer VS.
- Bowes-Sperry, L., & O’Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2005). To Act or not to Act: The Dilemma Faced by Sexual Harassment Observers. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(2), 288–306. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2005.16387886>
- Brosius, H.-B., Haas, A., & Koschel, F. (2016). *Methoden der empirischen Kommunikationsforschung*. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-19996-2>
- Bryant, S. A., & Spencer, G. A. (2003). University Students’ Attitudes About Attributing Blame in Domestic Violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 8.
- Bullock, C. F., & Cubert, J. (2002). Coverage of Domestic Violence Fatalities by Newspapers in Washington State. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17(5), 475–499. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260502017005001>

- Bundeskriminalamt. (2020). *Partnerschaftsgewalt Kriminalstatistische Auswertung – Berichtsjahr* 2020.
https://www.bka.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Publikationen/JahresberichteUndLagebilder/Partnerschaftsgewalt/Partnerschaftsgewalt_2020.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=3
- Burkitt, K. H., & Larkin, G. L. (2008). The Transtheoretical Model in Intimate Partner Violence Victimization: Stage Changes Over Time. *Violence and Victims*, 23(4), 411–431. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.23.4.411>
- Burn, S. M. (2009). A Situational Model of Sexual Assault Prevention through Bystander Intervention. *Sex Roles*, 60(11–12), 779–792. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9581-5>
- Burn, S. M., Aboud, R., & Moyles, C. (2000). The Relationship Between Gender Social Identity and Support for Feminism. *Sex Roles*, 42(11/12), 1081–1089.
- Caprara, G. V., Steca, P., Cervone, D., & Artisticco, D. (2003). The Contribution of Self-Efficacy Beliefs to Dispositional Shyness: On Social-Cognitive Systems and the Development of Personality Dispositions. *Journal of Personality*, 71(6), 943–970. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.7106003>
- Carll, E. K. (2003). News Portrayal of Violence and Women: Implications for Public Policy. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46(12), 1601–1610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764203254616>
- Carlyle, K. E., Orr, C., Savage, M. W., & Babin, E. A. (2014). News Coverage of Intimate Partner Violence: Impact on Prosocial Responses. *Media Psychology*, 17(4), 451–471. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2014.931812>

- Carlyle, K. E., Slater, M. D., & Chakroff, J. L. (2008). Newspaper Coverage of Intimate Partner Violence: Skewing Representations of Risk. *Journal of Communication*, 58(1), 168–186. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2007.00379.x>
- Chabot, H. F., Tracy, T. L., Manning, C. A., & Poisson, C. A. (2009). Sex, Attribution, and Severity Influence Intervention Decisions of Informal Helpers in Domestic Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(10), 1696–1713. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509331514>
- Chng, C. L., & Burke, S. (1999). An Assessment of College Students' Attitudes and Empathy toward rape. *College Student Journal*, 33(4), 573–583.
- Christensen, M. C. (2013). Using Theater of the Oppressed to Prevent Sexual Violence on College Campuses. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 14(4), 282–294. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838013495983>
- Christensen, M. C., & Harris, R. J. (2019). Correlates of Bystander Readiness to Help Among a Diverse College Student Population: An Intersectional Perspective. *Research in Higher Education*, 60(8), 1195–1226. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-018-09544-6>
- Cialdini, R. B., Brown, S. L., Lewis, B. P., Luce, C., & Neuberg, S. L. (1997). Reinterpreting the empathy–altruism relationship: When one into one equals oneness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(3), 481–494. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.3.481>
- Cinquegrana, V., Baldry, A. C., & Pagliaro, S. (2018). Intimate partner violence and bystanders' helping behaviour: An experimental study. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 10(1), 24–35. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JACPR-08-2016-0243>

- Cismaru, M., Jensen, G., & Lavack, A. M. (2010). If the Noise Coming from Next Door were Loud Music, You'd Do Something About It. *Journal of Advertising*, 39(4), 69–82. <https://doi.org/10.2753/JOA0091-3367390405>
- Clarke, A. K., & Lawson, K. L. (2009). Women's Judgments of a Sexual Assault Scenario: The Role of Prejudicial Attitudes and Victim Weight. *Violence and Victims*, 24(2), 248–264. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.24.2.248>
- Cohn, E. S., Dupuis, E. C., & Brown, T. M. (2009). In the Eye of the Beholder: Do Behavior and Character Affect Victim and Perpetrator Responsibility for Acquaintance Rape? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39(7), 1513–1535. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00493.x>
- Conway, M., Pizzamiglio, T., & Mount, L. (1996). Status, Communalities, and Agency: Implications for Stereotypes of Gender and Other Groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(1), 25–38.
- Corradi, C., Marcuello-Servós, C., Boira, S., & Weil, S. (2016). Theories of femicide and their significance for social research. *Current Sociology*, 64(7), 975–995. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392115622256>
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24(4), 349–354. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0047358>
- Cruschwitz, J., & Haentjes, C. (2021). *Femizide*. S. Hirzel Verlag.
- Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8(4, Pt.1), 377–383. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0025589>
- Dawson, M., & Carrigan, M. (2021). Identifying femicide locally and globally: Understanding the utility and accessibility of sex/gender-related motives and

- indicators. *Current Sociology*, 69(5), 682–704.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392120946359>
- Dawson, M., & Piscitelli, A. (2021). Risk Factors in Domestic Homicides: Identifying Common Clusters in the Canadian Context. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(1–2), 781–792. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517729404>
- De Judicibus, M., & McCabe, M. P. (2001). Blaming the Target of Sexual Harassment: Impact of Gender Role, Sexist Attitudes, and Work Role. *Sex Roles*, 44(7/8), 401–417.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Validzic, A., Matoka, K., Johnson, B., & Frazier, S. (1997). Extending the Benefits of Recategorization: Evaluations, Self-Disclosure, and Helping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 33(4), 401–420.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1997.1327>
- Easteal, P., Blatchford, A., Holland, K., & Sutherland, G. (2021). Teaching Journalists About Violence Against Women Best Reportage Practices: An Australian Case Study. *Journalism Practice*, 1–17.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2021.1886866>
- Easteal, P., Holland, K., & Judd, K. (2015). Enduring themes and silences in media portrayals of violence against women. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 48, 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2014.10.015>
- Elisha, E., Idisis, Y., Timor, U., & Addad, M. (2010). Typology of Intimate Partner Homicide: Personal, Interpersonal, and Environmental Characteristics of Men Who Murdered Their Female Intimate Partner. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 54(4), 494–516.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X09338379>

- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43, 51–58.
- Entman, R. M. (2007). Framing Bias: Media in the Distribution of Power. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 163–173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00336.x>
- European Commission. (2016). *Gender-based violence*. Publications Office. <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2838/009088>
- Fairbairn, J., & Dawson, M. (2013). Canadian News Coverage of Intimate Partner Homicide: Analyzing Changes Over Time. *Feminist Criminology*, 8(3), 147–176. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085113480824>
- Fischer, P., Asal, K., & Krueger, J. I. (2013). *Sozialpsychologie für Bachelor: Lesen, Hören, Lernen im Web*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-30272-5>
- Fischer, P., Jander, K., & Krueger, J. I. (2014). *Sozialpsychologie für Bachelor: Lesen, Hören, Lernen im Web*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-30272-5>
- Fischer, P., Krueger, J. I., Greitemeyer, T., Vogrincic, C., Kastenmüller, A., Frey, D., Heene, M., Wicher, M., & Kainbacher, M. (2011). The bystander-effect: A meta-analytic review on bystander intervention in dangerous and non-dangerous emergencies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137(4), 517–537. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023304>
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 878–902. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878>

