



BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

A STUDY ON SWEDISH AUTHORITIES' PERCEPTIONS ON GENDER OF OFFENDERS AND VICTIMS OF INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

MARIA PUUR

BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

A STUDY ON SWEDISH AUTHORITIES' PERCEPTIONS ON GENDER OF OFFENDERS AND VICTIMS OF INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

MARIA PUUR

Puur M. Behind Closed Doors. A Study on Swedish Authorities' Perceptions on Gender of Offenders and Victims of Intimate Partner Violence. *Degree project in criminology 15 credits*. Malmö University: Faculty of Health and Society, Department of criminology, 2019.

Intimate partner violence is a global issue that occur in both opposite and same-sex relationships, with both male and female offenders, but also with male and female victims. The police and social services are the two main authorities in Sweden to evaluate the situation of intimate partner violence, identify the offender, examine the probability of future violence, and to provide victim support. The purpose of this paper is to investigate Swedish authorities' perceptions regarding intimate partner violence from a gender perspective, using an experimental vignette technique. The study examines the perception of stereotypical and non-stereotyped gender and gender roles through various constructs and aims to explore how offenders and victims of intimate partner violence is perceived by police employees and social workers. The participants age, gender, education background, and work experience of intimate partner violence is also analysed in combination with variances of perception regarding offender and victim culpability, offender risk and the severity of the incident. The result of the study follows previous literature where male-to-female intimate partner violence is perceived as more severe, and male offenders as more culpable, though the differences are minor. Further does this study indicate only small differences between perceptions of gender between police employees and social workers.

Keywords: gender differences, IPV, offender, perceptions, police, same-sex relationships, social worker, victim

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to begin by thanking Viveka at the section for domestic violence with the Police in Malmö for the opportunity to write this thesis. I would also like to thank all the participants, both police employees and social workers, for your time and all the important work that you do every day.

I want to express a special gratitude to my supervisor, Klara Svalin, for your wonderful commitment and support that has empowered me to carry out all the work with this paper.

But above all I want to thank my beautiful family for being there always.

CONTENT

INTRODUCTION	5
Aim and research questions	6
BACKGROUND	6
Offending and victimisation	6
Perceptions of intimate partner violence	8
Problematic and conservative attitudes towards intimate partner violence	8
Perceptions of offenders and victims	8
Police perceptions	9
METHOD	10
Data	10
Procedure	11
Sample	11
Ethical considerations	12
Materials	12
Vignettes	13
Questions	13
Measures	14
Variables	14
RESULTS	15
Swedish authorities' perceptions	15
Perceptions of offenders and victims	15
Participants characteristics and their perceptions	17
DISCUSSION	18
Result discussion	18
Methodology discussion and study limitations	18
Conclusions	20
REFERENCES	21
Appendix I	23
Appendix II	24
Example 1	24
Example 2	24
Appendix III	25
Appendix IV	26
Appendix V	27
Appendix VI	28
Appendix VII	29

INTRODUCTION

Violence comes in many different forms and variations, it differs between various contexts and depends on who exercises it and against whom, when it is exercised and how and why (Nilsson & Lövkrona, 2015). Most violence is considered a criminal act, but vary between time periods, society and cultures (ibid). Violence exists within different dimensions and the concept is multifaceted and often involves a thin line between what is public and private and between what is legitimate and illegitimate (Ray, 2018).

Violence within intimate relationships is a global social issue that every day affect many women, men and children all over the world. A meta-analysis, containing data from 81 countries, shows an average global lifetime prevalence of intimate partner violence (IPV) against women at 30 percent (Devries et al, 2013). The prevalence varies within the globe and the occurrence for western Europe, including Sweden, is lower, at 19.3 percent (ibid). Though, giving the National Council for Crime Prevention in Sweden (NCCP), the lifetime victimisation of IPV, is 25.5 percent for women and 16.8 percent for men aged 16-79 years old (NCCP, 2014). According the last made report of intimate partner violence in Sweden, almost as many males, 6.7 percent, as females, 7.0 percent, reported being victimized during one year (NCCP, 2014), and this is similar to other countries as well (Russell, 2018). Some minor studies show that IPV also occur within LGBT¹-relationships (NCCP, 2017, Russell, 2018), and that it is a growing problem (Baker et al, 2013).

Self-reported victimisation seems to be stable over time and police reports of IPV appears to be increasing, still, the dark number of victimizations is still thought to remain high (NCCP, 2014). The high dark number may be a consequence due to the fact that IPV is a crime type that is less visible since it has a tendency to occur in a private context or setting (de Vogel & Nicholls, 2016). Self-reported victimisation shows that the number of women reporting IPV to the authorities is 4.9 percent, while the equivalent share of men is only 2.9 percent (NCCP, 2014). Studies on women's victimisation of IPV has revealed reasons for not reporting an incident to be because of an wish to quiet down what has happened and to keep it private, or because they want to protect the offender (ibid). Other reasons may be that they are afraid of the consequences of an police report being filed, but commonly also that they wait with reporting to the police, hoping that the situation will get better (ibid).

IPV is a broad term since the crimes can be quite diverse (Fisher et al, 2016), and therefore it can take many different forms, including physical assault, rape and sexual violence, psychological or emotional violence, but also torture, financial abuse, and control of movement and social contacts (Ray, 2018). Even though the term is so varied, each victimization entails deliberate harm that are being inflicted on the victim by a current or former intimate partner (Fisher et al, 2016). Several studies reveal that it is less common to report crimes where the offender is known or related to the victim, compared to when the offender is unknown (ibid).

Research on IPV tend to mainly focus on male-to-female IPV that occurs in opposite-sex relationships, even though there are studies which has showed that is not always the case (NCCP, 2014). Contemporary research has started to broaden

¹ An initialism that stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender.

its perspective and studies on female-to-male IPV are today being conducted to a greater degree to extend our knowledge (Storey & Strand, 2013). Still, there is limited knowledge on female-to-male IPV and IPV that occurs within LGBT-relationships (NCCP, 2017). This can lead to limitations regarding how the justice system and other authorities in society are managing and preventing IPV, since the methods usually are based on male-to-female violence (ibid). The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, therefore, highlights the importance of future studies regarding gender differences within IPV and the importance of the justice system and other authorities, to review their own beliefs about who it is that offend, and who it is that becomes victimized by IPV (ibid). Society and its representatives tend to perceive some victims of IPV as more worthy than others (Sorenson & Thomas, 2009), and therefore it is important that police employees and social workers, who has a mission to see to, prevent and react against IPV, are aware of their own views regarding victims and offenders and the potential effect that these views can have in their work with IPV. Hence their perceptions are important in the work with both risk assessment and victim support.

Aim and research questions

The purpose of this study is to investigate the Swedish authorities' perceptions about intimate partner violence from a gender perspective. This because perceptions and judgments about offenders and victims of IPV often are based on individuals' collective professional knowledge and belief, but also on the basis of personal values that vary between different individuals and their view of society. The work aims to examine whether there are differences regarding perceptions of offenders and victims of crime, between different groups that come into contact with IPV; this based on the participant's workplace, education background, years of working with IPV, age and gender. The study will investigate the perception of stereotypical and non-stereotyped gender and gender roles through various constructs that are relevant towards work with victims and offenders of intimate partner violence. To answer the aim, this study is conducted based on two research questions:

- Q1 How does Swedish authorities, police employees and social workers, perceive offenders and victims of intimate partner violence in both opposite and same-sex relationships?
- Q2 Can variances in perceiving's be related to participants characteristics, such as gender, age, education background or work experience with intimate partner violence?

BACKGROUND

Intimate partner violence is a complex phenomenon, no matter what type of relationship it occurs in or who it is that offend or becomes victimized. The upcoming part of the paper will show just how complex IPV can be according to previous research, how it has been viewed back in the days, and how IPV between men and women are perceived in other studies.

