

Psychology of Women Quarterly

Why Women are Blamed for Being Sexually Harassed: The Effects of Empathy for Female Victims and Male Perpetrators

Journal:	<i>Psychology of Women Quarterly</i>
Manuscript ID	PWQ-18-294.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Qualitative Skills:	
Quantitative Skills:	ANOVA, ANCOVA, MANOVA, MANCOVA, Experimental studies (RCT)
Topical Expertise:	Sexual harassment, Vignette studies

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Why Women are Blamed for Being Sexually Harassed: The Effects of Empathy for Female
Victims and Male Perpetrators

Renata Bongiorno

University of Exeter, Exeter, United Kingdom and University of Queensland, Brisbane,
Australia

Chloe Langbroek

University of Queensland, Brisbane Australia

Paul G. Bain

University of Bath, Bath, United Kingdom

Michelle Ting

University of Queensland, Brisbane Australia

Michelle K. Ryan

University of Exeter, Exeter, United Kingdom

Author Note

This research was supported in part by funding from a European Research Council
Consolidator Grant: (ERC-2016-COG Grant 725128) awarded to the final author.

Correspondence concerning this article, including requests to access underlying
research materials, can be sent to Renata Bongiorno, Psychology, University of Exeter,
Streatham Campus, Exeter, EX4 4QG, United Kingdom. Email: r.bongiorno@exeter.ac.uk

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

2

Abstract

The #MeToo movement has highlighted the widespread problem of men's sexual harassment of women. Women are typically reluctant to make a sexual-harassment complaint and often encounter victim-blaming attitudes when they do, especially from men. Informed by the social identity perspective, two experiments examined the influence of empathy—both for women who are sexually harassed and for male harassers—on men's and women's propensity to blame victims. In Study 1, university students ($N = 97$) responded to a vignette describing a male student's harassment of a female student. Men blamed the victim more than women, which was explained by their greater empathy for the male perpetrator but not lesser empathy for the female victim. Using the same vignette, Study 2 asked university students ($N = 135$) to take either the male perpetrator's or the female victim's perspective. Regardless of participant gender, participants who took the male-perpetrator's perspective versus the female-victim's perspective reported greater victim blame, and this was explained by their greater empathy for the male perpetrator and lesser empathy for the female victim. Together, the findings provide evidence to suggest that male-perpetrator empathy may be equally or more important than female-victim empathy for explaining victim blame for sexual harassment. Implications for social-change, including policies to limit male-perpetrator empathy when processing women's sexual-harassment complaints in organizational settings, are discussed.

Keywords: empathy, victim blame, sexual harassment

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

3

Why Women are Blamed for Being Sexually Harassed: The Effects of Empathy for Female
Victims and Male Perpetrators

The sexual harassment of women by men is a pervasive and often hidden social problem (Fitzgerald & Cortina, 2018). In an effort to break the silence that often surrounds this form of abuse, millions of women have become involved in the #MeToo movement, using social media platforms like Twitter and Facebook to share their experiences of sexual harassment and its negative effects on their lives (Raihani, 2017). Yet the backlash against this movement (Solnit, 2018) has exposed the stigma that continues to surround women who are sexually harassed, and why reporting this form of abuse can actually worsen outcomes for victims (Bergman, Langhout, Palmieri, Cortina, & Fitzgerald, 2002). Consistent with this backlash, research shows that women are frequently blamed for being harassed through a focus on their purportedly provocative behaviors (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2017; De Judibus & McCabe, 2001; McDonald, Graham, & Martin, 2010). Research also shows that men, more than women, blame women for being harassed and endorse other negative views about female victims that help limit the culpability of male perpetrators (Lonsway, Cortina, & Magley, 2008).

To effectively address the problem of sexual harassment, it is important to understand men's more negative attitudes than women towards women who are sexually harassed. Existing theory and research suggests men's lesser empathy for female victims is likely to be important (Batson & Ahmad, 2009; Diehl, Glaser, & Bohner, 2014). In the current research, we focus on how empathy—both for women who are the targets of sexual harassment (female-victim empathy), but also for men who are accused of sexual harassment (male-perpetrator empathy)—influences men's and women's responding. Our research is informed by the social identity perspective, which considers how people's group affiliations and propensity to take the perspective of ingroup members influences their social responding

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

4

(Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Using this theoretical framework, we extend the typical focus on empathy's prosocial effects when it is directed towards victims (e.g., see Batson & Ahmad, 2009) to also consider the potential negative consequences of empathy for perpetrators. We test the hypothesis that both lesser empathy for female victims and greater empathy for male perpetrators will be important for explaining why men compared to women (Study 1), or people primed to focus on the male perpetrators' compared to the female victim's perspective (Study 2), are more likely to blame women for being sexually harassed.

Sexual Harassment: Definition, Prevalence and Effects

In many countries around the world, including the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia, sexual harassment is considered a form of sex discrimination. In Australia, where we conducted our research, sexual harassment is defined by the Australian Sex Discrimination Act 1984 as unwelcome sexual advances or requests for sexual favors that could reasonably be anticipated to offend, humiliate or intimidate the harassed person (Commonwealth of Australia, 2016, p. 37). Sexual harassment encompasses a wide range of behaviors including staring or leering; unwelcome touching; and sexual insults or taunts (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2014). Sexual harassment occurs in a range of contexts, including in the workplace (Ilies, Hauserman, Schwochau, & Stibal, 2003); educational institutions (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2017; Rosenthal, Smidt, & Freyd, 2016); public spaces (The Australia Institute, 2015) and online (Barak, 2005; Megarry, 2014).

Both women and men can be victims or perpetrators of sexual harassment. In this research we focus on male-to-female harassment, which extensive research indicates is the most prevalent form (Berdahl, Magley, & Waldo, 1996; Fitzgerald & Cortina, 2018; Paludi & Paludi, 2003). A recent Australian survey, representative of the population in terms of

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

5

respondent gender, age and residential area, found that one third (33%) of women compared to less than one in ten (9%) men had experienced sexual harassment since the age of 15, with the majority of women (90%) and men (61%) indicating their harasser was male (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2012). However, the prevalence of sexual harassment is likely to be much higher, as the 2012 survey asked respondents whether they had experienced sexual harassment using the legal definition, rather than scales that list specific behaviors that are considered sexual harassment (Ilies et al., 2003)

Victims report a range of negative physical, psychological and job/academic related effects from being sexually harassed, including post-traumatic stress, increased depression, greater levels of job/academic withdrawal and stress, and reduced productivity (Chan, Lam, Chow, & Cheung, 2008; Rosenthal et al., 2016; Willness, Steel, & Lee, 2007). The negative effects of sexual harassment are exacerbated by victim blame, which we focus on in the current research, and which relates to beliefs that women are sexually harassed, at least in part, because of their provocative behavior towards men (Jensen & Gutek, 1982). Considered a form of secondary victimization, being blamed for experiencing sexual harassment can help to explain why the job and health related outcomes for women who make a complaint are no better and can actually be worse than for those who do not report the abuse (Bergman et al., 2002). A fear of being blamed also contributes to very low rates of reporting (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2017; Jensen & Gutek, 1982) and to self-blame, which is a cause of additional psychological distress for women who are sexually harassed (Collinsworth, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 2009)

Gender Differences in Attitudes to Sexual Harassment and the Role of Empathy for Female Victims

Women and men tend to have different attitudes and beliefs about sexual harassment and how it affects women. Meta-analytic reviews suggest that unless the behavior is extreme

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

6

(e.g., sexual coercion), men are much less likely than women to perceive it as sexual harassment (Blumenthal, 1998; Rotundo, Nguyen, & Sackett, 2001). For instance, men are much less likely than women to consider derogatory remarks or dating pressure (e.g., unwanted, repeated requests for a date) as sexual harassment (see Rotundo et al., 2001). Men are also more likely than women to believe that women: fabricate or exaggerate sexual-harassment claims; have ulterior motives for filing a complaint; or are to blame for being sexually harassed due to behaving or dressing in a provocative manner or failing to clearly discourage men's sexual advances (Bitton & Danit, 2013; De Judicibus & McCabe, 2001; Diehl et al., 2014; Herzog, 2007; Lonsway et al., 2008; McCabe & Hardman, 2005; Russell & Trigg, 2004).