- Flood, M., & Pease, B. (2009). Factors Influencing Attitudes to Violence Against Women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 10*(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838009334131>
- Franiuk, R., Seefeldt, J. L., & Vandello, J. A. (2008). Prevalence of Rape Myths in Headlines and Their Effects on Attitudes Toward Rape. *Sex Roles, 58*(11–12), 790–801. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9372-4>
- Franklin, C. A., Brady, P. Q., & Ashworth, L. M. (2020). Bystander Behaviors following an Accusation of Rape: The Effect of Relational Distance and Participant Sex on Victim-Centered Intervention. *Journal of School Violence, 19*(3), 292–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2019.1680558>
- Frese, B., Moya, M., & Megías, J. L. (2004). Social Perception of Rape: How Rape Myth Acceptance Modulates the Influence of Situational Factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(2), 143–161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260503260245>
- Frye, V. (2007). The informal social control of intimate partner violence against women: Exploring personal attitudes and perceived neighborhood social cohesion. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35*(8), 1001–1018. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20209>
- Frye, V., Paul, M. M., Todd, M.-J., Lewis, V., Cupid and Jane Coleman, M., Salmon, C., & O’Campo, P. (2012). Informal Social Control of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women: Results From a Concept Mapping Study of Urban Neighborhoods. *Journal of Community Psychology, 40*(7), 828–844. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21493>
- Gainsburg, I., & Earl, A. (2018). Trigger warnings as an interpersonal emotion-regulation tool: Avoidance, attention, and affect depend on beliefs. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 79*, 252–263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2018.08.006>

- Geiger, B., & Wolf, B. (2014). *Gewaltfrei Leben. Verantwortungsvolle Berichterstattung für ein gewaltfreies Leben*. https://www.stark-machen.de/images/dokumente/Service/Interaktives_PDF_Verantwortungsvolle_Berichterstattung_2014.pdf
- Gender Equality Media. (2021). *Nachgezählt: 93 Prozent der Medienberichte verharmlosen Gewalt an Frauen*. <https://genderequalitymedia.org/356tagemedienscreening/>
- Gerber, G. L., Cronin, J. M., & Steigman, H. J. (2004). Attributions of Blame in Sexual Assault to Perpetrators and Victims of Both Genders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(10), 2149–2165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02694.x>
- Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. (1976). Living with television: The violence profile. *Journal of Communication*, 26, 173–199.
- Gillespie, L. K., Richards, T. N., Givens, E. M., & Smith, M. D. (2013). Framing Deadly Domestic Violence: Why the Media’s Spin Matters in Newspaper Coverage of Femicide. *Violence Against Women*, 19(2), 222–245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801213476457>
- Gini, G., Albiero, P., Benelli, B., & Altoè, G. (2008). Determinants of adolescents’ active defending and passive bystanding behavior in bullying. *Journal of Adolescence*, 31(1), 93–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2007.05.002>
- Gleirscher, K. (2017). Femizid – Verhinderung und Prävention in Österreich. *Wiener Interventionsstelle gegen Gewalt in der Familie: Tätigkeitsbericht 2016*, 16–20.
- Gracia, E. (2004). Unreported cases of domestic violence against women: Towards an epidemiology of social silence, tolerance, and inhibition. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 58(7), 536–537. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2003.019604>

- Gracia, E. (2006). Acceptability of domestic violence against women in the European Union: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 60(2), 123–129. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2005.036533>
- Gracia, E. (2014). Intimate partner violence against women and victim-blaming attitudes among Europeans. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 92(5), 380–381. <https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.13.131391>
- Gracia, E., García, F., & Lila, M. (2009). Public Responses to Intimate Partner Violence Against Women: The Influence of Perceived Severity and Personal Responsibility. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 12(2), 648–656. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1138741600002018>
- Gracia, E., & Herrero, J. (2006). Public Attitudes Toward Reporting Partner Violence Against Women and Reporting Behavior. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(3), 759–768. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00288.x>
- Gracia, E., & Lila, M. (2015). *Attitudes towards violence against women in the EU*. FGB-Fondazione Giacomo Brodolini. <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2838/045438>
- Gracia, E., Lila, M., & Santirso, F. A. (2020). Attitudes Toward Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the European Union: A Systematic Review. *European Psychologist*, 25(2), 104–121. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000392>
- Gracia, E., Martín-Fernández, M., Marco, M., Santirso, F. A., Vargas, V., & Lila, M. (2018). The Willingness to Intervene in Cases of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women (WI-IPVAW) Scale: Development and Validation of the Long and Short Versions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1146. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01146>
- Gracia, E., Rodriguez, 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. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01567>
- Gracia, E., & Tomás, J. M. (2014). Correlates of Victim-Blaming Attitudes Regarding Partner Violence Against Women Among the Spanish General Population. *Violence Against Women*, 20(1), 26–41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801213520577>
- Greitemeyer, T., Fischer, P., Kastenmüller, A., & Frey, D. (2006). Civil Courage and Helping Behavior: Differences and Similarities. *European Psychologist*, 11(2), 90–98. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.11.2.90>
- Heath, L., Gordon, M. T., & LeBailly, R. (1981). What Newspapers Tell Us (and Don't Tell Us) about Rape. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 2(4), 48–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/073953298100200407>
- Heppner, C., & Çelebi, D. (2020). Wenn Männer Frauen töten – zum Phänomen des Femizids in Deutschland. *djbZ*, 23(1), 24–26. <https://doi.org/10.5771/1866-377X-2020-1-24>
- Hjarvard, S. (2008). The Mediatization of Society: A Theory of the Media as Agents of Social and Cultural Change. *Nordicom Review*, 29(2), 102–131. <https://doi.org/10.1515/nor-2017-0181>
- Hoefnagels, C., & Zwikker, M. (2001). The Bystander Dilemma and Child Abuse: Extending the Latane and Darley Model to Domestic Violence¹. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31(6), 1158–1183. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb02668.x>
- Hogg, M. A., & Reid, S. A. (2006). Social Identity, Self-Categorization, and the Communication of Group Norms. *Communication Theory*, 16(1), 7–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2006.00003.x>

- Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social Identity and Self-Categorization Processes in Organizational Contexts. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 121–140.
- Hogg, M. A., & Turner, J. C. (1987). Intergroup behaviour, self-stereotyping and the salience of social categories. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 26(4), 325–340. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1987.tb00795.x>
- Jimenez, J. A., & Abreu, J. M. (2003). Race and sex effects on attitudinal perceptions of acquaintance rape. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50(2), 252–256. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.50.2.252>
- Karakashian, L., Walter, M., Christopher, A., & Lucas, T. (2006). Fear of negative evaluation affects helping behavior: The bystander effect revisited. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 8(1), 13–32.
- Katz, J., Pazienza, R., Olin, R., & Rich, H. (2015). That's What Friends Are For: Bystander Responses to Friends or Strangers at Risk for Party Rape Victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(16), 2775–2792. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514554290>
- Kilpatrick, D. G. (2004). What Is Violence Against Women: Defining and Measuring the Problem. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(11), 1209–1234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260504269679>
- Kingsnorth, R. F., & Macintosh, R. C. (2004). Domestic violence: Predictors of victim support for official action. *Justice Quarterly*, 21(2), 301–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820400095821>
- Koepsell, J. K., Kernic, M. A., & Holt, V. L. (2006). Factors That Influence Battered Women to Leave Their Abusive Relationships. *Violence and Victims*, 21(2), 131–147. <https://doi.org/10.1891/vivi.21.2.131>

- Labhardt, D., Holdsworth, E., Brown, S., & Howat, D. (2017). You see but you do not observe: A review of bystander intervention and sexual assault on university campuses. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 35, 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.05.005>
- Laner, M. R., Benin, M. H., & Vitrone, N. A. (2001). Bystander attitudes toward victims of violence: Who's worth helping? *Deviant Behavior*, 22(1), 23–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/016396201750065793>
- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10(3), 215–221. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0026570>
- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* Appleton-Century-Croft.
- Latané, B., & Nida, S. (1981). Ten Years of Research on Group Size and Helping. *Psychological Bulletin*, 89(2), 308–324.
- Latané, B., & Rodin, J. (1969). A lady in distress: Inhibiting effects of friends and strangers on bystander intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 5(2), 189–202. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(69\)90046-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(69)90046-8)
- Leuschner, F., & Rausch, E. (2022). Femizid – Eine Bestandsaufnahme aus kriminologischer Perspektive. *CrimRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.21428/cb6ab371.6bae6e48>
- Levine, M. (1999). Rethinking Bystander Nonintervention: Social Categorization and the Evidence of Witnesses at the James Bulger Murder Trial. *Human Relations*, 52(9), 1133–1155. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679905200902>
- Levine, M., & Cassidy, C. (2010). Groups, Identities, and Bystander Behaviour. How Group Processes Can Be Used To Promote Helping. In S. Stürmer & M. Snyder

- (Eds.), *The Psychology of Prosocial Behavior: Group Processes, Intergroup Relations, and Helping* (pp. 209–223). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Levine, M., Cassidy, C., Brazier, G., & Reicher, S. (2002). Self-Categorization and Bystander Non-intervention: Two Experimental Studies¹. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(7), 1452–1463. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb01446.x>
- Levine, M., & Crowther, S. (2008). The responsive bystander: How social group membership and group size can encourage as well as inhibit bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1429–1439. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012634>
- Levine, M., Prosser, A., Evans, D., & Reicher, S. (2005). Identity and Emergency Intervention: How Social Group Membership and Inclusiveness of Group Boundaries Shape Helping Behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(4), 443–453. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271651>
- Levine, M., & Thompson, K. (2004). Identity, Place, and Bystander Intervention: Social Categories and Helping After Natural Disasters. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 144(3), 229–245. <https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.144.3.229-245>
- Liang, B., Goodman, L., Tummala-Narra, P., & Weintraub, S. (2005). A Theoretical Framework for Understanding Help-Seeking Processes Among Survivors of Intimate Partner Violence. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 36(1–2), 71–84. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-005-6233-6>
- Machackova, H. (2020). Bystander reactions to cyberbullying and cyberaggression: Individual, contextual, and social factors. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 36, 130–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.06.003>

- MacNab, B. R., & Worthley, R. (2008). Self-Efficacy as an Intrapersonal Predictor for Internal Whistleblowing: A US and Canada Examination. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 79(4), 407–421. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9407-3>
- Martín-Fernández, M., Gracia, E., & Lila, M. (2018). Assessing Victim-Blaming Attitudes in Cases of Intimate Partner Violence against Women: Development and Validation of the VB-IPVAW Scale. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 27(3), 133–143. <https://doi.org/10.5093/pi2018a18>
- McCombs, M., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36, 176–187.
- McDonnell, K. A., Burke, J. G., Gielen, A. C., O’Campo, P., & Weidl, M. (2011). Women’s Perceptions of Their Community’s Social Norms Towards Assisting Women Who Have Experienced Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Urban Health*, 88(2), 240–253. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-011-9546-9>
- McMahon, S. (2010). Rape Myth Beliefs and Bystander Attitudes Among Incoming College Students. *Journal of American College Health*, 59(1), 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2010.483715>
- McMahon, S., & Banyard, V. L. (2012). When Can I help? A Conceptual Framework for the Prevention of Sexual Violence Through Bystander Intervention. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 13(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838011426015>
- Meltzer, C. E. (2021). Tragische Einzelfälle? Wie Medien über Gewalt gegen Frauen berichten. *OBS-Arbeitspapier*, 47, 1–80.
- Molotch, H., & Lester, M. (1974). News as Purposive Behavior: On the Strategic Use of Routine Events, Accidents, and Scandals. *American Sociological Review*, 39(1), 101. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2094279>

- Monckton Smith, J. (2020). Intimate Partner Femicide: Using Foucauldian Analysis to Track an Eight Stage Progression to Homicide. *Violence Against Women*, 26(11), 1267–1285. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801219863876>
- Moreno Martín, F., Alvarez, M.-J., Alonso, E. A., & Villanueva, I. F. (2020). Campaigns Against Intimate Partner Violence Toward Women in Portugal: Types of Prevention and Target Audiences. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 29(7), 876–895. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2019.1637990>
- Mudde, A. N., Hoefnagels, C. J., Van Wijnen, L. G. C., & Kremers, S. P. J. (2006). Bystanding an abused child: Testing the applicability of the stages of change construct. *Health Education Research*, 22(1), 128–138. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyl056>
- Nardi-Rodríguez, A., & Paredes-López, N. (2021). How Can We Increase Neighbors' Intention to Report Intimate Partner Violence Against Women During the Pandemic? *Violence Against Women*, 107780122110342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012211034203>
- Nickerson, A. B., Aloe, A. M., Livingston, J. A., & Feeley, T. H. (2014). Measurement of the bystander intervention model for bullying and sexual harassment. *Journal of Adolescence*, 37(4), 391–400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2014.03.003>
- Nickerson, A. B., Feeley, T. H., & Tsay-Vogel, M. (2017). Applying Mass Communication Theory to Bystander Intervention in Bullying. *Adolescent Research Review*, 2(1), 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-016-0030-3>
- O'Campo, P., McDonnell, K., Gielen, A., Burke, J., & Chen, Y. (2002). Surviving physical and sexual abuse: What helps low-income women? *Patient Education*

and Counseling, 46(3), 205–212. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-3991\(01\)00214-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-3991(01)00214-2)