Offending and victimisation

The victimisation of IPV has various patterns depending on who it is that becomes victimized and who it is that carries out the violence (Ray, 2018). The most common couple-related violence, which both women and men perform, is usually marked by

temporary anger and aggression (Ray, 2018; Scarduzio et al, 2017), and both men and women engage in similar patterns of situational and reactive violence (Espinoza & Warner, 2016). Situational couple violence is described as a conflict based on the result of an occasional argument which has escalated (Scarduzio et al, 2017). Research has revealed that within opposite-sex relationships, women and men are likewise as aggressive and controlling and the behaviour and aggression is often bidirectional (Bates et al, 2018) and when the aggression is bidirectional, partners are less likely to see themselves in the need of help (Espinoza & Warner, 2016).

Another type of violence, which is most often committed by men, is more compulsive and is characterized by serious escalation of violence and terrorism (Ray, 2018; Scarduzio et al, 2017). Intimate terrorism is described as the systematic use of not only violence, but also the use of other controlling tactics, for example economic subordination, threats, and isolation in order to secure constant and nonstop power over a spouse (Scarduzio et al, 2017). Some researchers claim that men are more likely to offend than women, while other researchers argue that women are more frequently violent toward men and engage in more coercive and controlling behaviours (ibid). Another pattern of IPV is that it is more likely to involve *repeat victimization* and more probable to result in physical injury than any other type of crime directed towards a person (Ray, 2018). As prior violence and victimization is a strong risk factor for future violence, IPV is typically seen escalating and approximately one third of the upcoming episodes of violence occur within five weeks of the first (ibid). This is disturbing since about forty percent of women and almost 67 percent of men, stated that the main reason for not reporting IPV to the police is because they consider the incident to be a small thing (NCCP, 2014).

The aim for control is an equal underlying motivator for both male and female IPV, even though female offenders are more likely than males to use a weapon and do more commonly explain their use of violence with lost temper, jealousy, desire for control or to punish the partner, retaliation or self-defence (Espinoza & Warner, 2016). Despite that some evidence indicates that only a small quantity of offending females use violence as an act in self-defence, most of both the past and the present discourse, refer to women's use of violence in opposite-sex relationships as a prime response to victimisation by males (ibid). Research on both male and female offenders show a symmetry of psychological features that include jealousy, anxious and insecure attachment, controlling behaviours, impulsivity and antisocial behaviour including lack of self-control (ibid).

IPV is, whoever offends or becomes victimised, obviously a complex crime type and international research reveals that both men and women experience IPV at significant rates (Baker et al, 2013). Several studies have shown that men experiencing IPV has difficulties in identifying themselves as victims and being recognized by others as victims (ibid). Research has revealed that men are more unwilling to report assaults and to seek medical care, which might be a function of the societal perception of masculine gender roles (Bates et al, 2018). Female victims are four times more likely to report, which might be due to that female-perpetrated abuse is less likely to be viewed, by both male victims and many other individuals in the population, as a crime (Espinoza & Warner, 2016). Some men that seek help have been met with scarce resources and rejection from aid programs and been given negative experiences (ibid). Male victims revealed that female perpetration of IPV sometimes has been viewed as a joke and some males has even been arrested

and or removed from the home without adequate evidence of male violence (Espinoza & Warner, 2016).

Perceptions of intimate partner violence

For centuries, IPV, has not been considered a serious problem (Ray, 2018). It was not until the 80s that the police in the US and the UK started to more seriously pursue the problem of IPV and this was done in response to feminist campaigning (ibid). Prior the 80s IPV was viewed as a private matter that did not need the attention of police or other authorities (McPhedran et al, 2017).

Problematic and conservative attitudes towards intimate partner violence

The issue of violence within intimate relationships was back in the days more referred to as wife abuse and was mostly based on a patriarchal and hetero-normative marriage model (Baker et al, 2013). A patriarchal ideology views the practise of power and violence as an acceptable way to resolve disagreements and sees men as authorised to control women in their intimate sphere (ibid). The patriarchal system legitimizes the control of women and the use of force as a means to keep that control, which in turn puts violence against women less likely to be viewed as deviant or criminal; particularly when it happens within the context of an intimate relationship (Ray, 2018). In a patriarchal system there is only a hetero-normative frame and same-sex relationships is either invisible or deviant (Baker et al, 2013). In order to understand, what use to be seen as asymmetry of who gets victimized of IPV (i.e. more females than males), research has largely focused on the historically and socially created influence of patriarchy in accepting men to control and dominate their female partners (Bates et al, 2018).

There are both problematic views of IPV and some more liberal views, though there is only little research on positive attitudes regarding IPV because most studies, especially when it comes to police perceptions, focus on officers' negative or stereotypical views (DeJong et al, 2008). With that in mind, international research has during the last decades showed that there are a variety of reasons why police officers might dislike or resist to respond to IPV calls (ibid). Some reasons are due to that it sometimes can be hard to see who is the victim and who is the offender, because there are not always any signs that a criminal act has even occurred (ibid). Other reasons are that some individuals, with limited knowledge, fail to appreciate the complex nature of IPV, for example regarding the numerous reasons why victims stay with their abusive partners (ibid). As said above, there are also reasons in form of patriarchal, misogynistic or sexist opinions which may blame women for their own victimisation (ibid). Contrary to the sociocultural prescribed patriarchy as one of the most important reasons for IPV, the majority of males endorse respectful opinions towards women and are less accepting of men using retaliatory violence in responding to women's practice of violence (Espinoza & Warner, 2016).

Perceptions of offenders and victims

Even though evidence points towards gender symmetry of IPV, female-to-male IPV is often viewed as less common and less problematic - and even less consequential than male-to-female IPV (Espinoza & Warner, 2016). Both men and women are seen to perceive female offenders as less blameworthy and are less probable to hand out responsibility to female offenders compared to male offenders (ibid). Male-to-female IPV is also expected to be perceived in favour for reporting to the authorities, which leads to consequences where witnesses might be less likely to

intervene or to alert authorities in cases with female-to-male IPV (Espinoza & Warner, 2016). Research that employs hypothetical gendered IPV scenarios has revealed that individuals view acts of violence as less serious in cases where the victim is male and the offender is female and female violence is more likely to be perceived as dependent on the context, compared to male violence, which might make some people look for external and broader explanations for that kind of behaviour from women (Bates et al, 2018).

Even if bidirectional IPV is a common form, female violence is still viewed in a more acceptable way and is usually more often explained by a lot of other factors, compared to male violence (Espinoza & Warner, 2016). Violence exercised by men has a tendency to receive greater blame for comparable acts (Espinoza & Warner, 2016), which might be in regard of gender-role stereotypes that incline perceptions of males as stronger and more likely to offend and women more vulnerable and probable to be victimised (Ahmed et al, 2013). In a vignette study, by Ahmed and colleagues (2013), scenarios where the offender is male were considered as more serious than scenarios where the offender were female. Also, scenarios where the victim was a female was perceived as more serious than when the victim was a male (ibid). The victimisation of males can in itself be viewed as an aberration from masculine gender roles and might therefore be met with attitudes of both confusion and blame toward male victims and these victims obtain greater negative stigmatisation than female victims (Espinoza & Warner, 2016). International research shows a bias against male victims and more of an lenience toward female offenders and studies have revealed that men are more likely than females to be arrested, charged and convicted (Espinoza & Warner, 2016). This alongside that men's statements of self-defence are much less likely than women's to be believed by the justice system (ibid). In IPV cases where there is no injury, men are more likely to be charged and cases involving male injury, women were arrested at just above 60 percent, compared to over 90 percent of males arrested in IPV cases involving female injury (ibid).

There is substantial literature regarding public attitudes and perceptions of IPV in opposite-sex relationships, but research on perceptions of IPV within same-sex relationships is still quite limited (Ahmed et al, 2013). The public opinion regarding same-sex attraction in Sweden are one of the most liberal and accepting in Europe, alongside the Netherlands and Denmark (Gerhards, 2010). In Sweden, LGBT-individuals can live their lives quite openly and the law endorses the same privileges and opportunities as others (Ahmed et al, 2013). Even so, male-to-female IPV have been viewed as more serious than any other gender constellation, both in the less and more severe scenarios in a Swedish vignette study (Ahmed et al, 2013). This is in line with the prediction made on the basis of gender-role stereotypes - that IPV that involves both a male offender and a female victim is perceived as the most serious incident, regardless of the severity of the violence (Ahmed et al, 2013). Further, female participants were also seen to show greater levels of concern than male participants regardless of gender and gender orientation of offender or victim (ibid).