Existing theory and research suggest that people's negative attitudes towards disadvantaged or stigmatized groups – including men's greater likelihood of blaming women for being sexually harassed – can be explained by their lack of empathy for the victim or the victim group due to a failure to consider their perspective (for a review see Batson & Ahmad, 2009). Empathy is defined in different ways (Batson & Ahmad, 2009), but here we follow Batson, Early, and Salvarani (1997) to define empathy as an other-oriented emotion that relates to the welfare of a person or group in need, including feelings such as sympathy, compassion and concern. This form of empathy, also referred to as empathic concern, is an emotional response that can be distinguished from perspective-taking. Perspective-taking involves considering a situation from another's perspective, which can promote feelings of empathy towards that person, but does not always do so (Batson, Eklund, Chermok, Hoyt, & Ortiz, 2007; also see Tarrant, Calitri, & Weston, 2012).

To understand how empathy may contribute to negative attitudes towards female victims of sexual harassment, Diehl et al. (2014, Study 1) measured men's and women's victim empathy along with their endorsement of a measure of sexual harassment myth

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

7

1
2
3 acceptance (Lonsway et al., 2008), incorporating people's tendencies to deny sexual
4
5 harassment, downplay its consequences, and blame the victim. A hierarchical regression
6
7 showed that sexual harassment myths were endorsed more by men than by women, but when
8
9 the measure of participant's victim empathy was included in the model, the effect of
10
11 participant gender on endorsement of these myths became non-significant. They interpreted
12
13 this finding as indicating that gender differences in victim empathy could explain gender
14
15 differences in sexual harassment myth acceptance, although this was not based on a direct
16
17 test of mediation or moderation.
18
19

20
21 The social identity perspective (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner et al., 1987) provides a
22
23 useful theoretical framework for understanding why women compared to men may have
24
25 more empathy for woman who are sexually harassed and may thereby be less likely to blame
26
27 victims. According to this perspective, people define themselves not just as individuals, but
28
29 as members of social groups. Different social contexts emphasize the salience of one (or
30
31 potentially multiple) group memberships in common with others (e.g., gender, ethnic or
32
33 political groups), and the perception of similar others as interchangeable with the self. In a
34
35 case of male-to-female sexual harassment (and presuming other groups memberships are
36
37 equivalent) women's shared gender-group membership with the victim would facilitate their
38
39 greater likelihood of taking the victim's perspective, which can facilitate empathy (Batson,
40
41 Chang, Orr, & Rowland, 2002; Batson, Polycarpou, et al., 1997; Vescio, Sechrist, &
42
43 Paolucci, 2003). Women's greater empathy for a female victim may in turn make them less
44
45 likely than men to blame the victim (for a recent review on group membership as a basis for
46
47 empathy, see Vanman, 2016).
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 According to social identity theory, people will generally take the perspective of those
55
56 they consider ingroup (rather than outgroup) members within a given social context.
57
58 However, the theory also specifies that typical patterns of ingroup-outgroup responding are
59
60

not inevitable, and can be affected by a range of social factors including those that promote outgroup perspective-taking (Haslam & Reicher, 2012; Reicher, Cassidy, Wolpert, Hopkins, & Levine, 2006; Reicher, Haslam, & Smith, 2012; Reicher, Hopkins, Levine, & Rath, 2005). For instance, in relation to national identity (e.g., being Bulgarian), ingroups can be mobilized to protect vulnerable religious and ethnic outgroups (e.g., Bulgarian Jews during World War II) by political leaders who focus attention on the perspectives and experiences of those outgroups (Reicher et al., 2006)

In other research that has focused specifically on sexual harassment, Diehl et al. (2014; Study 2) found that when men read about a case of sexual harassment from the perspective of the female victim (compared to both a neutral control and an account from the male perpetrator's perspective) their endorsement of myths about sexual harassment were lower and equivalent to that of women. Diehl et al. (2014) speculated that this effect for men was likely due to outgroup perspective-taking leading to greater empathy for the female victim; however, they did not examine this empirically (for related research on the positive effect of outgroup perspective taking, see Batson et al., 2002; Batson, Polycarpou, et al., 1997).

The Role of Empathy for Male Perpetrators

Existing research examining the effects of empathy, including explaining why women are blamed for being sexually harassed, has primarily focused on its prosocial effects when it is directed towards victims or those in need. However, there are two perspectives in cases of male-to-female harassment—the female victim's and the male perpetrator's—which leaves open the possibility that men have more negative attitudes towards women who are sexually harassed because they are more likely than women to feel empathy for the male perpetrator's predicament. In research reported by Diehl et al. (2014; Study 2), participants were more likely to endorse myths about sexual harassment after reading about a case of sexual

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

9

1
2
3 harassment from the male perpetrator's (compared to the female victim's) perspective, but
4
5 the researchers attributed this finding to lesser empathy for female victims and did not
6
7 consider possible effects of male-perpetrator empathy. To reduce men's greater likelihood of
8
9 blaming women for being sexually harassed, addressing their greater empathy for male
10
11 perpetrators may be just as important as promoting their empathy for female victims.
12
13

14
15 The need to consider how empathy for the male perpetrator could affect men's
16
17 attitudes towards female victims is also consistent with the social identity perspective (Tajfel,
18
19 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner et al., 1987). As people derive an important part of their
20
21 identities from their existing social groups, they are motivated to evaluate their ingroups as
22
23 positive and moral (Leach, Ellemers, & Barreto, 2007; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Accusations
24
25 of ingroup wrong-doing, as in the case of a man's sexual harassment of a woman, may pose a
26
27 threat to men's sense of their gender group as moral. To reduce this threat, men may afford
28
29 male perpetrators the benefit of the doubt and interpret events in a way that is biased towards
30
31 that perpetrator's perspective. Men may believe, for example, that the male perpetrator did
32
33 not mean to cause harm, that what occurred was based on a misunderstanding, or that the
34
35 allegations are false—accounts that are frequently provided by men defending allegations of
36
37 sexual harassment in court (McDonald et al., 2010; Tata, 2000)
38
39
40
41

42
43 We argue that the role of male-perpetrator empathy has been overlooked in empirical
44
45 research on responses to sexual harassment. However, existing research on responding to
46
47 male-to-female sexual assault does support the notion that people can interpret events in a
48
49 way that is biased towards the perspective of the ingroup male perpetrator, and that this can
50
51 have negative implications for their attitudes and behaviors towards female victims. For
52
53 instance, Bal and van den Bos (2010) found that male students were more likely to derogate,
54
55 blame, and distance themselves from a female-rape victim when the male perpetrator was a
56
57 fellow student rather than a professor or a working adult. Along similar lines, Bongiorno,
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

10

1
2
3 McKimmie, and Masser (2016) found that both men and women were more likely to use
4
5 common excuses for rape (e.g., a female victim's counter-normative behavior, such as their
6
7 failure to forcefully resist their attacker) to help exonerate a male perpetrator who was from a
8
9 culturally similar, rather than culturally dissimilar, background to themselves.