- Pagliaro, S., Pacilli, M. G., Giannella, V. A., Giovannelli, I., Spaccatini, F., & Baldry, A. C. (2021). Legitimizing Intimate Partner Violence: Moral Evaluations, Attribution of Responsibility, and (Reduced) Helping Intentions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(5–6), 2929–2941. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518760611>
- Palazzolo, K. E., & Roberto, A. J. (2011). Media Representations of Intimate Partner Violence and Punishment Preferences: Exploring the Role of Attributions and Emotions. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 39(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2010.536843>
- Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and Control of Response Bias. In *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes* (pp. 17–59). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-590241-0.50006-X>
- Pavlou, M., & Knowles, A. (2001). Domestic violence: Attributions, recommended punishments and reporting behaviour related to provocation by the victim. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 8(1), 76–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13218710109525006>
- Peters, J. (2008). Measuring Myths about Domestic Violence: Development and Initial Validation of the Domestic Violence Myth Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 16(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926770801917780>
- Powell, A., & Webster, K. (2018). Cultures of gendered violence: An integrative review of measures of attitudinal support for violence against women. *Australian & New*

- Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 51(1), 40–57.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0004865816675669>
- Pöyhönen, V., Juvonen, J., & Salmivalli, C. (2010). What Does It Take to Stand Up for the Victim of Bullying?: The Interplay Between Personal and Social Factors. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 56(2), 143–163. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mpq.0.0046>
- Pozzoli, T., & Gini, G. (2010). Active Defending and Passive Bystanding Behavior in Bullying: The Role of Personal Characteristics and Perceived Peer Pressure. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 38(6), 815–827.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-010-9399-9>
- Pozzoli, T., & Gini, G. (2013a). Friend similarity in attitudes toward bullying and sense of responsibility to intervene. *Social Influence*, 8(2–3), 161–176.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15534510.2012.716372>
- Pozzoli, T., & Gini, G. (2013b). Why Do Bystanders of Bullying Help or Not? A Multidimensional Model. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 33(3), 315–340.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431612440172>
- Radford, J., & Russell, D. E. H. (1992). Introduction. In J. Radford & D. E. H. Russell (Eds.), *Femicide. The Politics of Woman Killing* (pp. 3–13). Twayne Publishers.
- Richards, T. N., Gillespie, L. K., & Smith, M. D. (2014). An Examination of the Media Portrayal of Femicide–Suicides: An Exploratory Frame Analysis. *Feminist Criminology*, 9(1), 24–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085113501221>
- Richards, T. N., Kirkland Gillespie, L., & Dwayne Smith, M. (2011). Exploring News Coverage of Femicide: Does Reporting the News Add Insult to Injury? *Feminist Criminology*, 6(3), 178–202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085111409919>

- Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2004). Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations. *Gender & Society*, 18(4), 510–531. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243204265269>
- Scheufele, D. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication*, 20.
- Schrötte, M. (2017). Gewalt in Paarbeziehungen. *Institut für Sozialarbeit und Sozialpädagogik e.V., Geschäftsstelle Zweiter Gleichstellungsbericht der Bundesregierung*. <https://doi.org/10.25595/1364>
- Schuchmann, I., & Steinl, L. (2021). Femizide – Zur strafrechtlichen Bewertung von trennungsbedingten Tötungsdelikten an Intimpartnerinnen. *Kritische Justiz*, 54(3), 312–327. <https://doi.org/10.5771/0023-4834-2021-3-312>
- Shotland, R. L., & Straw, M. K. (1976). Bystander Response to an Assault: When a Man Attacks a Woman. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34(5), 990–999.
- Slaby, R., Wilson-Brewer, R., & DeVos, H. (1994). *Final report for Aggressors, Victims, and Bystanders Project*. Education Development Center.
- Suarez, E., & Gadalla, T. M. (2010). Stop Blaming the Victim: A Meta-Analysis on Rape Myths. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(11), 2010–2035. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509354503>
- Sutherland, G., Easteal, P., Holland, K., & Vaughan, C. (2019). Mediated representations of violence against women in the mainstream news in Australia. *BMC Public Health*, 19(1), 502. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6793-2>
- Swan, S., & Wyer, R. S. (1997). Gender Stereotypes and Social Identity: How Being in the Minority Affects Judgments of Self and Others. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(12), 1265–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672972312004>

- Tajfel, H. (1972). Social Categorization. English Manuscript of “La catégorisation sociale”. In S. Moscovici (Ed.), *Introduction a la Psychologie Sociale* (pp. 272–302). Larousse.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. The Social Psychology of Interpersonal Conflict. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7–24). Nelson-Hall.
- Taylor, C. A., & Sorenson, S. B. (2005). Community-based Norms About Intimate Partner Violence: Putting Attributions of Fault and Responsibility into Context. *Sex Roles*, 53(7–8), 573–589. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-7143-7>
- Taylor, E., Banyard, V., Grych, J., & Hamby, S. (2019). Not All Behind Closed Doors: Examining Bystander Involvement in Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 34(18), 3915–3935. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516673629>
- Taylor, R. (2009). Slain and Slandered: A Content Analysis of the Portrayal of Femicide in Crime News. *Homicide Studies*, 13(1), 21–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088767908326679>
- Temkin, J., Krahe, B., Krahe, P. B., Bronaugh, R. N., Neyers, J., & Pitel, S. (2008). *Sexual Assault and the Justice Gap: A Question of Attitude*.
- Turner, J. C. (1985). Social categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. In E. J. Lawler (Ed.), *Advances in group processes: Theory and research* (pp. 77–122). JAI Press.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Basil Blackwell.

United Nations. (2013). *Vienna Declaration of Femicide*.

[https://www.unodc.org/documents/commissions/CCPCJ/CCPCJ_Sessions/CCP
CJ_22/_E-CN15-2013-NGO1/E-CN15-2013-NGO1_E.pdf](https://www.unodc.org/documents/commissions/CCPCJ/CCPCJ_Sessions/CCP
CJ_22/_E-CN15-2013-NGO1/E-CN15-2013-NGO1_E.pdf)

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2021). *UNODC Research: 2020 saw a woman or girl being killed by someone in their family every 11 minutes*.

https://www.unodc.org/unodc/frontpage/2021/November/unodc-research_-2020-saw-every-11-minutes-a-woman-or-girl-being-killed-by-someone-in-their-family.html

van Gelder, N., Peterman, A., Potts, A., O'Donnell, M., Thompson, K., Shah, N., &

Oertelt-Prigione, S. (2020). COVID-19: Reducing the risk of infection might increase the risk of intimate partner violence. *EClinicalMedicine*, 21, 100348.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100348>

Vilar, R., Milfont, T. L., & Sibley, C. G. (2020). The role of social desirability responding in the longitudinal relations between intention and behaviour. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*,

70, 101457.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2020.101457>

Voith, L. A. (2019). Understanding the Relation Between Neighborhoods and Intimate

Partner Violence: An Integrative Review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 20(3),

385–397. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838017717744>

Walby, S. (2022). What is femicide? The United Nations and the measurement of

progress in complex epistemic systems. *Current Sociology*, 001139212210843.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921221084357>

Waltermaurer, E. (2012). Public Justification of Intimate Partner Violence: A Review of

the Literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 13(3), 167–175.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838012447699>