Police perceptions

Police officers are the main authority to evaluate, both the evidence and the situation of IPV, identify the offender, examine the probability of future violence, and provide victim support (Russell, 2018). In order to respond to an IPV incident, police employees do several risk assessments regarding immediate and future risk

of the threat of danger of physical harm (Russell, 2018). This assessment is influenced by their prior knowledge and beliefs regarding abuse and intimate partner relationships (ibid). Previous research regarding police officers perceptions is in line with public perceptions (Ahmed et al, 2013), as police employees find male-to-female IPV as more serious and dangerous than female-to-male IPV or IPV in same-sex relationships (Russell, 2018). It is important that police officers are as open minded as possible when it comes to violence risk assessment of IPV and by relying on prior knowledge and gender-based stereotypes, their decision-making regarding culpability and risk can lead officers to over or underestimate a future risk or danger, which may leave the victims vulnerable to additional abuse (ibid).

Women are perceived as less violent than men and the general perception is that men are less vulnerable, both to injury but also to the negative effects that often occurs after being abused (Russell, 2018). Stereotypical perspectives may lead to men being held more responsible for their own victimization and their truthfulness as victim minimized (ibid). The postulation that offenders are masculine, and victims are feminine may affect the perceptions of same-sex couples and research has showed that homosexual males are labelled as more womanly and less manly than heterosexual males while homosexual women are perceived as more masculine and less feminine than heterosexual females (ibid). Both police employees and social workers have an important role to maintain in society and their perceptions are therefore equally important. Though, literature regarding social service's perceptions of IPV seems limited.

METHOD

This study has a quantitative approach with a factorial design. A quantitative approach is chosen because the data that is collected and analysed are quantitative and because the current study is not in-depth going (King & Wincup, 2008). This design is used in order to examine group means within various populations and is also called a factorial analysis of variance (Parke, 2010). Factorial designs often use scenarios or vignettes to describe a situation or event followed by some questions (Sorenson & Thomas, 2009). The design is also known as an experimental vignette when the levels of the factors are randomly assigned by the researcher (ibid). In the current study, using a vignette technique, authorities perception will be measured through an online survey and the design of the method are based on previous research by Russell (2018) and Ahmed and colleagues (2013), in order to make sure the method, that consist of vignettes regarding perceptions, is reliable. A vignette aims to describe an event, happening, circumstance or other scenario and are flexible and can therefore be used to measure many different types of attitudes or beliefs (Vargas, 2008). The technique is often used with closed questions in studies regarding individuals' norms and values (Bryman, 2008), and are particularly useful when aiming to measure complex constructs (Vargas, 2008). The technique is based on a few situations or scenarios that are presented to the respondents in order to study their normative perceptions (Bryman, 2008).

Data

The data used in this study were collected through an online survey using Sunet Survey. Each survey included three case scenarios or vignettes where the offenders' and victims' gender were altered between each vignette constructing both opposite

and same-sex couples. Participant recruitment was conducted in two parts, using both a convenience sampling (Battaglia, 2008) and a snowball sampling technique (Chromy, 2008) in order to access both police employees and employees in the social services. First, email has been sent to all seven police regions in Sweden asking for contact with group leaders within groups that works specifically with IPV or police officers working in external duty. Second, 64 municipalities in the south of Sweden has been contacted by email asking for contact with the social services in each municipality. Each established contact, both within the police force and the social services, then got email invitations which described the aim and included a sign-up link to the study where the ones that are interested in participating could notify their interest. All contacts then were asked to forward this link to their employees and co-workers.

Procedure

Of the seven police regions and the 64 municipalities contacted, 41 police employees and social workers filled in the recruitment form on the sign-up link and were interested in participating. The participants were gradually divided into six groups and were assigned different vignettes in order to increase the generalizability of the study. Group 1 and 5 were assigned the same vignettes and group 2 and 6 other vignettes. The vignettes assigned to group 3 and 4 had the same content as the vignettes assigned the other groups, but with the difference that the gender of both the offender and victim were manipulated and changed to other relationship constructs in order to further increase the generalisability between vignettes. All questionnaires were distributed gradually, while the recruitment progressed leading to three rounds of questionnaire deliveries, first group 1 and 2, then group 3 and 4, and then group 5 and 6. The respondents were assigned two questionnaires respectively, containing three scenarios each, that were handed out with about one week in between.

In hope of increasing participation, as a thank-you message after each questionnaire, respondents has been encouraged to forward the interest sign-up link to employees and colleagues. When the time for the study began to run scarce and there no longer was any time to hand out two questionnaires to each respondent, the thank-you message was changed in the last two groups where the respondents instead were invited to hand out a link that led directly to a questionnaire containing four vignettes that were the same as the vignettes for group 3 and 4. This raised participation with four individuals, giving an improved sample of 45 participants.

Sample

When the publication time for the questionnaire expired, there were still two participants who did not answer any of the two questionnaires, giving a final sample of 43 participants, where one participant only answered the first questionnaire and not the second. The final sample exists of 22 police employees (51.2 percent) and 21 social workers (48.8 percent) and most participants, over 80 percent, are female and less than 20 percent are male. The participants age varies between 29 years to 64 years old with a mean age of the total sample at 43 years. There is a higher mean age for police employees, 46 years compared to 40 years for social workers. In the sample there are 12 participants who have police training, 21 participants have read sociology or have an education as social worker, 5 participants have read criminology and the rest has various kinds of degrees or no higher degree at all. Six participants has a year or less experience of working with IPV and thirteen individuals has 2 – 4 years of experience, eleven participants has 5 – 9 years'

experience, while thirteen participants has ten or more years of experience of working with IPV.

Ethical considerations

It is important to make ethical reflections and considerations while conducting scientific research (Vetenskapsrådet, 2017). In order to ensure that research is done in an responsible manner, these reflections and considerations play an important role in the quality of research, implementation and in the results that are used to develop our society (ibid). In research regarding individuals and sensitive data, such as crime and victimisation, it is important that the researcher consider the potential benefits of the study to the possibility of harm to the participating individuals (Maxfield & Babbie, 2015). There are individuals that are more exposed to harm while participating in a study (ibid). Though, in the current study the participants one way or another work with offenders and victims of IPV and should therefore not be further harmed by this study. When conducting the current study, reflections regarding volunteerism, integrity, confidentiality and anonymity have constantly been made, from the planning of data and selection, investigation form, questionnaire and during the study and the ongoing work.

The ethical principle regarding *voluntary* participation (Bryman; 2008; Maxfield & Babbie, 2015; Vetenskapsrådet 2017), were in this study satisfied by that participants volunteered to participate and were informed that the purpose of the study was to study perceptions of IPV. All the group leaders that was contacted got an information letter by email regarding the study's purpose and information about who it is that is conducting the study. The sign-up link had full information regarding the study's purpose, that it is voluntary to participate and that they at any time can cancel their participation. Also, in the email delivering the questionnaire there were repeated information regarding voluntary participation and that they at any time could withdraw their participation. There were likewise information regarding anonymity and confidentiality, where *anonymity* was ensured in that participants got an ID-number, after they filled in the recruitment form on the sign-up link, that they would use when answering the two questionnaires and that their email-addresses and ID-number only would be linked in an Excel-file on a private and password protected computer that only the author can access. This needed to be confirmed due to that most of the email-addresses from authorities consists of the persons first and last name. *Confidentiality* was guaranteed in the same manner, full information on the sign-up page and that all data is kept on a private and password protected computer that only the author have access to, except that the projects supervisor might see data, if support is needed with the analysis. The guarantee of the confidentiality means that no one will be able to identify single individuals, neither during the data collection nor when the results are being presented (Bryman, 2008; Maxfield & Babbie, 2015; Vetenskapsrådet, 2017). The *consent* was taken for granted if they did fill in the sign-up page and pressed "send". After the study is approved and examined, all data will be deleted from the computer. The Ethics Council at Malmö University has approved of the procedures in this study, see the statement with reference number 47 in appendix I.