Overview of the Current Studies

14
15 In summary, we argue that understanding average gender differences in attitudes
16
17 towards victims of male-to-female sexual harassment relies on understanding the effect that
18
19 ingroup perspective-taking has on men's and women's empathy for both the female victim
20
21 and the male perpetrator. We argue that women's shared gender-group membership with the
22
23 victim facilitates their greater focus on her perspective, promoting greater victim empathy
24
25 and reducing the likelihood that women will blame a woman for being sexually harassed. In a
26
27 similar way, we argue that men's shared gender-group membership with a male perpetrator
28
29 facilitates a greater focus on the male-perpetrator's perspective, prompting relatively greater
30
31 empathy for that perpetrator (i.e., due to having to defend allegations of sexual harassment)
32
33 and relatively greater blame of the female victim.

34
35
36
37 The social identity approach locates people's tendencies to take the perspectives of
38
39 ingroup members as important for understanding their social responding. Consistent with this
40
41 focus, we will also examine whether it is possible to shift the predicted participant gender
42
43 differences in responding to male-to-female sexual harassment by asking men and women to
44
45 focus on the perspective of either the male student or the female student before making their
46
47 responses. Following the perspective-taking manipulation, we predict that differences in
48
49 levels of empathy for the male perpetrator, the female victim, and victim blame will be a
50
51 function of whose perspective participants focus on, rather than participant gender.

52
53
54
55 We conducted two studies to examine our hypotheses. In Study 1, we asked male and
56
57 female participants to read a vignette describing a case of male-to-female sexual harassment,
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

11

1
2
3 before completing measures of empathy for the female victim, the male perpetrator, and
4
5 victim blame. In Study 2, we used the same vignette and measures as Study 1, but
6
7 experimentally manipulated perspective-taking by asking participants to consider how the
8
9 female student's allegations had affected the male student's life (male-perpetrator
10
11 perspective), or to imagine how the male student's behavior had affected the female student's
12
13 life (female-victim perspective). We predicted that men more than women (Study 1), or
14
15 participants who focused on the male- rather than the female-student's perspective (Study 2),
16
17 would report greater victim blame, and that this would be explained by their relatively greater
18
19 perpetrator empathy independent of their relatively lesser victim empathy.
20
21
22
23

24 Study 1

25
26 In this study we chose the context of female students being sexually harassed by male
27
28 students within a higher-education setting. Participants were self-identified male and female
29
30 Australian university students who responded to a vignette describing a female student's
31
32 serious allegation of sexual harassment against a male student living in the same residential
33
34 college. We considered this scenario suitable for our research aims based on surveys in
35
36 Australia (e.g., Australian Human Rights Commission, 2017) and other comparable countries
37
38 (e.g., The United States, see Rosenthal et al., 2016) which show that male-to-female sexual
39
40 harassment is a serious and prevalent issue in higher education. Victim blame is also common
41
42 and contributes to very low reporting rates (i.e., less than 6% of those harassed had reported
43
44 the abuse; Australian Human Rights Commission, 2017).
45
46
47
48

49 Study Design and Hypotheses

50
51 The measured variable of participant gender (male, female) represented the two levels
52
53 of our design. Victim blame was our key outcome measure and male-perpetrator empathy and
54
55 female-victim empathy were the mediators. We examined the prediction that compared to
56
57 women, men would report greater victim blame (Hypothesis 1); and that men's greater
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

12

propensity than women to blame the victim would be explained by their relatively lesser empathy for the female victim (Hypothesis 2a), and by their relatively greater empathy for the male perpetrator (Hypothesis 2b).

Method

The study was approved by a university ethical review committee and administered online. Participants demonstrated their consent at two points: (a) by clicking an icon to continue at the bottom of the online consent form; and (b) by submitting the completed survey. We kept personally identifying information (e.g., names and email addresses) separate from responses to manage risks associated with the potential for online confidentiality breaches. These procedures are in accordance with the guidelines established by the Board of Scientific Affairs Advisory Groups on conducting internet-based research (Kraut et al., 2004). We conducted analyses using IBM SPSS Statistics 23 software.

Participants. We advertised the survey as ‘Judgments about the Behavior of Students’ and targeted Australians currently enrolled as university students to complete the survey online. We advertised the survey to first year psychology students at an Australian university in the state of Queensland, using the SONA online management system connected to the School of Psychology’s Research Participation Scheme. We also advertised the survey through a page created on Facebook, which was shared throughout student networks via chain-referral sampling. Students from the School of Psychology Research Participation Scheme received course credit. Students recruited via the Facebook page were given the opportunity to be entered into a prize draw to win a \$100 gift certificate.

We recruited 61 participants (14 men, 47 women) from the Psychology Research Participation Scheme. We initially recruited 46 participants through Facebook, however 4 recruits (1 man, 3 women) identified that they were not currently enrolled as students, so 42 participants recruited through Facebook were retained for the analysis (11 men, 31 women).

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

13

1
2
3 The vast majority of participants recruited through Facebook were students in Queensland (n
4 = 39, 93%); the same state as those recruited through the Psychology Research Participation
5
6 Scheme.
7
8

9
10 Our total number of participants for initial analyses was 103 (25 men; 78 women:
11
12 $M_{\text{age}} = 20.19$ years, $SD = 3.95$). All participants were Australian citizens, and the majority (n
13 = 98, 95%) had English as a first language. Eighteen participants (17%) had lived in
14
15 university college residences, slightly more than the actual proportion (10%) of Australian
16
17 students who live in university college residences (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2013).
18
19

20 21 **Materials and Procedure.**

22
23
24 **Instructions.** Participants were provided with the following initial instructions: “This
25
26 project is seeking input from Australian students concerning how Australian universities
27
28 should deal with allegations of sexual harassment amongst students. You will be asked to
29
30 read and respond to a case based on actual events. Please carefully read the following case
31
32 before making your responses.”
33
34

35
36 **Vignette.** Following the instructions, participants were presented with the sexual
37
38 harassment vignette. To ensure realism, our vignette was based on actual incidents of sexual
39
40 harassment reported by female students in university college residences in Australia
41
42 (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2011), and on cases of sexual harassment handled by
43
44 the Australian Human Rights Commission (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2008,
45
46 2014). The scenario details also reflected the most typical male-to-female pattern of sexual
47
48 harassment uncovered in the recent large-scale survey of Australian university students
49
50 (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2017), which found that almost twice as many
51
52 women (32%) as men (17%) had been sexually harassed on campus and harassers were:
53
54 overwhelmingly male (77%); from the student population (68%); and that harassment
55
56 commonly occurred in residential colleges (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2017).
57
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

14

1
2
3 The vignette was:
4

5 An Australian female student reported being sexually harassed by an Australian male
6 student who was living in the same college as her on campus. She alleged that the
7 harassment occurred over the span of several months, taking place in several different
8 locations, including corridors and in the dining and common rooms in the college.
9
10 On the first day at the college, after being allocated rooms in the same corridor, the
11 female student alleged that the male student came up behind her while she was
12 unpacking and told her that she had a “really nice ass” and that he wouldn't mind if
13 she came to his room whenever she felt like “having some fun” with him.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 The female student also claimed that whenever she was in the common room
25 at the same time as the male student, he would come over and stand or sit as close as
26 he could to her, often slapping her bum or attempting to put his arm around her waist.
27
28 After asking him not to touch her, the female student claimed that she would often
29 have to leave the common room, and that the male student would react by calling out
30 after her that he was “just trying to get cosy” and that she “really needed to relax”.
31
32 The female student also reported that the male student often made a point of sitting
33 opposite her during dinner and would attempt to stroke her leg with his foot under the
34 table and made sexual gestures at her, including licking his lips and sucking on his
35 fingers.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The female student also alleged that the male student had sent several
48 pornographic images to her email, usually accompanied by explicit descriptions of
49 sexual acts he wanted her to engage in with him.
50
51
52
53

54 The female student claimed that on several occasions, the male student had
55 also come back to the college after going out drinking, and would bang loudly on her
56 door to be let in because he wanted a "cuddle". After refusing to unlock her door, the
57
58
59
60

female student claimed that the male student would yell insults at her, accusing her of being "frigid" and "ugly".