- Webster, K., Ward, A., Diemer, K., Flood, M., Powell, A., Forster, K., & Honey, N. (2019). Attitudinal support for violence against women: What a population-level survey of the Australian community can and cannot tell us. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 54(1), 52–75. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajs4.56>
- Weiner, B. (1979). A Theory of Motivation for Some Classroom Experiences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71(1), 3–25.
- Weiner, B. (1980). A Cognitive (Attribution)—Emotion—Action Model of Motivated Behavior: An Analysis of Judgments of Help-Giving. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39(2), 186–200.
- Weiner, B. (1995). *Judgements of responsibility: A foundation for a theory of social conduct*. Guilford Press.
- West, A., & Wandrei, M. L. (2002). Intimate Partner Violence: A Model for Predicting Interventions by Informal Helpers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17(9), 972–986. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260502017009004>
- Wijaya, C. N., Roberts, L. D., & Kane, R. T. (2021). Attribution Theory, Bystander Effect and Willingness to Intervene in Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 088626052199794. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260521997945>
- Wischnewski, A. (2018). Femi(ni)zide in Deutschland – ein Perspektivwechsel. *FEMINA POLITICA - Zeitschrift für feministische Politikwissenschaft*, 27(2–2018), 126–134. <https://doi.org/10.3224/feminapolitica.v27i2.10>
- World Health Organisation (Ed.). (2002). *World Report on Violence and Health*. Organisation mondiale de la santé.
- World Health Organization. (2012a). *Understanding and addressing violence against women*. Femicide.

https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/77421/WHO_RHR_12.38_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

World Health Organization. (2012b). *Understanding and addressing violence against women. Intimate Partner Violence.*

https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/77432/WHO_RHR_12.36_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Yllö, K. (1983). Sexual Equality and Violence Against Wives in American States. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 14(1), 67–86.

Yodanis, C. L. (2004). Gender Inequality, Violence Against Women, and Fear: A Cross-National Test of the Feminist Theory of Violence Against Women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19(6), 655–675.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260504263868>

Zeit Online. (2022). *Faesser zu häuslicher Gewalt: Femizide nicht verharmlosen.*
<https://www.zeit.de/news/2022-05/22/faesser-zu-haeuslicher-gewalt-femizide-nicht-verharmlosen>

Appendix

Appendix A: Abstracts

Femicide is a serious problem of today's society. Therefore, measures for its prevention have to be taken. One promising approach for this lies in fostering the intervention of bystanders in situations of intimate partner violence against women with the help of media reporting. Consequently, drawing from the bystander intervention model by Latané and Darley (1970), this thesis was interested in whether media coverage on femicide, containing cues to foster bystander intervention while reducing potential interfering processes, could increase participants' willingness to help in cases of intimate partner violence, compared to reporting containing bystander cues without simultaneous reduction of the interfering processes, and coverage without any cues. Furthermore, gender, attitudes and awareness towards intimate partner violence and femicide, as well as self-efficacy were included into the research as moderating factors, to account for interindividual differences. An experimental study was conducted, in order to investigate the research interest. Results showed no significant effects of the reporting on participants' willingness to help in a case of intimate partner violence, contrary to previous theoretical assumptions. Furthermore, only a significant interaction effect of awareness could be obtained, all other moderations did not show significant results. However, exploratory analyses showed a significant moderation effect of social desirability and significant direct effects of the moderator variables on participants' willingness to help. Theoretical implications and further research directions are being discussed and proposed.

Femizid stellt ein wichtiges Problem der heutigen Gesellschaft dar. Aufgrund dessen müssen Maßnahmen zur Prävention von Femiziden gefunden und ergriffen werden. Einen vielversprechenden Ansatz dafür bildet die Förderung von Bystander-Interventions-Verhalten in Situationen von Partnerschaftsgewalt gegen Frauen mit Hilfe von Medienberichterstattung. Diese Masterarbeit war folglich daran interessiert zu untersuchen, ob – anhand des Bystander-Interventions-Model von Latané und Darley (1970) – Medienberichterstattung über Femizid, die Hinweise zur Förderung von Bystander-Intervention mit einer gleichzeitigen Reduktion potentieller Störfaktoren enthält, die Bereitschaft von Teilnehmer:innen erhöhen könnte, in Situation von Partnergewalt einzugreifen, verglichen mit Medienberichterstattung, die potentielle Störfaktoren nicht reduziert oder solcher, die keine Hinweise enthält. Des Weiteren wurden Geschlecht, Einstellung und Bewusstsein gegenüber Femizid und Partnerschaftsgewalt sowie Selbstwirksamkeit als moderierende Faktoren in die Forschung miteinbezogen, um interindividuellen Unterschieden Rechnung zu tragen. Zur Untersuchung des Forschungsinteresses wurde eine Experimentalstudie durchgeführt. Die Ergebnisse konnten keine signifikanten Effekte der Medienberichterstattung auf die Bereitschaft der Teilnehmer:innen, in Partnergewaltsituationen einzugreifen, zeigen, was im Widerspruch zu vorherigen theoretischen Annahmen steht. Zudem konnte nur ein signifikanter Interaktionseffekt von Bewusstsein gegenüber Femizid und Partnerschaftsgewalt gefunden werden, alle anderen Moderationen waren nicht signifikant. Explorative Analysen zeigten jedoch einen signifikanten Moderationseffekt von sozialer Erwünschtheit und signifikante direkte Effekte der Moderatorvariablen auf die Bereitschaft der Teilnehmer:innen, einzugreifen. Theoretische Implikationen und weitere Forschungsansätze werden diskutiert.

Appendix B: Stimuli

Femizid – ein gefährliches Problem der Gesellschaft

Der gefährlichste Ort ist für Frauen nicht der verlassen Park oder die dunkle Gasse. Die meisten Frauen werden zu Hause von der Person geschlagen, misshandelt oder im schlimmsten Fall sogar getötet, die ihnen am nächsten steht: Ihrem Partner. In Deutschland versucht jeden Tag ein Mann, seine Partnerin zu töten, jeden dritten Tag stirbt eine Frau durch die Hand ihres Partners. Diese Frauen sind unsere Freundinnen, Nachbarinnen, Kolleginnen und Bekannten – denn der sogenannte Femizid, also der Mord an einer Frau durch ihren Intimpartner, durchzieht alle gesellschaftlichen Schichten. Das macht Femizide zu einem bedeutenden Problem der Gesellschaft, das jeden etwas angeht. Um Frauen, die von ihren Partnern geschlagen und misshandelt werden, zu helfen und somit weitere Femizide zu verhindern, ist die Hilfe und das Einschreiten jedes einzelnen dringend gefragt. Da häusliche Gewalt oft hinter verschlossenen Türen stattfindet, ist es umso wichtiger, dass Sie genau hinschauen und Verantwortung zeigen, wenn Sie in Ihrem Umfeld Anzeichen von Partnerschaftsgewalt bemerken. Dazu zählen zum Beispiel lautstarke Streits, körperliche Anzeichen von Gewalt, wie z. B. blaue Flecken oder Wunden, die häufig versteckt werden, Abhängigkeit vom Partner oder ein stark kontrollierendes und einschränkendes Verhalten des Mannes. Wenn Sie solche Anzeichen bei Frauen in Ihrer Umgebung bemerken, können Sie ihr helfen und sind persönlich verantwortlich dafür, einzuschreiten.