Materials

This study uses a vignette technique to measure the participants perception regarding the severity of the IPV incident, offender culpability and risk, and victim culpability. A vignette study is experimental in regards to that an researcher experimentally alter the wording of the vignette by varying a few independent

variables, for example gender, race or age of both the victim and offender (Bryman, 2008; Vargas, 2008). Each participant was provided two questionnaires, with approximately one week in between. Each survey consisted of three shorter vignettes describing an IPV incident. Based on research conducted by Russell (2018) and Ahmed and colleagues (2013) the gender of the offender and victim was manipulated and therefore also sexual orientation.

Vignettes

The vignettes in this study only alter the gender of the offender and the gender of the victim, creating a 2 (offender gender; male/female) x 2 (victim gender; male/female) experiment or factor design that contains two factors, both of them having two levels. This yields four versions of the vignette; male-to-female, male-to-male, female-to-male and female-to-female IPV. Every version has in this study also been written in two varieties, serious assault with or without a pointy weapon, to increase the generalizability of the study. Every respondent has been distributed to read four of these eight vignettes. In addition to the vignettes above, four other vignettes were written as *distracters*, to make it harder for the participants to identify the variables under study, and all the original respondents (who signed-up) got to read two of these distracters, one in each questionnaire. The distracters were written to intensify masculine and feminine stereotypes; masculine male-to-female, male-to-feminine female, masculine female-to-female and male-to-feminine male. The eight original vignettes have allowed the current study to test for two main interaction effects, the perception of gender on the offender and the perception of gender on the victim (i.e. type of relationship; opposite or same-sex).

A requirement regarding vignettes is that the situations or events in the scenarios described must be realistic, which makes it important to construct scenarios that are believable (Bryman, 2008). Half of the scenarios, the ones with the use of weapon, in the current study were completely based on grounds of judgments in different cases of IPV cases from the Court of Appeal in Sweden and the other half of the scenarios were partly based on different grounds of judgments in various cases of intimate partner violence from the Court of Appeal in Sweden. All scenarios or vignettes thus describes an incident of serious assault happening within the context of an intimate relationship, see appendix II for examples on the vignettes.

There are a few factors that have been found to influence police decision making in cases of IPV and those include the presence of an offender, the presence of witnesses, the presence of serious injuries and whether the offender is affected by alcohol (McPhedran et al, 2017). Therefore, a decision were made not to use any indications on alcohol or drug use in the vignettes, nor any witnesses or children present either, built on that the perception of the incident may be interpreted differently, based on other factors rather than the actual gender and gender roles in the relationship. Gender of the characters in the scenarios were manipulated through the names of the offender and victim. All names were typical Swedish for the participants not to take ethnicity into consideration.

Questions

The questions to each vignette are structured to measure characteristics of the incident, offenders and victims. Inspired by Russell (2018) and Ahmed and colleagues (2013), these questions have been answered through ratings on a scale going from 1 to 7. The participants have thus been asked to respond as they see fit due to their perception of each vignette and answer the questions regarding features

of the incident, offender and victim. The participants has, besides their workplace (police employee or social worker), also been asked about their age, gender, education background (police training, law, criminology, sociology, psychology and so on), and the number of years working specific with offenders and victims of IPV. To determine the validity of the manipulations and to make sure the respondents read the vignette, the respondents were asked whether the couple was opposite or same sex. One participant answered this inaccurately in a distracter vignette, which is not being analysed in the current study anyway. All materials, the scenarios and questions, in this study were pre-tested by a clinical professor emeritus in forensic psychology at Malmö University to optimize for language, clarity, relevance and likelihood.

Measures

This study uses statistical analyses designed to compare groups to explore constructs that include incident severity, offender and victim culpability and offender risk. All items were measured through a likert-type scale (1 = little extent/not at all to 7 = large extent/very). Based on the questions in the questionnaire, several variables have been computed to create new variables, or indexes, to more easily analyse and manage the data. When creating appropriate index of variables, it is advisable to test how high internal consistency the variables have together and this is done using the statistical measure Cronbach's alpha (α) (Barmark, 2009; Field, 2013). The measure indicate whether the correlation between the merged variables are suitable and ranges from 0 to 1, where the value should exceed .7 for there to be considered sufficiently high coherence between the variables (Barmark, 2009). Not all indexes in this dataset have exceeded the .7 limit, however, some researchers suggest that research in early stages can have values as low as .5 and still be sufficient measures (Field, 2013). See table A1 in appendix III for information regarding Cronbach Alpha, range, mean, standard deviations and cases (N) for all the dependent variables.

Variables

Incident severity were measured by two questions asking respondents to rate how serious and violent they thought the incident was. Those two items were then computed in various ways to measure different gender constructs. There are ten variables in this dataset measuring different gender constructs of incident severity and the Cronbach Alpha values of the computed variables differs between $\alpha = .560$ to $\alpha = .947$.

Offender culpability were measured by respondents rating to what extent they thought the offender; is responsible for the violent event, intended to argue with the victim, intended to harm the victim, is guilty of the physical damage caused to the victim. Those four items were then computed in various ways to measure different gender constructs. In this dataset there are eight variables measuring different gender construct of offender culpability and the Cronbach Alpha values of the computed variables differs between $\alpha = .461$ to $\alpha = .799$.

Offender risk were measured by respondents rating to what extent they thought the offender being a risk to other people, the risk for serious injury if the victim remains in the residence or that the offender has physically wounded the victim before. Those three items were then computed in various ways to measure different gender constructs. In this study there are eight variables of gender constructs to measure

offender risk and the Cronbach Alpha values of the computed variables differs between $\alpha = .540$ to $\alpha = .807$.

Victim culpability were measured by respondents rating to what extent they thought the victim; is responsible for the violent event, intended to argue with the offender and intended to harm the offender. Those three items were then computed in various ways to measure different gender constructs. There are eight variables measuring various gender constructs and victim culpability and the Cronbach Alpha values of the computed variables differs between $\alpha = .649$ to $\alpha = .880$.

RESULTS

In the planning of this study, analyses using parametric statistics as ANOVA and independent t-tests, was supposed to be performed, but since most of the dependent variables in this dataset is not normally distributed, and because of the low number of observations ($N = 43$), these tests has not been optimal (Pallant, 2007). Instead this study will use non-parametric statistics to answer the research questions. By using Mann-Whitney U Test and Kruskal-Wallis Test, medians instead of mean values, will be used to compare groups where the tests show significance, otherwise the result will show mean values. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient have been performed to see correlations between participants age and the dependents variables.

Swedish authorities' perceptions

Variations in perceptions between police employees and social workers have not been significant when using Mann-Whitney U Test and therefore these insignificant variances will be shown using mean values instead. The perceptions regarding the severity of the incident only show a slight difference between opposite and same-sex relationships where both police employees and social workers perceive opposite-sex incidents as more severe, compared to incidents occurring in same-sex relationships, see table 1.

Table 1. Mean differences of perceptions of incident severity between opposite and same sex relationships.

	Police employees		Social workers		Total	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>
Opposite-sex relationship	25.10	21	26.05	20	25.56	41
Same-sex relationship	23.86	21	24.80	20	24.32	41

Perceptions of offenders and victims

The mean difference in incident severity, offender risk and victim culpability between perceptions regarding gender of offenders in the total sample is minor, see table 2 on the next page. Regarding offender culpability, male offenders are perceived as more culpable (48.28) compared to female offenders (46.86) according to both social workers and police employees. Police employees perceive male offenders as more culpable (49.00) compared to social workers (47,50) and social workers perceive female offenders as less culpable (46.73) compared to police employees (46.99). The police employees in this sample also perceive incidents as

more severe when the offenders are male (25.14) compared to female (23.86), whereas the difference within social workers are smaller (25.19 / 25.70).

Table 2. Mean differences of perceptions regarding offenders.