After repeatedly asking the male student to leave her alone, she finally sought help from a grievance officer in the college to intervene and stop the harassment.

When spoken to by the grievance officer about his behaviour, the male student admitted to most of the allegations. However he insisted that he had only been "joking around" and was just trying to "liven things up a bit in college". He indicated that he had never meant to upset the female student and had actually thought she had "enjoyed the attention".

Measures. After reading the vignette, participants completed the dependent measures. We used multiple items for all measures and composite scores were calculated as means. Participants then completed the comprehension check, a suspicion check, and demographic items.

Victim empathy. First, we measured empathy for the female victim. Consistent with our definition of empathy as *empathic concern* (see Batson & Ahmad, 2009), the four items we used to measure empathy were: "empathy", "concern", "sympathy", and "compassion". We selected items with high face validity from previous studies (e.g., see Batson, Polycarpou, et al., 1997; de Vos, van Zomeren, Gordijn, & Postmes, 2013; Tarrant, Dazeley, & Cottom, 2009) and excluded those that were not clear measures of the construct (e.g., excluding "indifferent" (reverse scored) from de Vos et al. 2013 and "warm" from Batson et al., 1997).

Similar to previous studies (e.g., Batson, Polycarpou, et al., 1997), these empathy items were presented randomly along with 13 distractor items describing other emotion states (e.g., "anger", "disgust"). Participants were asked to indicate how much they experienced the following emotions towards the female student while reading about the case. Participants rated each item on a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*a great deal*).

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

16

1
2
3 For the current sample, Cronbach's alpha was .71 for scores on this 4-item empathy
4 measure. This variable was negatively skewed (see Table 1) and where relevant for analyses
5 (i.e., as a dependent variable in a t -test), we corrected for negative skew using a square-root
6 transformation (z -score = 1.22; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Results for the transformed and
7 untransformed variable was nearly identical, with significance tests generating the same
8 conclusions in all cases. For ease of interpretation, we report the results for the untransformed
9 variable.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 *Perpetrator empathy.* We used the same items to measure empathy for the male
20 perpetrator, adapting the wording of the initial question by asking participants to indicate how
21 much they experienced the following emotions towards the male student while reading about
22 the case. Cronbach's alpha was .70 for scores on this 4-item measure of perpetrator empathy.
23 This variable was positively skewed (see Table 1), which we corrected for using square-root
24 transformation (z -score = 2.55) where relevant for analyses (i.e., as a dependent variable in a
25 t -test). As the results for the transformed and untransformed variables were nearly identical,
26 with significance tests generating the same conclusions in all cases, for ease of interpretation
27 we report the results for the untransformed variable.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 *Victim blame.* To measure the blame attributed to the female victim, we used four
41 items based on a victim blame measure from Bongiorno et al. (2016). The original items
42 assessed a victim's responsibility and provocative behaviors in a context of sexual assault
43 (including mentioning rape). For the present study, we developed the items to assess
44 judgments of responsibility and provocative behavior in response to our sexual harassment
45 scenario. The items were: "It's likely that the female student flirted with the male student at
46 some point"; "the female student should be willing to take some responsibility for what
47 happened"; "the female student is unlikely to have encouraged the attention she received
48 from the male student" (reverse scored); "It's very unlikely that the female student led the
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

17

1
2
3 male student on” (reverse scored). These reflected the types of victim blaming reported in the
4
5 survey into sexual harassment and assault at Australian universities, indicating high face
6
7 validity (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2017, p. 161-2).

8
9
10 These items were randomized and embedded with a number of distractor items
11
12 expressing opinions about the male and female student (e.g., “It’s normal for male students to
13
14 act this way towards female students”; “Most male students would not engage in this type of
15
16 behavior”). Participants rated each item on a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*strongly*
17
18 *disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Cronbach’s alpha for scores on this 4-item victim blame
19
20 measure was .75.
21
22

23
24 **Comprehension and suspicion checks.** To check if participants had read to the end of
25
26 the vignette, they were asked to indicate whether the male student admitted or denied most of
27
28 the female student’s allegations (“admit”, “deny”, “I can’t remember”). To test for suspicion,
29
30 participants were also asked to indicate what they thought the purpose of the study was.
31
32 Because men and women can have different views of what constitutes sexual harassment, we
33
34 also measured whether participants perceived the behavior of the male student as sexual
35
36 harassment (i.e., “In your opinion, was the male student’s behavior sexual harassment?” 1 =
37
38 *no, not at all*, 7 = *yes, very much*).
39
40
41

42 Results

43
44 **Data Analysis Plan.** Our analyses followed three phases. First, we performed
45
46 preliminary analyses on comprehension and suspicion checks. Second, we performed *t*-tests
47
48 for Hypothesis 1 that men would report greater victim blame than women. Third, we ran
49
50 multiple mediation analyses to test Hypotheses 2a and 2b that men’s greater victim blame
51
52 would be explained by their relatively lesser empathy for the female victim and by their
53
54 relatively greater empathy for the male perpetrator.
55
56
57
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

18

1
2
3 **Preliminary Analyses of Manipulations and Measures.** Of the 103 Australian
4 university students who were screened for inclusion in the initial analyses, we excluded 6
5 participants (4 women recruited from 1st Year and 2 women recruited from Facebook) who
6 incorrectly answered the question about whether the male student admitted or denied most of
7 the female student's allegations. No participants guessed the research aims in the suspicion
8 check. This resulted in a final sample of 97 participants (25 men, 72 women). Using victim
9 blame as the dependent variable, we used G*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007)
10 to perform a post-hoc power analysis, which indicated that even though the sample sizes of
11 men and women differed, there was reasonable power (.78) to detect the observed Cohen's *d*
12 of .64.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Ratings of whether the male student's behavior was perceived as sexual harassment
27 approached the ceiling point of 7 ($M = 6.35, SD = .90$). Perceptions of the behavior as sexual
28 harassment by men ($M = 6.16, SD = .80$) and women ($M = 6.42, SD = .93$) were not
29 significantly different, $t(95) = 1.23, df = 95, p = .22, 95\% CI [-.16, .67]$.
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Correlations.** Table 1 shows correlations between the measures for male and female
36 participants respectively. Victim blame was negatively correlated with female-victim
37 empathy for both men and women, while male-perpetrator empathy was positively correlated
38 with victim blame for women but not for men. Male-perpetrator and female-victim empathy
39 were uncorrelated, confirming the appropriateness of examining their distinct effects. The
40 highest correlations for both men and women were between victim blame and empathy for
41 the female victim ($r = -.55, r = -.37$ respectively).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 **Main Analyses.** To test Hypothesis 1, independent samples *t*-tests were conducted on
52 victim blame (see Table 1 for Means [*SDs*] for male and female participants). Consistent with
53 predictions, men were more likely to blame the victim than women were, $t(95) = 2.65, p =$
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
01, 95% CI [1.24, .18,], Cohen's *d* = .64.

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

19

Examining Hypotheses 2a and 2b, we first compared levels of empathy (see means in Table 1). Men reported more empathy for the perpetrator than women, $t(95) = 2.51, p = .014$, 95% CI [.95, .11], Cohen's $d = .56$. For victim empathy, the difference in men's and women's empathy for the female victim was not statistically significant, $t(95) = -1.70, p = .09$, 95% CI [-.07, -.87], Cohen's $d = .38$ (See Table 1 for means).