Da es häufig sehr schwierig für Opfer von Partnerschaftsgewalt ist, sich ohne Unterstützung von ihrem Partner zu befreien, müssen Sie sie dabei unterstützen. Es ist gar nicht so schwer, einer betroffenen Frau zu helfen. Sprechen Sie die Frau auf Ihre Situation an und zeigen Sie ihr, dass Sie ihr helfen und Sie unterstützen möchten. Informieren Sie sich über Adressen von Frauenhäusern in Ihrer Umgebung und bieten Sie der Betroffenen an, gemeinsam mit ihr ein solches aufzusuchen und sie bei der Trennung von Ihrem Partner zu unterstützen. Schreiten Sie ein, wenn Sie Zeuge eines gewaltsamen Streits werden – am besten, indem Sie die Polizei rufen. Wenn Sie sich unsicher sind, aber Partnerschaftsgewalt in Ihrer Umgebung vermuten, rufen Sie immer die Polizei – die Beamten wissen meist, was zu tun ist. Es ist besser, die Beamten einmal zu oft anzurufen als gar nicht. Mit einem kleinen Anruf können Sie betroffenen Frauen sehr viel weiterhelfen, sich von ihren gewalttätigen Partnern zu befreien und können somit ohne viel persönlichen Aufwand dabei helfen, ein Leben zu retten. Schieben Sie dabei die Verantwortung nicht auf andere ab – sobald Sie etwas bemerken, sind Sie persönlich dafür zuständig, zu handeln und zu helfen. Dabei können Sie nichts falsch machen – außer nicht einzuschreiten. Viele Betroffene berichten, dass sie sich ohne die Hilfe von außenstehenden Personen wie Ihnen niemals aus ihrer Notsituation hätten befreien können – nehmen Sie sich ein Beispiel daran und retten Sie Leben!

Stimulus 1: Bystander intervention cues with simultaneous reduction of the interfering processes

Femizid – ein gefährliches Problem der Gesellschaft

Der gefährlichste Ort ist für Frauen nicht der verlassen Park oder die dunkle Gasse. Die meisten Frauen werden zu Hause von der Person geschlagen, misshandelt oder im schlimmsten Fall sogar getötet, die ihnen am nächsten steht: Ihrem Partner. In Deutschland versucht jeden Tag ein Mann, seine Partnerin zu töten, jeden dritten Tag stirbt eine Frau durch die Hand ihres Partners. Diese Frauen sind unsere Freundinnen, Nachbarinnen, Kolleginnen und Bekannten – denn der sogenannte Femizid, also der Mord an einer Frau durch ihren Intimpartner, durchzieht alle gesellschaftlichen Schichten. Das macht Femizide zu einem bedeutenden Problem der Gesellschaft, das jeden etwas angeht. Um Frauen, die von ihren Partnern geschlagen und misshandelt werden, zu helfen und somit weitere Femizide zu verhindern, ist die Hilfe und das Einschreiten jedes einzelnen dringend gefragt. Da häusliche Gewalt oft hinter verschlossenen Türen stattfindet, ist es umso wichtiger, dass Sie genau hinschauen und Verantwortung zeigen, wenn Sie in Ihrem Umfeld Anzeichen von Partnerschaftsgewalt bemerken. Dazu zählen zum Beispiel lautstarke Streits, körperliche Anzeichen von Gewalt, wie z. B. blaue Flecken oder Wunden, die häufig versteckt werden, Abhängigkeit vom Partner oder ein stark kontrollierendes und einschränkendes Verhalten des Mannes. Wenn Sie solche Anzeichen bei Frauen in Ihrer Umgebung bemerken, können Sie ihr helfen und sind persönlich verantwortlich dafür, einzuschreiten.

Da es häufig sehr schwierig für Opfer von Partnerschaftsgewalt ist, sich ohne Unterstützung von ihrem Partner zu befreien, müssen Sie sie dabei unterstützen. Es ist gar nicht so schwer, einer betroffenen Frau zu helfen. Sprechen Sie die Frau auf Ihre Situation an und zeigen Sie ihr, dass Sie ihr helfen und Sie unterstützen möchten. Informieren Sie sich über Adressen von Frauenhäusern in Ihrer Umgebung und bieten Sie der Betroffenen an, gemeinsam mit ihr ein solches aufzusuchen und sie bei der Trennung von Ihrem Partner zu unterstützen. Schreiten Sie ein, wenn Sie Zeuge eines gewaltsamen Streits werden – am besten, indem Sie die Polizei rufen. Wenn Sie sich unsicher sind, aber Partnerschaftsgewalt in Ihrer Umgebung vermuten, rufen Sie immer die Polizei – die Beamten wissen meist, was zu tun ist. Es ist besser, die Beamten einmal zu oft anzurufen als gar nicht. Mit einem kleinen Anruf können Sie betroffenen Frauen sehr viel weiterhelfen, sich von ihren gewalttätigen Partnern zu befreien und können somit ohne viel persönlichen Aufwand dabei helfen, ein Leben zu retten.

Stimulus 2: Bystander Intervention Cues

Femizid – ein gefährliches Problem der Gesellschaft

Der gefährlichste Ort ist für Frauen nicht der verlassene Park oder die dunkle Gasse. Die meisten Frauen werden zu Hause von der Person geschlagen, misshandelt oder im schlimmsten Fall sogar getötet, die ihnen am nächsten steht: Ihrem Partner. In Deutschland versucht jeden Tag ein Mann, seine Partnerin zu töten, jeden dritten Tag stirbt eine Frau durch die Hand ihres Partners. Diese Frauen sind unsere Freundinnen, Nachbarinnen, Kolleginnen und Bekannten – denn der sogenannte Femizid, also der Mord an einer Frau durch ihren Intimpartner, durchzieht alle gesellschaftlichen Schichten. Das macht Femizide zu einem bedeutenden Problem der Gesellschaft. Um Frauen, die von ihren Partnern geschlagen und misshandelt werden, zu helfen und somit weitere Femizide zu verhindern, ist auch die Hilfe und das Einschreiten des Umfelds wichtig. Auch Außenstehende können dazu beitragen, die Situation für Betroffene zu verbessern und offizielle Stellen dabei unterstützen, auf Partnerschaftsgewalt aufmerksam zu werden. Anzeichen für Partnerschaftsgewalt sind zum Beispiel lautstarke Streits, körperliche Anzeichen von Gewalt, also blaue Flecken oder Wunden, die häufig versteckt werden, Abhängigkeit vom Partner oder ein stark kontrollierendes und einschränkendes Verhalten des Mannes.

In solchen Situationen sollte eingegriffen werden, um betroffenen Frauen zu helfen und sie aus ihrer gewalttätigen Beziehung zu befreien, beispielsweise mit Hilfe der Polizei oder Frauenhäusern. Dadurch können Leben gerettet werden.

Stimulus 3: No Cues

Appendix C: Questionnaire

Start of Block: Begrüßungsblock

Q35

Q12

Liebe Teilnehmende,

vielen Dank, dass Sie uns bei unserer Studie des Instituts für Publizistik und Kommunikationswissenschaft der Universität Wien unterstützen.