	Police employees				Social workers				Total			
	Female Offender		Male Offender		Female Offender		Male Offender		Female Offender		Male Offender	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Incident severity	23.86	21	25.14	22	25.19	21	25.70	20	24.52	42	25.40	42
Offender culpability	46.99	21	49.00	22	46.73	21	47.50	20	46.86	42	48.28	42
Offender risk	29.05	21	29.60	22	28.52	21	29.20	20	28.79	42	29.41	42
Victim culpability	9.63	21	10.06	22	9.78	21	8.45	20	9.71	42	9.29	42

Male-to-female IPV incidents are perceived as more severe (13.02) and female-to-female IPV as least severe (11.95), see table 3 below. There is barely any difference in social workers (13.10) and police employees (12.05) perceiving's of the severity of incidents of male-to-female IPV. Offender culpability is perceived as greater when the offender is male, and the victim is female (24.74) and female offenders who perpetrate female victims are perceived as least culpable (22.71). Offender risk is perceived as greater in male-to-female IPV (15.49) and male victims are perceived to be less of a risk in same-sex relationships (13.92). Police employees perceive male victims as more culpable when the offender also is male (5.22) compared to social workers (4.15), who sees male victims of male offenders as least culpable of the gender constructs in this study.

Table 3. Mean differences of perceptions in relation two various gender constructs.

		Police employees				Social workers				Total			
		Female victim		Male Victim		Female victim		Male Victim		Female victim		Male Victim	
		Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Incident severity	Female offender	11.73	22	12.23	22	12.19	21	13.00	21	11.95	43	12.60	43
	Male offender	12.95	22	12.18	22	13.10	20	12.60	20	13.02	42	12.38	42
Offender culpability	Female offender	23.02	22	24.10	22	22.38	21	24.35	21	22.71	43	24.22	43
	Male offender	25.28	22	23.71	22	24.15	20	23.35	20	24.74	42	23.54	42
Offender risk	Female offender	15.00	22	14.09	22	13.95	21	14.57	21	14.49	43	14.33	43
	Male offender	15.61	22	13.99	22	15.35	20	13.85	20	15.49	42	13.92	42
Victim culpability	Female offender	4.75	22	4.89	22	5.14	21	4.64	21	4.94	43	4.77	43
	Male offender	4.84	22	5.22	22	4.30	20	4.15	20	4.58	42	4.71	42

There are only small differences between female and male victims when it comes to incident severity, offender culpability and victim culpability, see table A2 in appendix IV. The mean differences between groups and between perceiving's of gender only vary slightly in all analyses.

Participants characteristics and their perceptions

When analysing differences of gender and work experience, Mann-Whitney U Tests have been conducted, because the two independent variables are categorical with only two groups; female/male and 4 years or less/5 years or more. Gender of participants show significant differences regarding offender risk in female-to-female IPV ($p = .006$), and male participants perceive offender risk to be greater in female-to-female IPV ($Md = 18$) compared to female participants ($Md = 15$). By using the z-value from the test (see table A3 in appendix IV) the effect size has been calculated to $r = .41$ which according to Pallat (2007) can be viewed as an medium effect.

A Mann-Whitney U Test shows significant differences ($p = .048$) between the two groups of work experience with IPV regarding female offender culpability. Participants with less experience perceive female offenders as more culpable ($Md = 50$) than participants with more experience of working with IPV ($Md = 48$). The effect size shows a medium effect, $r = .31$ (see table A4 in appendix IV). Another test also showed significant differences between participants work experience and their perceptions regarding offender culpability in male-to-female IPV ($p = .045$). Participants with more experience perceive male offenders as more culpable when the victim is female ($Md = 26,5$), compared to participants with less experience ($Md = 24,5$) with a medium effect size at $r = 0,31$ (see table A5 in appendix IV). The last Mann-Whitney U Test to display significant differences ($p = .05$) was between participants work experience and their perceptions of female offenders' risk in opposite-sex relationships. Participants with longer experience perceive female offenders as less of a risk for a male victim ($Md = 14$) than participants with less experience ($Md = 16$). The test also showed this to be a medium effect, $r = 0,30$ (see table A6 in appendix V).

Bivariate analyses, using Pearson product-moment correlations, between the dependent variables and participants age showed one significant correlation, see table A7 in appendix V. The analyses showed a significant ($p = .046$) medium strong negative correlation between participants age and incident severity for female-to-female IPV, $r = -.305$, indicating that the younger participants are, the more severe they perceive incidents with female offenders and female victims.

A Kurskal-Wallis Test is the non-parametric alternative to a one-way between groups analysis of variance (Pallat, 2007) and were in this study used to test significance between the independent variables and the participants education background (police training, social worker training, criminology, other education or none). These tests did however not display any significant results and will therefore not be presented in this paper, instead mean values are presented in tables A8 to A11 in appendix V to VII. The main finding of these mean comparisons shows that participants with police training perceive incidents of same-sex relationships, female offenders and victims, less severe than participants with other education backgrounds.

DISCUSSION

In the section below, a discussion regarding the results of this study will be apprehended in relation to previous research followed by a discussion about methodological and study limitations. Due to the small sample size, the result in this study need to be interpreted with caution. Most of the result can only be applied to the actual sample in this study and not to all police employees and social workers in Sweden.

Result discussion

Male-to-female IPV is, in previous research, viewed as more serious and is more beheld as abuse than IPV in same-sex relationships or female-to-male IPV (Russell, 2018). The analysis of the current study follows previous literature and indicate that the participants perceive male-to-female incidents as more severe and female-to-female IPV as less severe. Male offenders in opposite-sex relationships are also seen as more culpable than female offenders and this by participants with longer experience of working with IPV. Offender risk in this study has been perceived greater in male-to-female IPV and the participants perceive female victims to be at greater risk when the offender is male. Previous literature reveals that IPV against male victims are less likely to be identified as IPV and are seen as a more acceptable behaviour compared to when the same behaviour is shown towards a female (Bates et al, 2018). In the current study, male victims are perceived to be at a lower risk in same-sex relationship compared to other relationship constructs.

The results regarding female-to-male IPV is in line with previous literature by Ahmed and colleagues (2013) regarding that it is considered as less serious than male-to-female IPV, and the current study shows that female offenders are perceived as less of an risk against male victims by participants with more experience. Though, participants with less experience perceive female offenders as more culpable compared to male offenders. Overall, female offenders are in the current study seen as least culpable in same-sex relationships, though, the younger the participants are, the more severe they perceive female-to-female IPV. IPV against women is usually perceived as more serious than IPV against men and previous research conducted in Sweden showed that female participants also show greater levels of concern than male participants, no matter of the gender of the offender or victim, nor the orientation of the relationship (Ahmed et al, 2013). Though in the current study male participants perceived greater levels of risk for female victims in same-sex relationships, and according to Ahmed and colleagues (2013), the gender of the victims influences respondents' perceptions of IPV more than their sexual orientation. Yet again, even if the result follows previous literature, the differences in the current study are minor and therefore hard to apply to a greater level.

Methodology discussion and study limitations

There are a few limitations regarding the current study that need to be discussed. There are various and easier ways to measure attitudes and beliefs (Bryman, 2008), though in the current study a vignette technique was chosen due to that experimental vignettes are sometimes seen as methodologically superior to simple and direct questioning (Sorenson & Thomas, 2009). An advantage in the vignette technique is that the respondent's decision is in relation of a concrete situation which reduces the risk for un-reflected answers (Bryman, 2008) and the technique also decreases

the risk for responses due to social desirability (Sorenson & Thomas, 2009). Each vignette in a study must disclose realistic and believable situations or events (Bryman, 2008) which make the construction of vignettes an important part of the study. Even though the vignettes in the current study is based on judgments from the Court of Appeal in Sweden, it is still impossible to know to what extent participants creates a picture of the individuals described in the vignettes and to what extent this might have an effect on the validity and the comparability in the study (Bryman, 2008). Another limitation in the current study, regarding the use of vignettes, is that the participants might get a feeling of their answers being judged, due to that the questions regards human beings (ibid). Therefore, it could instead of creating them based on real cases, be preferable to make them up in order to create some distance between the participants and the vignettes (ibid). Even with these reservations, a vignette study is seen as a highly realistic alternative for the science of norms and values (ibid). The validity in the current study is further strengthened by that the questions in the questionnaire is based on research conducted by both Russell (2018) and Ahmed and colleagues (2013) and due to that all the vignettes and questions also have been pre-tested by a clinical professor emeritus in forensic psychology. To increase the internal reliability, all indexes have first undergone a test of Cronbach alpha, that examines the internal consistency between the variables and through a well-written methodology and a clear approach, the replicability of this study has increased, enabling others to carry out the same study.