The mediating roles of perpetrator and victim empathy were tested using multiple mediation with Hayes' (2013) PROCESS macro for SPSS (with 5000 bootstrap samples), including female-victim and male-perpetrator empathy as parallel mediators. As shown in Figure 1, when both mediators were entered into the model, the significant participant gender effect for victim blame became non-significant. Only the mediation effect through male-perpetrator empathy was significant, indicated by a 95% confidence interval not including zero (male-perpetrator empathy: mean indirect [unstandardized] effect = .17; $SE = .11$, 95% CI [.016, .482]; female-victim empathy: mean indirect [unstandardized] effect = .19; $SE = .13$, 95% CI [-.014, .540]). That is, men's greater propensity than women to blame the female victim was mediated by their greater empathy for the male perpetrator, in support of Hypothesis 2b. Inconsistent with Hypothesis 2a, men's greater propensity than women to blame the victim was not mediated by their lesser empathy for the female victim.

Discussion

In Study 1, we tested our hypotheses that when responding to a case of male-to-female sexual harassment, gender differences in victim blame are explained by gender differences in empathy for the female victim and the male perpetrator. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, men were more likely than women to blame the victim. Inconsistent with Hypothesis 2a, men's relatively greater victim blame was not explained by their lesser empathy than women for the female victim. However, consistent with Hypothesis 2b, men

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

20

1
2
3 greater feelings of empathy for the male perpetrator did help explain why they were more
4
5 likely than women to blame the victim.
6
7

8 Even though empathy for the male perpetrator was significantly higher for male than
9
10 female participants, for both men and women means for this measure were below the scale
11
12 midpoint. While we cannot conclude that men felt strong perpetrator empathy overall,
13
14 variation in empathy within this range was still consequential for victim blame. This suggests
15
16 that even small changes in perpetrator empathy may influence people's judgements about
17
18 culpability and responsibility. Such judgments may transfer into other practical outcomes,
19
20 including reducing men's willingness to intervene as bystanders when they witness other men
21
22 sexually harassing women, or to encourage women to make a formal complaint or access
23
24 services (e.g., counselling) to overcome related trauma.
25
26
27

28 Empathy for the female victim was clearly associated with lesser victim blame,
29
30 consistent with the positive effects of victim empathy outlined in the literature (e.g., Diehl et
31
32 al., 2014; Batson & Ahmad, 2009). However, empathy for the female victim did not mediate
33
34 the gender effect for victim blame because we did not find significant gender differences in
35
36 female-victim empathy, which was high overall. This lack of significant gender difference
37
38 suggests that men's empathy for female victims may be similar to women's in this type of
39
40 scenario, even though men feel relatively greater empathy than women for a male perpetrator,
41
42 and are thus more likely to blame woman for being sexually harassed.
43
44
45
46

47 Study 1 established a link between gender differences in male-perpetrator empathy
48
49 and victim blame. However, if ingroup perspective-taking underlies average gender
50
51 differences in responding to sexual harassment, it should be possible to shift male and female
52
53 participant's typical patterns of responding by asking them to focus on the perspective of
54
55 either the male or female student before making their responses.
56
57

Study 2

60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

21

1
2
3 In Study 2, we used the same vignette and student population as Study 1, but this
4
5 time, we experimentally manipulated perspective-taking by asking male and female
6
7 participants to write a paragraph from the male- or female-student's perspective before
8
9 making their responses. We predicted that participant's levels of empathy for the male
10
11 perpetrator, the female victim and subsequent victim blame would vary as a function of
12
13 whose perspective they focused on when considering the allegations. This prediction was also
14
15 informed by findings reported in Study 2 of Diehl et al. (2014), whereby both men and
16
17 women who read about a case of sexual harassment from the male-perpetrator's, rather than
18
19 the female-victim's perspective, showed greater endorsement of myths about sexual
20
21 harassment.
22
23
24
25

26 Study Design and Hypotheses

27
28 We implemented a 2 (perspective-taking: male student, female student) x 2
29
30 (participant gender: male, female) between-participants design. As in Study 1, victim blame
31
32 was our key outcome measure and male-perpetrator empathy and female-victim empathy
33
34 were the mediators. We examined the prediction that participants who considered the male
35
36 perpetrator's (compared to the female victim's) perspective would report greater victim
37
38 blame (Hypothesis 3). We proposed that this would be explained by their relatively lesser
39
40 empathy for the female victim (Hypothesis 4a), and by their relatively greater empathy for
41
42 the male perpetrator (Hypothesis 4b).
43
44
45
46

47 Method

48
49 A university ethical review committee approved Study 2, which was administered
50
51 online. Participant consent and the management of risks associated with online confidentiality
52
53 breaches were identical to Study 1.
54
55

56 **Sample size determination.** We used the effect size for victim blame from Study 1
57
58 (Cohen's $d = .64$) as our best proxy indicator of the perspective-taking effect. A power
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

22

1
2
3 analysis using G*Power (Faul et al., 2007), recommended a sample of 62 to replicate the
4
5 Study 1 effect with power equal to .80. While we did not predict participant gender effects,
6
7 we estimated a sample size to examine participant gender interactions based on a medium
8
9 effect ($f = .25$), resulting in a recommended sample of 128. We aimed for a sample 30%
10
11 higher than this to account for unequal cell sizes and failures on the comprehension,
12
13 suspicion and manipulation checks.
14
15

16
17 **Participants.** Our recruitment and reimbursement methods were similar to Study 1,
18
19 which we conducted in the previous academic year. We initially recruited 122 participants
20
21 (30 men, 92 women) through a similar Facebook page to Study 1, which was shared by a
22
23 different co-author to a new network of student connections. Six of these recruits (2 men, 7
24
25 women) were excluded for not being students. To avoid contamination effects, a further 2
26
27 (women) were excluded because they indicated that they had recently completed another
28
29 study about sexual harassment being run in parallel with the current study. Thus, we retained
30
31 111 participants recruited through Facebook (28 males, 83 females) for analyses, the vast
32
33 majority of whom were students in the state of Queensland ($n = 101$, 91%). We also recruited
34
35 61 participants from the new student cohort on the Psychology Research Participation
36
37 Scheme (30 men, 31 women). When we became aware that the overall quota for women had
38
39 been passed, we restricted further data collection to men in the Psychology Research
40
41 Participation Scheme, without making this explicit to participants, and this is why the
42
43 proportion of men from this sample was higher than in Study 1. Thus, the total sample was
44
45 172 (58 men; 114 women: $M_{\text{age}} = 19.73$ years, $SD = 1.75$). That vast majority ($n = 159$,
46
47 92.4%) were Australian citizens and had English as a first language ($n = 158$, 91.9%). One-
48
49 hundred and four participants (60.5%) had lived in residential colleges, a higher proportion
50
51 than Study 1 due to a co-author sharing the Facebook page for the survey throughout a
52
53 network of students living in college residences.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Materials and Procedure.

Instructions and vignette. Participants were given the same initial instructions and vignette as Study 1. We incorporated the following additional instructions for the perspective-taking manipulation, adapted from Batson et al. (1997): “As you read the case, we want you to try and take the perspective of the [female/male] student described. Please try to imagine how the [female/male] student would be feeling about the [male student’s behavior/female student’s allegations] and how it has affected [her/his life]. After reading the case, you will be asked to write a brief paragraph from the [female/male] student’s perspective.” After reading the vignette, participants were asked to: “Please now take a minute or two to write about the case you just read from the perspective of the [female/male] student described. We would like you to write down how you think the [female/male] student would be feeling about the [male student’s behavior/female student’s allegations] and how it would affect [her/his] life.”

Measures. Following the vignette, participants completed identical measures to Study 1. Participants completed the items measuring empathy for the male perpetrator first ($\alpha = .72$), followed by items measuring empathy for the female victim ($\alpha = .78$) followed by the victim blame items ($\alpha = .72$).