In dieser Studie geht es um **Femizid und dessen Darstellung in den Medien**. Unter einem Femizid versteht man, dass ein Mann seine weibliche (Ex-)Partnerin tötet. Diese Studie möchte dazu beitragen, die Berichterstattung über dieses wichtige Thema zu verbessern.

Wir freuen uns, dass Sie dazu bereit sind, uns bei diesem Vorhaben zu unterstützen. Uns interessieren dabei Ihre persönlichen Einschätzungen. Dabei gibt es keine richtigen und falschen Antworten.

Die Befragung wird ca. **10 Minuten** dauern. Bitte nehmen Sie sich ausreichend Zeit, lesen Sie sich die Fragen und Antwortmöglichkeiten genau durch und beantworten Sie alle Seiten des Fragebogens nacheinander. Um möglichst genaue Ergebnisse erzielen zu können, bitten wir Sie, den gesamten Fragebogen vollständig auszufüllen.

Informationen zum Datenschutz:

Die Daten werden ausschließlich für wissenschaftliche Forschungszwecke verwendet. Die Auswertung erfolgt zu **jederzeit anonym, Rückschlüsse auf einzelne Befragte sind nicht möglich**.

Bitte beachten Sie: Die Teilnahme an der Studie ist freiwillig. Ihre Daten werden zu jeder Zeit streng vertraulich und anonym behandelt.

Vielen Dank für Ihre Unterstützung!

Datenschutz Ich habe die Datenschutzerklärung gelesen und stimme zu, an der Studie teilzunehmen.

☐ Ja, ich stimme zu. (1)

☐ Nein, ich lehne ab. (2)

End of Block: Begrüßungsblock

Start of Block: Trigger-Block

Q14

Wie bereits erwähnt, werden Sie in diesem Fragebogen auf Fragen und Inhalte zu sensiblen Themen stoßen. Dabei handelt es sich unter anderem um Fragen zu ihrem Geschlecht und ihrer politischen Einstellung. Außerdem werden sie mit den Themen **Femizid und häusliche Gewalt** konfrontiert. Wenn diese Themen bei Ihnen ungewollte Erinnerungen oder Emotionen hervorrufen, überlegen Sie sich, ob Sie an der Umfrage teilnehmen möchten.

Wenn Sie sich unwohl fühlen, können Sie den Fragebogen jederzeit abbrechen. Sollten Sie selbst betroffen sein, wenden Sie sich an die Polizei oder kontaktieren Sie das Hilfetelefon [Gewalt gegen Frauen](#).

Unter der kostenlosen und anonymen Hotline 08000 116 016 erhalten Sie Hilfe von Berater:innen, die schon in vielen Fällen Auswege aus schwierigen Situationen aufzeigen konnten. Scheuen Sie sich nicht, Hilfe zu holen und lassen Sie sich unterstützen, um aus einer gewalttätigen Beziehung auszubrechen.

Q37 Möchten Sie trotzdem an der Studie teilnehmen?

- ☐ Ja, ich möchte an der Studie teilnehmen. (1)
- ☐ Nein, ich möchte die Studie lieber abbrechen. (2)

End of Block: Trigger-Block

Start of Block: Demographie-Block

Q16 Bevor wir mit der Befragung beginnen, haben wir einige Fragen zu Ihrer Person.

Geschlecht Mit welchem Geschlecht identifizieren Sie sich?

- ☐ männlich (1)
- ☐ weiblich (2)
- ☐ divers (4)
-

Alter Wie alt sind Sie?

- ☐ 18-34 (6)
- ☐ 35-44 (7)
- ☐ 45-54 (8)
- ☐ 55+ (9)
-

Bildung Was ist der höchste Bildungsabschluss, über den Sie verfügen?

- ☐ Kein Schulabschluss (1)
- ☐ Mittlerer Schulabschluss (Qualifizierter Abschluss, Mittlere Reife etc.) (2)
- ☐ Abitur, Fachabitur (3)
- ☐ Hochschulabschluss, Fachhochschulabschluss (4)
-

Pol_Orient Die politische Orientierung wird oft in links und rechts unterteilt. Bitte ordnen Sie sich auf folgendem politischen Spektrum ein.

ganz links ganz rechts Ich möchte
nicht antworten

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Politische Orientierung ()



Page Break

Soc_Des Bitte geben Sie bei folgenden Aussagen an, inwiefern Sie ihnen zustimmen.

	Überhaupt nicht = 1 (37)	2 (38)	3 (39)	4 (40)	5 (41)	6 (42)	Voll und ganz = 7 (43)
Egal mit wem ich spreche, ich bin immer ein:e gute:r Zuhörer:in. (1)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ich habe noch nie absichtlich etwas gesagt, um die Gefühle von jemand anderem zu verletzen. (2)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ich bin nie davon genervt, wenn mich jemand fragt, einen Gefallen zu erwidern. (3)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ich habe nie das Gefühl, jemanden zurechtweisen zu müssen. (4)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Wenn ich etwas nicht weiß, habe ich überhaupt kein Problem damit, das zuzugeben. (5)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q28 Timing

First Click (1)

Last Click (2)

Page Submit (3)

Click Count (4)

End of Block: Demographie-Block

Start of Block: Moderatoren-Block

Partnern über
Dinge
diskutieren und
streiten. (6)

Wenn eine
Frau nicht
geschlagen
werden
möchte, kann
sie ihren
Partner auch
einfach
verlassen. (7)



Page Break

Wunsch, von ihrem Partner dominiert zu werden. (14)	
Frauen lösen die meiste Familiengewalt aus. (15)	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Q29 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

Gewalt und Femizide zu lernen. (6)							
Ich habe mich vor Kurzem über häusliche Gewalt und Femizide informiert. (7)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ich bin gerade aktiv dabei, mich über häusliche Gewalt und Femizide zu informieren. (8)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ich habe ehrenamtlich bei Projekten mitgearbeitet, die sich gegen häusliche Gewalt und Femizide einsetzen, z.B. in einem Frauenhaus. (9)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Es ist die Aufgabe von offiziellen Stellen, sich Gedanken über Femizide und häusliche Gewalt zu machen. (11)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Bisher habe ich mich noch nicht weiter über Femizide und häusliche Gewalt informiert. (12)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

hinterher zu
pfeifen. (5)

Ich glaube
nicht, dass ich
einen Mann
davon abhalten
könnte, seine
Partnerin zu
misshandeln.
(6)

Ich würde es
mir zutrauen,
einem Freund
zu sagen, dass
er aufhören
soll, seine
Partnerin zu
beleidigen. (7)

Ich glaube,
dass meine
Freunde auf
mich hören
würden, wenn
ich mich gegen
häusliche
Gewalt und
Femizid
ausspreche.
(8)

Ich traue es
mir zu, einem
Mann zu
sagen, dass er
sich einer Frau
gegenüber
unangemessen
verhält. (9)

Es wäre zu
schwierig für
mich, einen
Fremden damit
zu
konfrontieren,
dass er sich
seiner
Partnerin
gegenüber
unangemessen
verhalten hat.
(10)

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Q30 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

Page Break

Q17 Im Folgenden wird Ihnen ein Zeitungsartikel zum Thema Femizid angezeigt. Es ist sehr wichtig für die Ergebnisse der Studie, dass Sie sich diesen genau und aufmerksam durchlesen.