There are also some statistical limitations in the current study which must be emphasized. A study's statistical power, for instance significance, mainly relay on and are directly related, to the sample size and as the size of the sample declines, the capacity to spot minor or moderate effects disappears (Morgan, 2017). Most statistical analyses depend on large sample theory and the many assumptions which underlie statistical tests (Morgan, 2017), and many potential sources of bias comes in the forms of violations of these assumptions that is needed to be true to know that the significance and conclusions is correct (Field, 2013). Assumptions usually need to be met in parametric tests that are based on the normal distribution (ibid). The observations in the current study violates some important assumptions needed for parametric tests, for example the assumption of normality, which is not justified here. Outliers have been spotted and transformations in forms of square root have been executed to make the observations more normally distributed, though after a recheck, the assumption still was not justified. According to Morgan (2017) extreme outliers can be removed, though due to the disadvantage of making a small sample even smaller this was not a satisfactory option in this study. Instead the current study has preferred using non-parametric tests, due to that those tests do not have that strict requirements and do not make assumptions about the distribution of observations (Pallat. 2007). Non-parametric statistics are useful in small samples, but they also have some shortcomings since they tend to be less sensitive and not as powerful as parametric statistics, and may therefore fail to distinguish differences between groups that actually might be there (ibid).

One problem with the analyses in this study was partly since many analyses and comparisons between gender differences and participants workplace have not been significant. This means that there is a risk that the results depend on chance and thus are not generalizable to a population outside the studied. The generalizability, or external validity, in the current study has its limits due to the narrow target group and the small sample. Measures have been taken to increase the response rate in the form of reminders and thank-you messages that encouraged participants to forward

the questionnaires to co-workers. Though in the end, both police employees and social workers has a very important societal duty to maintain in first place.

Conclusions

Regardless of research change of focus within IPV and the exposure of gender symmetry, negative gender role stereotypes referring to male offending and female victimisation within opposite-sex relationships still influence western society; especially the societal views that appear to frame men as offenders and women as victims of IPV (Bates et al, 2018). The present study contributes to the literature of gender symmetry and the knowledge regarding how Swedish authorities, police employees and social workers, perceive gender constructs within IPV in both opposite and same-sex relationships. By using vignettes participants perceiving's, regarding incident severity, offender and victim culpability and offender risk were measured in relation to their workplace, gender, age, education background and work experience with IPV. The findings of this study have some limitations regarding generalizability, mostly due to a small sample, and therefore it would be profitable if future studies continue the work on perceptions and also attitudes regarding IPV, to extend the knowledge of this complex social issue.

Gender stereotypes concerning IPV perpetration and victimisation can hypothetically be harmful in regard to the societal concerns of male victimisation, if the society deems only females to be the targets of IPV (Bates et al, 2018). The results of the current study is positive in the way that not many differences were found in perceptions regarding gender differences in IPV, which highlights that gender stereotypes do not affect the perceptions of the Swedish authorities to any great degree. This study consists of respondents working with IPV victims and offenders and therefore should have overall negative perceptions towards IPV, and hopefully positive views of same-sex relationships and hold equality values. However, even if it is important to see the symmetry between gender and gender roles, the asymmetry is also important when perceiving offenders and victims of IPV. This paper will end with a quote from Espinoza & Warner (2016; 963):

“Without treating gender as a variable, the problem becomes amorphous. Issues associated with abusive male dominance over female partners must never be ignored. Likewise, the plight of victimized males ought not be neglected or shrouded.”

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, A. M., Aldén, L., & Hammarstedt, M. (2013). Perceptions of Gay, Lesbian, and Heterosexual Domestic Violence Among Undergraduates in Sweden. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, (2), 249.
- Baker, N. L., Buick, J. D., Kim, S. R., Moniz, S., & Nava, K. L. (2013). Lessons from Examining Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence. *Sex Roles*, 69(3–4), 182-192.
- Barmark, M. (2009). *Faktoranalys. I: Djurfeldt, G. e., & Barmark, M. e. (red.). Statistisk verktygslåda 2 - multivariat analys*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Bates, E. A., Kaye, L. K., Pennington, C. R., & Hamlin, I. (2018). What about the Male Victims? Exploring the Impact of Gender Stereotyping on Implicit Attitudes and Behavioural Intentions Associated with Intimate Partner Violence. *Sex Roles*.
- Battaglia, M. (2008). *Convenience Sampling*. In: Sage Publications, inc, & Lavrakas, P. J. *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods. Volume 2*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications, Inc. Pages 947-949.
- Bryman A, (2008). *Samhällsvetenskapliga metoder*. (2 uppl.). Malmö: Liber.
- Chromy, R., J. (2008). *Snowball Sampling*. In: Sage Publications, inc, & Lavrakas, P. J. *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods. Volume 2*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications, Inc. Pages 947-949.
- DeJong, C., Burgess-Proctor, A., & Elis, L. (2008). Police officer perceptions of intimate partner violence: An analysis of observational data. *Violence and Victims*, 23(6), 683–696.
- Devries, K. M., Mak, J. Y. T., Garcia-Moreno, C., Petzold, M., Child, J.C., Falder, G., Lim, S., Bacchus, L. J., Engell, R. E., Rosenfeld, L., Pallitto, C., Vos, T., Abrahams, N., & Watts, C. H. (2013). The global prevalence of intimate partner violence against women. *Science*, 340, 1527–1528
- Espinoza, R. C., & Warner, D. (2016). Where Do We Go from here?: Examining Intimate Partner Violence by Bringing Male Victims, Female Perpetrators, and Psychological Sciences into the Fold. *Journal of Family Violence*, 31(8), 959–966.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using SPSS: (and sex, drugs and rock'n'roll)*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Fisher B. S., Reyns B. W., Sloan III J. J. (2016). *Introduction to Victimology. Contemporary Theory, Research, and Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gerhards, J. (n.d.). Non-Discrimination towards Homosexuality. The European Union's Policy and Citizens' Attitudes towards Homosexuality in 27 European Countries. *International Sociology*, 25(1), 5–28.
- King, R. D. & Wincup, E. (2008). *The Process of criminological research*. In: King, R. D. edt, & Wincup, E. edt. *Doing research on crime and justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Maxfield, M. G. & Babbie, E. R. (2015). *Basics of research methods: for criminal justice and criminology*. [Boston, MA] Cengage Learning, Inc, 2015.
- McPhedran, S., Gover, A. R., & Mazerolle, P. (2017). A cross-national comparison of police attitudes about domestic violence: a focus on gender. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, (2), 214
- Morgan, C. J. (2017). Use of proper statistical techniques for research studies with small samples. *Am J Physiol Lung Cell Mol Physiol* 313.
- NCCP (2017). *Polisiära arbetssätt för att förebygga upprepat partnervåld - med fokus på våldsutövare*. Rapport 2017:13. Stockholm: Brottsförebyggande rådet.
- NCCP (2014). *Brott i nära relation. En nationell kartläggning*. Rapport 2014:8. Stockholm: Brottsförebyggande rådet.
- Nilsson, G., & Lövkrona, I. (2015). *Våldets kön: kulturella föreställningar, funktioner och konsekvenser*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2015.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual: a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows*. Open University Press.
- Parke C. S. (2010). *Factorial design*. In: Salkind, N. J. *Encyclopedia of Research Design*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Ray, L. (2018). *Violence & Society*. 2nd edition. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2018.
- Russell, B. (2018). Police perceptions in intimate partner violence cases: the influence of gender and sexual orientation. *Journal of Crime & Justice*, 41(2), 193-205.
- Scarduzio, J. A., Carlyle, K. E., Harris, K. L., & Savage, M. W. (2017). "Maybe She Was Provoked": Exploring Gender Stereotypes About Male and Female Perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 23(1), 89-113.
- Sorenson, S. & Thomas, K. A. (2009). Views of Intimate Partner Violence in Same- and Opposite-Sex Relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(2), 337
- Storey J. E. & Strand S. (2013) Assessing violence risk among female IPV perpetrators: An examination of the B-SAFER. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, (9), 964.
- Vargas, P. (2008). *Vignette Question*. In: Sage Publications, inc, & Lavrakas, P. J. *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods. Volume 2*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications, Inc. Pages 947-949.
- Vetenskapsrådet (2017) *God forskningsred*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.
- de Vogel, V., & Nicholls, T. L. (2016). Gender Matters: An Introduction to the Special Issues on Women and Girls. *International journal of forensic mental health*, 15(1), 1–25.