As in Study 1, the scale measuring empathy for the male perpetrator was significantly positively skewed and the scale measuring empathy for the female victim was significantly negatively skewed (see Table 2 for the Skewness index for each variable). In each case, we corrected for skew using square-root transformation (perpetrator empathy z -score = 1.29; victim empathy z -score = 1.90). Results for the transformed and untransformed variables were nearly identical, with significance tests generating the same conclusions in all but one case. We report the results for the untransformed variables for ease of interpretation, noting the one difference below.

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

24

1
2
3 After our key measures, which were also embedded amongst a number of distractor
4 items as in Study 1, participants completed the same measures as Study 1 for whether the
5 actions were sexual harassment, the comprehension check, the suspicion check, and
6 demographic items. Participants recruited through Facebook were also asked to indicate
7 whether they had recently completed another study on sexual harassment via a link on
8 Facebook that we were running in parallel with the current study.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

Results

17
18
19 **Data Analysis Plan.** As in Study 1, our analyses followed three phases. First, we
20 performed preliminary analyses on comprehension and suspicion checks and measures. In the
21 second phase, we performed ANOVAs (analyses of variance) to test Hypothesis 3 that
22 participants who considered the male perpetrator's (rather than the female victim's)
23 perspective would endorse greater victim blame. These analysis would also allow us to
24 examine if there were any main or interaction effects for participant gender. In the third
25 phase, we ran multiple mediation analyses to test Hypothesis 4a and 4b that greater victim
26 blame shown by participants who considered the male perpetrator's (rather than the female
27 victim's) perspective would be explained by their relatively lesser empathy for the female
28 victim and relatively greater empathy for the male perpetrator
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Preliminary Analyses of Manipulations and Measures.** Of the 172 Australian
43 university students who satisfied the screening criteria, 18 were excluded (1 man and 4
44 women from the Research Participation Scheme and 2 men and 11 women from Facebook)
45 because they incorrectly answered the question about whether the male student admitted or
46 denied most of the female student's allegations, strongly suggesting that they had not read the
47 full scenario.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 Next, we examined whether participants passed the perspective-taking manipulation
57 check. Of the remaining 154 participants, the majority ($n = 135$, 87.7%) passed this check
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

25

(e.g., male student perspective-taking: *"I think the male student would be quite shocked by the allegations from the female student. He seemed to be having 'a bit' of fun and didn't mean to insult the female student. He would also feel quite upset that it has been taken to this level which is now a serious matter."*; female student perspective-taking: *"The female would be feeling abused and uncomfortable, and basically unsafe in her own environment. Furthermore, as she is forced to deal with this person in a college environment (where it may seem 'uncool' to speak out about it, she would feel alone and helpless to stop the harassment."*).

Participants who failed the perspective-taking manipulation check either wrote very little, made judgmental remarks, and/or took the alternative perspective (e.g., failed male perspective-taking who also took the victim's perspective: *"The male student would possibly feel threatened and could put the rest of his life in jeopardy. Although I think its fair, what the woman did according to her situation - considering the female gave the offender knowledge that what he was doing was wrong and she didn't like it. The male offender deserves what he gets."*; failed female perspective-taking: *"She never really told me she didn't like what I was doing, and now everyone thinks I'm a weirdo"*). Across the two experimental conditions, similar numbers of male and female participants failed the perspective-taking manipulation check (e.g., failed female student perspective-taking: 4 men, 3 women; failed male student perspective-taking: 4 men, 8 women). No participants guessed the research aims in the suspicion check. This resulted in a final sample of 135 participants (47 men, 88 women), including 68 participants (23 men, 45 women) in the female student perspective-taking condition, and 67 participants (24 men, 43 women) in the male student perspective-taking condition.

The male student's behavior was clearly perceived as sexual harassment ($M = 6.01$, $SD = 1.10$). Using a 2 (perspective-taking: male student, female student) \times 2 (participant

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

26

gender: male, female) between groups analysis of variance to identify differences on this measure, there was a significant main effect for perspective-taking: $F(1, 131) = 4.96, p = .028, \eta_p^2 = .036$, with participants in the female student perspective-taking condition ($M = 6.25, SD = .85$) agreeing more strongly than those in the male student perspective-taking condition that the male students' behavior was sexual harassment ($M = 5.76, SD = 1.26$). There was no main effect for participant gender $F(1, 131) = .12, p = .731, \eta_p^2 = .001$, and the interaction was not significant $F(1, 131) = .850, p = .358, \eta_p^2 = .006$.

Correlations. Table 2 shows correlations between the measures for participants in the male student versus female student perspective-taking conditions. Victim blame was negatively correlated with victim empathy for participants who took the female student's perspective, but not for participants who took the male student's perspective. In both perspective-taking conditions, victim blame was positively correlated with male-perpetrator empathy. As in Study 1, male-perpetrator empathy and female-victim empathy were uncorrelated in both perspective-taking conditions, confirming the appropriateness of examining their distinct effects. The highest correlation in the female student perspective-taking condition was between female-victim empathy and victim blame ($r = -.37$). In the male student perspective-taking condition, the highest correlation was between male-perpetrator empathy and victim blame ($r = .35$).

Main Analyses. We performed an analysis of variance (ANOVA), using a 2 (perspective-taking: male student, female student) x 2 (participant gender: men, women) design, for the key measure of victim blame. Supporting Hypothesis 3, there was a significant main effect of perspective-taking on victim blame (see means in Table 2). Participants who took the male student's perspective attributed greater blame to the victim than participants who took the female student's perspective, $F(1, 131) = 5.50, p = .021, \eta_p^2 = .04, 95\% CI$ (Mean difference) [.10, .88]. The main effect for participant gender on victim blame was not

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

27

1
2
3 significant, with a similar level for men ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.25$) and for women ($M = 3.09$, SD
4 $= 1.15$), $F(1, 131) = .11$, $p = .737$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$. The interaction between participant gender and
5
6 perspective-taking was also not significant, $F(1, 131) = 1.50$, $p = .222$, $\eta_p^2 = .011$.
7
8
9

10 To examine Hypotheses 4a and 4b, we first conducted preliminary analyses to
11 establish how perspective-taking and participant gender were related to male perpetrator and
12 female-victim empathy. For each empathy measure we used a 2 (perspective-taking: male
13 student, female student) x 2 (participant gender: male, female) analysis of variance, with both
14 factors between-subjects. For male-perpetrator empathy there was a main effect of
15 perspective-taking (see means in Table 2), with participants who took the male student's
16 perspective reporting significantly more empathy for the male perpetrator than participants
17 who took the female student's perspective, $F(1, 131) = 20.11$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .13$, 95% CI
18 (Mean difference) [.49, 1.18]. The main effect for participant gender was not significant, with
19 men's and women's empathy for the male perpetrator not differing significantly: ($M = 2.86$,
20 $SD = 1.22$ and $M = 2.64$, $SD = 1.02$ respectively) $F(1, 131) = 1.18$, $p = .279$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$. The
21 interaction between participant gender and perspective-taking was also not significant, $F(1,$
22 $131) = 2.11$ $p = .149$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 For victim empathy, there was a significant main effect of perspective taking (see
41 means in Table 2), with participants who took the female student's perspective reporting
42 significantly more empathy for the victim than participants who took the male student's
43 perspective, $F(1, 131) = 4.17$, $p = .043$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$, 95% CI (Mean difference) [-.76, -.02].
44 However, this difference was not significant using the transformed variable ($p = .072$). The
45 main effect for participant gender was not significant, with women's and men's empathy for
46 the female not differing significantly ($M = 5.53$, $SD = 1.19$ and $M = 5.53$, $SD = .92$
47 respectively), $F(1, 131) = .00$, $p = .983$, $\eta_p^2 = .00$. The interaction between participant gender
48 and perspective-taking was also not significant, $F(1, 131) = .03$, $p = .861$, $\eta_p^2 = .00$.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