End of Block: Moderatoren-Block

Start of Block: All Cues

Q18

Q19 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

End of Block: All Cues

Start of Block: BI Cues

Q19

Q20 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

End of Block: BI Cues

Start of Block: No Cues

Q21

Q22 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

End of Block: No Cues

Start of Block: DV-Block

Attention Check Mit was beschäftigte sich der eben gelesene Zeitungsartikel?

- ☐ Femizid (1)
 - ☐ Wirtschaftskriminalität (2)
 - ☐ Corona (3)
 - ☐ Klimawandel (4)
-

Q31 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

Page Break



ByIn Im Folgenden lesen Sie einige Aussagen, bei denen Sie bitte angeben sollen, wie wahrscheinlich es ist, dass Sie in den beschriebenen Situationen entsprechend handeln würde. Bitte fühlen Sie sich dazu bestmöglich in die jeweilige Situation ein und antworten Sie ganz ehrlich, wie Sie handeln würden.

[illegible]

Wenn eine Frau
von ihrem
Partner auf der
Straße wegrennt,
würde ich den
Mann stoppen.
(6)

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Wenn ein Mann
in einem
Supermarkt
seine Partnerin
beleidigt, würde
ich die Situation
ignorieren. (7)

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Wenn ich
herausfinden
würde, dass eine
Nachbarin von
ihrem Mann
geschlagen wird,
würde ich ihr
raten, ihn
anzuzeigen. (8)

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Wenn ein Mann
in einer Bar seine
Partnerin
anschreit, würde
ich einschreiten,
um der Frau zu
helfen. (9)

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Wenn ich herausfinden würde, dass eine Frau in meiner Nachbarschaft häufig von ihrem Partner geschlagen wird, ihn aber nicht anzeigen möchte, würde ich die Polizei rufen. (10)

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Wenn ein Mann
auf der Straße
das Handy seiner
Partnerin nimmt
und auf den
Boden wirft, gehe
ich zu ihm hin
und stelle ihn für
seine Tat zur
Rede. (11)

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Wenn ich in
meiner Wohnung

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

höre, wie ein
Mann seine
Partnerin
anschreit und
bedroht, gehe ich
hin und
beschütze die
Frau. (12)

Wenn eine Frau
in eine Bäckerei
kommt, weint
und sagt, dass
ihr Partner sie
verfolgt und
bedroht, würde
ich die Polizei
rufen. (13)

Wenn ein Paar in
meiner
Nachbarschaft
nachts streitet
und sich
anschreit, würde
ich hingehen und
klingeln, um zu
fragen, ob alles
in Ordnung ist.
(14)



würde ich die
beiden
zurechtweisen.
(19)

Wenn ein
Mann seine
Partnerin auf
der Straße zu
Boden drückt,
würde ich
einschreiten
und
versuchen, ihn
aufzuhalten.
(20)

Wenn eine
Frau in der
Nachbarschaft
mir erzählt,
dass ihr
Partner sie
bedroht, weil
sie ihn
verlassen
möchte, würde
ich ihr raten,
zur Polizei zu
gehen. (21)

Wenn eine
Frau in einer
Bar von ihrem
Partner
geschlagen
wird und ihn
nicht anzeigen
möchte, würde
ich die Polizei
rufen. (22)

Wenn ein Paar
in einem
Supermarkt
einen heftigen
Streit hat,
würde ich
etwas sagen,
um die
Situation zu
stoppen. (23)

Wenn ich ein
Paar in der
Nachbarschaft
heftig streiten
und sich
anschreien
höre, würde
ich die beiden



ignorieren.
(24)

Wenn ein
Mann seine
Partnerin in
einer Bar
schlägt und
sich direkt
danach bei ihr
entschuldigt,
würde ich die
Situation
ignorieren.

(25)

Wenn eine
Frau mir in
einer Bar
erzählt, dass
ihr Partner sie
schlägt, würde
ich ihr raten,
die Polizei zu
rufen. (26)

Wenn ein
Paar, das
offensichtlich
zu viel
getrunken hat,
in einer Bar
anfängt, sich
zu schubsen
und zu
schlagen,
würde ich die
Polizei rufen.
(27)

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Q34 Timing

First Click (1)

Last Click (2)

Page Submit (3)

Click Count (4)

Page Break

MC Wenn Sie an den Zeitungsartikel denken, den Sie im Rahmen dieser Studie gelesen haben: Inwiefern stimmen Sie den folgenden Aussagen zu?

	Überhaupt nicht = 1 (25)	2 (26)	3 (27)	4 (28)	5 (29)	6 (30)	Voll und ganz = 7 (31)
Sie wurden in dem Artikel direkt angesprochen, in einem Fall von Partnerschaftsgewalt einzugreifen. (1)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Im Artikel wurde darauf eingegangen, dass viele Betroffene berichteten, dass sie sich nur mit Hilfe von Außenstehenden aus ihrer Situation befreien konnten. (2)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Der Artikel ist darauf eingegangen, dass Sie als Außenstehende:r nichts falsch machen können - außer nicht zu helfen. (3)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Der Artikel ist explizit darauf eingegangen, dass Sie dafür verantwortlich sind, in Fällen von Partnerschaftsgewalt einzugreifen und zu helfen. (4)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

End of Block: DV-Block

Start of Block: Debriefing-Block

Debrief **Vielen Dank für Ihre Teilnahme!**

Die Studie sollte herausfinden, welchen Einfluss verschiedene Arten von Berichterstattung über Femizid auf die Leser:innen und deren Hilfeverhalten in Fällen von häuslicher Gewalt und Femizid haben. Dabei waren Sie Teil eines Online-Experiments. **Der Zeitungsartikel, den Sie gesehen haben, wurde von uns erstellt und so nie in einer Zeitung veröffentlicht.** Wir entschuldigen uns für die Täuschung.

Das Ziel dieser Studie ist es, die Berichterstattung über Femizide zu verbessern und damit betroffenen Frauen leichter Hilfe zukommen zu lassen.

Sollten Sie selbst betroffen sein, wenden Sie sich an die Polizei oder kontaktieren Sie das Hilfetelefon Gewalt gegen Frauen. Unter der kostenlosen und anonymen Hotline 08000 116 016 erhalten Sie Hilfe von Berater:innen, die schon in vielen Fällen Auswege aus schwierigen Situationen aufzeigen konnten. Scheuen Sie sich nicht, Hilfe zu holen und lassen Sie sich unterstützen, um aus einer gewalttätigen Beziehung auszubrechen.

Vielen Dank, dass Sie uns bei diesem Vorhaben unterstützt haben!

Q24 Möchten Sie zu dieser Befragung oder zum besseren Verständnis Ihrer Antworten noch etwas anmerken? Bitte schreiben Sie kurz ein paar Stichworte dazu.

End of Block: Debriefing-Block