APPENDIX I

Statement from the Ethics Council at Malmö University.



Malmö universitet / Fakulteten för Hälsa och samhälle

Etikrådet

Adm sekreterare Ewa Sortberg Bassmann

1(2)

Utlåtande

2019-03-01

HS2019 löp nr 47

Projekt:	Intimate partner violence and the Swedish justice systems perceptions of gender differences.
Student:	Maria Puur
Handledare:	Klara Svalin
Föredragande:	Claes Andersson

Etikrådets utlåtande:

Studentarbetet avser att använda faktiska domar från Malmö tingsrätt och för att konstruera avidentifierade könsstereotypa respektive icke könsstereotypa vinjetter och som medarbetare vid polis- respektive åklagarmyndighet därefter tillfrågas att bedöma. Studentarbetets syfte är enligt ansökan att undersöka om könsstereotypa vinjetter bedöms annorlunda än icke könsstereotypa vinjetter samt om det finns skillnader mellan olika grupper inom polis- respektive åklagarmyndighet. Underlag för att studera sådana variationer avser vad man i ansökan benämner demografiska variabler vilka exemplifieras med ålder, könsidentitet, typ av tjänst, antal år i tjänst och utbildning.

Etikrådet konstaterar att de domar som används för att konstruera vinjetter avser känsliga personuppgifter, men att dessa känsliga personuppgifter hanteras adekvat genom att domarna har avidentifierats och omformulerats till könsstereotypa respektive icke könsstereotypa vinjetter. Etikrådet vill här enbart klargöra att de ursprungliga domarna bör hanteras på ett sätt som innebär att utomstående inte får tillgång till domarna samt att domarna makuleras efter att uppsatsen har examinerats.

Etikrådet gör även bedömningen att de demografiska variabler som beskrivs i ansökan i kombination med de könsstereotypa bedömningar deltagarna ombeds att genomföra också utgör känsliga personuppgifter. Flera demografiska uppgifter i kombination kan identifiera enskild och utgör därmed en personuppgift. Könsidentitet, det vill säga det kön som personen identifierar sig med och som inte är begränsad till juridiskt kön, utgör alltid en känslig personuppgift. Även de könsstereotypa bedömningar deltagarna ombeds genomföra tangerar vad som kan betraktas vara känslig information som överskrider respondentens profession och yrkesroll. Principiellt gör etikrådet bedömningen att det i ett begränsat material vore fullt tillräckligt att inhämta uppgifter om samt göra jämförelser mellan polis- respektive åklagarmyndighet alternativt mellan individer som har respektive inte har deltagit i utbildning avseende riskbedömning. Etikrådet konstaterar vidare att det i den information som studenten avser att lämna till deltagarna inte framgår på vilket sätt studentarbetet avser att genomföra subanalyser av exempelvis egen könsidentitet i relation till egen bedömning av könsstereotypa respektive icke könsstereotypa vinjetter. Etikrådet är angelägen om att korrekt och komplett information om studentarbetets syfte adderas till informationsbrevet. Etikrådet är vidare angelägen om att den slutliga uppsatsen enbart presenterar information på gruppnivå och som

Postadress	Besöksadress	Tel	Fax	Internet	E-post
Malmö universitet Fakulteten för hälsa och samhälle 205 06 Malmö	Malmö sjukhusområde Jan Waldenströms g 25	040-665 74 54	040-665 81 00	www.mah.se	etikradet@mah.se

2(2)

inte på något sätt kan härledas till enskild, att insamlad data hanteras med sådan varsamhet att obehöriga inte får tillgång till materialet, samt att insamlade data makuleras efter examination.

Etikrådet överlämnar till studenten att tillsammans med sin handledare hantera de rekommendationer etikrådet lämnat i detta yttrande och vill avslutningsvis önska studenten lycka till med det fortsatta uppsatsarbetet.

För Etikrådet vid Fakulteten för hälsa och samhälle, Malmö universitet
Claes Andersson

APPENDIX II

Examples of vignettes used in the questionnaires.

Example 1

Lisa och Niklas har varit tillsammans i många år men har aldrig varit skrivna på samma adress och har således mestadels bott i var sin lägenhet. Den aktuella dagen ringer Niklas upp Lisa och vill att dom ska mötas hemma hos henne då han har något att diskutera. Lisa misstänker att det kommer uppstå någon form av dispyt då de har haft mycket inslag av bråk i sitt förhållande.

När Lisa kommer hem möter hon honom i trapphuset och märker att han är upprörd. Väl inne i lägenheten försöker Lisa lugna Niklas och ett bråk uppstår. Niklas tar tag i Lisa och Lisa slår då en tavla i hans huvud. Niklas rycker ner en dolk som hängde som prydnad på väggen i hallen och ställde sig mitt emot Lisa. De skriker fortfarande åt varandra och sedan menar Lisa att det bara sa "smack" och att Niklas då tryckt in dolken i hennes buk.

Niklas förklarar att han bara ville skrämma Lisa men när han inser vad som har hänt vill han köra henne till akuten. Men Lisa ringer istället en vän som kör henne, och övertalar vännen att ljuga och säga att det var en okänd gärningsperson i en park som knivskar henne och tog hennes handväska. Läkarna konstaterar att Lisa har ett tre centimeter brett sticksår som trängt in 10 centimeter och punkterat tjocktarmen.

Example 2

Emil och Stefan är gifta och har ett hus tillsammans i en mindre ort i Skåne. En dag när Emil kommer hem från jobbet märker han att Stefan är upprörd, han verkar arg över något som Emil ska ha sagt till hans mamma.

Emil går in i sovrummet för att byta kläder och då kommer Stefan bakom honom och tar tag i Emils hår och drar in honom i klädkammaren. Emil trillar över en tvättkorg som går sönder och det gjorde ont på Emil. Stefan kallar Emil för böggjäväl och hoppar med sitt knä ner på Emils bröstorg och satt sedan där och tryckte med knäet.

Stefan tog sedan tag i en blå verktygslåda som stod inne i klädkammaren och lyfte upp en hammare mot Emil. Emil blir rädd och får tag på en kudde som han tänkte försöka skydda sitt huvud med. Emil bad om ursäkt och lovade att inte göra om det. Stefan släpper då hammaren och trycker istället kudden mot Emils ansikte med båda händerna. Emil får ingen luft och fick inte loss kudden hur mycket han än drog i Stefans händer.

Emil slutade kämpa och Stefan gick därifrån. Det var tyst väldigt länge. Sen kom Stefan in och lyfte bort kudden från hans ansikte och kallade honom för idiot. Emil var så rädd så att han låg kvar tills Stefan sa åt honom att gå och lägga sig.

APPENDIX III

Table A1. Cronbach alpha, minimum and maximum values, mean values, standard deviations and number of observations.