28

To test the full mediation effects of male-perpetrator and female-victim empathy for the link between perspective-taking and victim blame (Hypotheses 4a and 4b), multiple mediation analyses using Hayes' (2013) PROCESS macro for SPSS (using 5000 bootstrap samples) were performed, with male-perpetrator empathy and female-victim empathy as parallel mediators. Bootstrapping is a more robust technique and does not rely on normally distributed variables (Erceg-Hurn & Mirosevich, 2008), so we used the untransformed empathy measures. For female-victim empathy, even though the main effect of perspective-taking was not significant in the ANOVA after correcting for skew, this main effect was significant when we used bootstrapping ($p = .037$, see Figure 2). Bias corrected 95% confidence intervals for both female-victim empathy (mean indirect [unstandardized] effect = .12; $SE = .06$ 95% CI [.013, .251]) and male-perpetrator empathy (mean indirect [unstandardized] effect = .26; $SE = .13$, 95% CI [.076, .571]) did not include zero, showing that both were significant mediators. As shown in Figure 2, when both mediators were entered into the model, the significant direct effect of perspective-taking on victim blame became non-significant, suggesting full mediation. Thus, greater victim blame for participants who took the male (as opposed to the female) student's perspective was explained by both their lesser empathy for the female victim and their greater empathy for the male perpetrator.

Discussion

In Study 2, we experimentally manipulated perspective-taking by asking participants to focus on either the male or the female student's perspective before making their responses. Consistent with our predictions, we found that participants who took the perspective of the male student accused of sexual harassment, rather than the female student who was the target of the harassment, attributed relatively more blame to that victim (Hypothesis 3). Mediation analyses demonstrated that this occurred because participants who considered the male-

perpetrator's perspective felt relatively less empathy for the female victim (Hypothesis 4a) and relatively greater empathy for the male perpetrator (Hypothesis 4b). There were no main effects or interactions for participant gender for any of our key measures.

The findings replicate the Study 1 results for perpetrator empathy and highlight why men may show greater victim blame as a result of a greater focus on the male perpetrator's (as opposed to the female victim's) perspective. Higher mean scores for male perpetrator empathy for participants who took his perspective were not indicative of high levels of empathy for that perpetrator. Nevertheless, the mean for that condition ($M = 3.1$) was closer to the scale midpoint of 4 on a 1 to 7 Likert-type scale than the lowest point. Moreover, the perspective taking manipulation had a much stronger effect on perceptions of the perpetrator than of the victim, with effect sizes for the perspective-taking manipulation four times larger for perpetrator empathy than for victim empathy. Thus, even in response to allegations involving an unambiguous case of sexual harassment, participants thought the female victim was more blameworthy arising from their greater empathy for the male perpetrator after considering his, rather than the victim's perspective.

The effect of perspective-taking on empathy for the female victim, while weaker than the effect shown for empathy for the male perpetrator, was also consistent with our hypotheses, showing that empathy for a female victim is important for explaining lesser victim blame, and is facilitated by a greater focus on the victim's (as opposed to the perpetrator's) perspective.

General Discussion

The goal of this research was to examine how empathy—both for a female victim of sexual harassment and for a male perpetrator—influences men's and women's likelihood of blaming the victim for being harassed. Our predictions were derived from the social identity perspective, which considers how group-based affiliations and ingroup perspective-taking

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

30

1
2
3 affects social responding. We expected that relatively lesser empathy for a female victim and
4
5 relatively greater empathy for a male perpetrator would be exhibited by men compared to
6
7 women (Study 1), and by participants who took the male-perpetrator's rather than the female-
8
9 victim's perspective (Study 2), and that both would be important for explaining greater victim
10
11 blame. We found partial support for our predictions relating to empathy for a female victim,
12
13 and full support for our predictions relating to empathy for a male perpetrator.
14
15

16
17 Overall, our findings suggest that in cases of male-to-female sexual harassment,
18
19 ingroup perspective-taking based on men's shared gender category with the male perpetrator
20
21 could predispose them to feel relatively more empathy for the male perpetrator and relatively
22
23 less empathy for the female victim than women. In Study 1, men's greater tendency to
24
25 endorse victim blame was explained by their greater empathy for the male perpetrator, but
26
27 not by their lesser empathy for the female victim. This finding suggests that men need not
28
29 feel lesser empathy for a female victim than women to feel relatively greater empathy for a
30
31 male perpetrator and to thereby be more likely than women to blame a woman for being
32
33 sexually harassed.
34
35
36

37
38 In Study 2, we examined whether a perspective-taking manipulation would affect
39
40 men's and women's responding. The social identity approach outlines a range of social
41
42 factors that can transform typical patterns of ingroup-outgroup responding, including those
43
44 that promote outgroup perspective-taking (Reicher, 2004; Reicher et al., 2006; Reicher et al.,
45
46 2005). Consistent with this view, we found that male and female participants asked to take
47
48 the perspective of the male student accused of sexual harassment, rather than the female
49
50 student who had been the target of abuse, reported relatively greater empathy for the male
51
52 perpetrator and relatively less empathy for the female victim, with both helping to explain
53
54 their greater tendency to blame the victim.
55
56
57
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

31

1
2
3 In both studies, there was no correlation between female-victim empathy and male-
4 perpetrator empathy, underscoring the importance of examining their distinct effects on
5 victim blame. However, men asked to focus on the female victim's perspective (as opposed
6 the male perpetrator's perspective), in Study 2 had relatively less empathy for the male
7 perpetrator and relatively more empathy for the female victim and they blamed the female
8 victim less. There is a corollary for women, though, as Study 2 also showed that women
9 prompted to consider the male perpetrator's perspective (as opposed to the female victim's
10 perspective) had relatively more empathy for the male perpetrator, relatively less empathy for
11 the female victim and blamed the victim more.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 These findings are based on a clear-cut case of sexual harassment, whereby the male
25 perpetrator admitted to most of the alleged behaviors, and participants recognized his
26 behaviors were sexual harassment. While it cannot be concluded that participants felt a strong
27 amount of empathy for the male perpetrator, the effect that participant gender (Study 1) and
28 perspective-taking (Study 2) had on perpetrator empathy was clear across studies and was
29 consequential for victim blame. Indeed, means for victim blame were above 3 on a 1 to 7
30 Likert-type scale for men in Study 1, and for those who took the male-student's perspective
31 in Study 2, with standard deviations above 1 indicating sizeable variation in scores. In a less
32 clear-cut case of sexual harassment, including where the male perpetrator denies the
33 allegations or where details are not fully disclosed, it is possible that empathy for the male
34 perpetrator would be higher than was found here, and lead to even greater levels of blame
35 towards female victims.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Our novel findings relating to empathy for male perpetrators highlight the importance
52 of examining its influence on how both men and women respond to allegations of male-to-
53 female sexual harassment. Men accused of sexual harassment and other forms of sexual
54 violence against women have generally not been considered acceptable or likely targets of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 empathy (see Batson, Polycarpou, et al., 1997 for a discussion of the improbability of
4
5 inducing empathy for perpetrators of gender-based violence, p. 116). However, more recent
6
7 research has uncovered that a lack of support for female victims is related to views of the
8
9 male perpetrator, including a belief that ‘good guys’ do not rape (Martinez, Wiersma-Mosley,
10
11 Jozkowski, & Becnel, 2018; McKimmie, Masser, & Bongiorno, 2014). The current findings
12
13 extend this work by showing that feeling empathy for men who sexually harass women based
14
15 on taking the male perpetrator’s perspective is an important factor in helping to explain why
16
17 women are likely to be blamed for their own sexual harassment, especially by men, but also
18
19 by women where the male-perpetrator’s perspective and outcomes become a focus.
20
21
22