		Dependent variables					
		Variables	α^*	Min. - Max.	Mean	St.d	N
Incident severity		Opposite sex ^a	.679	18 - 28	25.56	2.58	41
		Same sex ^a	.763	15 - 28	24.32	3.39	41
		Male offender ^a	.705	19 - 28	25.40	2.82	42
		Female offender ^a	.560	17 - 28	24.52	2.72	42
		Male victim ^a	.694	17 - 28	24.90	3.28	41
		Female victim ^a	.702	19 - 28	24.98	2.52	41
		Male-to-female ^b	.762	10 - 14	13.02	1.24	42
		Male-to-male ^b	.947	5 - 14	12.38	2.31	42
		Female-to-male ^b	.882	4 - 14	12.60	2.00	43
		Female-to-female ^b	.789	8 - 14	11.96	1.80	43
Offender culpability		Male offender ^c	.461	36 - 56	48.38	5.75	42
		Female offender ^c	.566	32 - 54	46.86	5.37	42
		Male victim ^c	.782	34 - 56	47.69	6.92	41
		Female victim ^c	.799	25 - 56	47.19	6.63	41
		Male-to-female ^a	.735	13 - 28	24.74	3.44	42
		Male-to-male ^a	.799	9 - 28	23.54	4.50	42
		Female-to-male ^a	.660	12 - 28	24.22	3.62	43
	Female-to-female ^a	.791	12 - 28	22.71	4.37	43	
Offender risk		Male offender ^d	.540	17 - 42	29.41	5.77	42
		Female offender ^d	.667	15 - 40	28.79	6.25	42
		Male victim ^d	.647	15 - 38	28.24	6.09	41
		Female victim ^d	.680	11.66 - 42	29.77	6.59	41
		Male-to-female ^e	.544	7 - 21	15.49	3.52	42
		Male-to-male ^e	.712	3 - 21	13.92	4.44	42
		Female-to-male ^e	.561	6 - 19	14.33	3.20	43
	female-to-female ^e	.807	3 - 21	14.49	4.80	43	
Victim culpability		Male offender ^d	.649	6 - 19	9.29	3.62	42
		Female offender ^d	.793	6 - 24	9.71	4.08	42
		Male victim ^d	.804	6 - 23	9.49	4.57	41
		Female victim ^d	.825	6 - 20	9.66	3.98	41
		Male-to-female ^e	.758	3 - 11	4.58	2.29	42
		Male-to-male ^e	.880	3 - 16	4.71	2.76	42
		Female-to-male ^e	.858	3 - 15	4.77	2.76	43
	female-to-female ^e	.853	3 - 11	4.94	2.34	43	

* = Cronbach Alpha, ^a = 4 items, ^b = 2 items, ^c = 8 items, ^d = 6 items, ^e = 3 items

APPENDIX IV

Table A2. Mean differences of perceptions regarding victims.

	<i>Police employees</i>				<i>Social workers</i>				<i>Total</i>			
	Female Victim		Male Victim		Female Victim		Male Victim		Female Victim		Male Victim	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>
Severity of incident	24.67	21	24.29	21	25.30	20	25.55	20	24.98	41	24.90	41
Offender culpability	48.08	21	47.76	21	46.25	20	47.62	20	47.19	41	47.69	41
Offender risk	30.31	21	27.99	21	29.20	20	28.50	20	29.77	41	28.24	41
Victim culpability	9.76	21	10.12	21	9.55	20	8.82	20	9.66	41	9.49	41

Table A3. Mann-Whitney U Test with participants gender as independent.

Offender risk					
	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Md Females	Md Males	N
Male-to-female	97.000	-1.257	15.5	17.5	42
Male-to-male	123.000	-0.417	14.5	15.5	42
Female-to-male	130.500	-0.298	15.0	15.5	43
Female-to-female	54.500**	-2.684	15.0	18.0	43

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table A4. Mann-Whitney U Test with participants experience of working with IPV as independent.

Offender culpability					
	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Md 4 years and less	Md 5 years and more	N
Male offender	211.000	-0.127	48.0	49.5	42
Female offender	140.500*	-1.977	50.0	48.0	42

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table A5. Mann-Whitney U Test with participants experience of working with IPV as independent.

Offender culpability					
	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Md 4 years and less	Md 5 years and more	N
Male-to-female	138.000*	-2.004	25.5	26.5	42
Male-to-male	15.500	-1.604	27.0	23.0	42
Female-to-male	151.000	-1.900	26.0	24.0	43
Female-to-female	215.000	-0.320	24.0	23.5	43

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

APPENDIX V

Table A6. Mann-Whitney U Test with participants experience of working with IPV as independent.

Offender risk					
	Mann-Whitney U	Z	Md 4 years and less	Md 5 years and more	N
Male-to-female	167.500	-1,241	15.0	16.0	42
Male-to-male	171.500	-1,134	16.0	14.0	42
Female-to-male	148.500*	-1,956	16.0	14.0	43
Female-to-female	187.000	-1,009	16.0	15.0	43

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table A7. Correlations on gender differences of incident severity and the age of the participants

Incident severity					
	1	2	3	4	
1 Age					
2 Male-to-female IPV	-.002				
3 Male-to-male IPV	.109	.193			
4 Female-to-male IPV	-.120	.190	.131		
5 Female-to-female IPV	-.305*	.303	.307*	.001	

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

APPENDIX VI

Table A8. Mean differences between the participants education background.

	Incident severity							
	Police training		Social worker training		Criminology		Other education or none	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>
Opposite sex	25.42	12	25.89	19	24.40	5	25.80	5
Same sex	23.58	12	24.58	19	24.60	5	24.80	5
Male offender	25.67	12	25.65	20	24.20	5	25.00	5
Female offender	23.33	12	24.90	20	24.80	5	25.60	5
Male victim	25.08	12	25.21	19	24.20	5	24.00	5
Female victim	23.92	12	25.26	19	24.80	5	26.60	5
Male-to-female IPV	13.00	12	13.15	20	12.20	5	13.40	5
Male-to-male IPV	12.67	12	12.50	20	12.00	5	11.60	5
Female-to-male IPV	12.42	12	12.86	21	12.20	5	12.40	5
Female-to-female IPV	10.92	12	12.10	21	12.60	5	13.20	5

Table A9. Mean differences between the participants education background.

	Offender culpability							
	Police training		Social worker training		Criminology		Other education or none	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>
Male offender	48.16	12	47.90	20	49.00	5	49.40	5
Female offender	46.17	12	46.32	20	49.00	5	48.57	5
Male victim	46.14	12	47.18	19	53.40	5	47.66	5
Female victim	48.19	12	46.42	19	44.60	5	50.31	5
Male-to-female IPV	25.60	12	24.65	20	21.80	5	26.00	5
Male-to-male IPV	22.55	12	23.25	20	27.20	5	23.40	5
Female-to-male IPV	23.58	12	24.11	21	26.20	5	24.26	5
Female-to-female IPV	22.58	12	22.38	21	22.80	5	24.31	5

APPENDIX VII

Table A10. Mean differences between the participants education background.

	Offender risk							
	Police training		Social worker training		Criminology		Other education or none	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>
Male offender	28.34	12	29.40	20	31.40	5	30.00	5
Female offender	26.67	12	27.95	20	32.40	5	33.60	5
Male victim	25.81	12	27.74	19	33.60	5	30.60	5
Female victim	29.20	12	29.16	19	30.20	5	33.00	5
Male-to-female IPV	15.54	12	15.75	20	13.60	5	16.20	5
Male-to-male IPV	12.81	12	13.65	20	17.80	5	13.80	5
Female-to-male IPV	13.00	12	14.14	21	15.80	5	16.80	5
Female-to-female IPV	13.67	12	13.90	21	16.60	5	16.80	5

Table A11. Mean differences between the participants education background.

	Victim culpability							
	Police training		Social worker training		Criminology		Other education or none	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>N</i>
Male offender	10.52	12	8.20	20	10.39	5	9.60	5
Female offender	9.49	12	10.12	20	10.60	5	7.66	5
Male victim	10.67	12	8.66	19	8.95	5	10.34	5
Female victim	9.34	12	9.94	19	12.04	5	6.92	5
Male-to-female IPV	4.51	12	4.35	20	6.84	5	3.40	5
Male-to-male IPV	6.01	12	3.85	20	3.55	5	6.20	5
Female-to-male IPV	4.66	12	4.83	21	5.40	5	4.14	5
Female-to-female IPV	4.83	12	5.28	21	5.20	5	3.52	5