23 24 **Practice Implications**

25
26 Many interventions to tackle male violence against women and promote men’s
27
28 positive bystander behavior currently use strategies to increase men’s empathy for women by
29
30 encouraging them to focus on the woman’s perspective and experiences (Banyard, Eckstein,
31
32 & Moynihan, 2010; Foubert, Godin, & Tatum, 2009; Zapp, Buelow, Soutiea, Berkowitz, &
33
34 Dejong, 2018). Our findings suggest that it may be equally important for interventions and
35
36 social-change campaigns to be focused on reducing empathy for male perpetrators. This
37
38 could be achieved by challenging myths that women provoke men’s sexual harassment or
39
40 often lie about being sexually harassed (see Lonsway et al., 2008). The ‘I Believe Her’
41
42 campaign (Brown, 2018) is one such effort, with this slogan being used as a hashtag on social
43
44 media to counter claims in high-profile cases that men accused of sexual violence are likely
45
46 to be the victims of women’s false accusations. Additional efforts that may be effective for
47
48 reducing empathy for male perpetrators include challenging media reports that give undue
49
50 prominence to their professional accomplishments or that focus on how the man’s life will be
51
52 negatively affected if there is a finding of sexual violence against him (LaChance, 2016).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Another important practice implication stemming from our findings for male
4 perpetrator empathy are that they can be used to improve how complaints of sexual
5 harassment are handled within universities and other organizations. To ensure that
6 appropriate action is taken against male harassers, organizations may need to implement
7 training to ensure that decision makers, who are often other men, are made aware of this
8 potential bias and trained to not be unduly influenced by their empathy for that perpetrator.
9
10 Additional steps to ensure a collegial relationship does not exist between decision makers and
11 the accused are also likely to be necessary. This may be especially important in cases where
12 students are sexually harassed by members of staff and concern for the fellow staff member
13 (and their career) outweighs concern for the welfare of students (for related report findings,
14 see Bull & Rye, 2018).

27 28 **Limitations and Future Directions**

29
30 In the current research, we examined our hypotheses in a university student context
31 with student samples who self-selected to participate in research about sexual harassment.
32 Thus, one limitation is that we cannot determine if their responses are representative of the
33 larger student population. Although we did not gather this information, it is possible that
34 student's familiar with the issue of sexual harassment (e.g., because they had experienced it
35 themselves or knew of someone who had), or with a more feminist outlook, were more likely
36 to participate. Their responses may therefore be different—and potentially more muted in
37 terms of the effects of perpetrator empathy and victim blame—to students who chose not to
38 participate.

39
40 Future research should also examine whether empathy for male perpetrators is
41 important for understanding why women are blamed for being sexually harassed in
42 alternative populations and contexts, including in cases where women are sexually harassed
43 in the workplace (Ilies et al., 2003) and online (Barak, 2005; Megarry, 2014). Examining
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

34

1
2
3 reactions to different types of sexual harassment (see, Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995;
4
5 Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Lim & Cortina, 2005) will also be important for establishing the
6
7 generalizability of our findings. The scenario used in the current research involved unwanted
8
9 sexual attention aimed at establishing a sexual relationship amongst peers. Future research is
10
11 needed to examine the effect of empathy for men who sexually harass women they are in a
12
13 position of power over, such as a male boss who harasses a female employee, or in rarer and
14
15 more severe cases involving sexual coercion (i.e., where bribery or force is used, see
16
17 Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Langhout et al., 2005).

21
22 Beyond the issue of victim blame, examining other responses to male-to-female
23
24 sexual harassment will also enhance our understanding of the effects of empathy for male
25
26 perpetrators. For instance, it may also help to explain when people are willing to be involved
27
28 in a cover up of the abuse, such as by discouraging woman from lodging a formal complaint
29
30 or by highlighting the risks to them for doing so (Cesario, Parks-Stamm, & Turgut, 2018).
31
32 Male-perpetrator empathy may also help explain endorsement of other myths about sexual
33
34 harassment, such as why people doubt a women's claims that they were sexually harassed, or
35
36 downplay the harm it caused (Lonsway et al., 2008). Future research can also examine
37
38 outcomes relating to the male perpetrator, including assessing the extent to which they are
39
40 considered blameworthy and what punishment is considered appropriate (McDonald et al.,
41
42 2010).
43
44
45

46
47 Future research should also examine how people's endorsement of traditional gender-
48
49 role beliefs (e.g., benevolent sexism, see Glick & Fiske, 1996) or their general endorsement
50
51 of group based dominance and inequality (e.g., social dominance orientation, see Pratto,
52
53 Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) influences the pattern of results for participant gender
54
55 (Study 1) and perspective-taking (Study 2) shown here. Existing research shows that sexism
56
57 is a significant predictor of victim blame for male-to-female sexual harassment (De Judicibus
58
59
60

1
2
3 & McCabe, 2001). It therefore follows that an individual (either male or female) who is high
4
5 in sexism or who believes in the primacy of some groups over others, would also be inclined
6
7 to show greater empathy for a male perpetrator or more resistant to instructions to focus on
8
9 the female-victim's perspective. Alternatively, individuals low in sexism, or who do not
10
11 believe in the primacy of some groups over others, may show greater empathy for victims
12
13 and be more resistant to instructions to focus on the male-perpetrator's perspective.
14
15

16
17 In the current research, we focused on the most common form of sexual harassment:
18
19 male-to-female. Thus, our findings cannot be generalized beyond a victim who is female and
20
21 a perpetrator who is male. In addition to the need to replicate the current findings using this
22
23 particular intersection of identities, future research is need to determine whether alternative
24
25 intersections of gender with the victim and perpetrator categories influences the pattern of
26
27 results shown here. In a case of female-to-male sexual harassment, it is possible that women
28
29 may feel more empathy for the perpetrator than men because the same ingroup bias shown by
30
31 men when the perpetrator is male may also be shown by women when the perpetrator is
32
33 female. For men responding to allegations of male-to-male sexual harassment, their level of
34
35 perpetrator empathy may rely more on beliefs about their own likelihood of being a target
36
37 (for related theorising, see Foubert et al., 2009; Schewe, 2002).
38
39
40
41

42
43 Beyond gender, the implications of other types of intersectionality of the victim and
44
45 perpetrator categories, including their national or ethnic backgrounds should also be
46
47 examined. In the current research, we deliberately left the ethnicity of the victim and
48
49 perpetrator ambiguous, describing them only as "Australian students". However, it is possible
50
51 that varying the nationality or ethnicity of the victim and the perpetrator may also affect the
52
53 how people respond. For instance, where an ethnic majority man is accused of sexual
54
55 harassment by a woman from an ethnic minority rather than the ethnic majority, ethnic
56
57 similarity to the perpetrator (and ethnic dissimilarity to the victim) may result in ethnic
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

36

majority men and women feeling relatively more perpetrator empathy, along with relatively lesser victim empathy, and to endorse victim blame more (for related findings involving sexual assault allegations, see Bongiorno et al., 2016).

The current research focused on (male-to-female) sexual harassment but beyond this form of abuse, perpetrator empathy may be important for explaining inadequate support for victims of other forms of abuse, including domestic violence and child sexual abuse. In light of recently exposed cover-up of child sexual abuse within religious institutions (Commonwealth of Australia Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, 2017), and police failures to protect women from men's sexual violence (Parratt & Pina, 2017), it would be valuable to examine whether concern for the perpetrator's predicament—in addition to a lack of empathy for victims—can help explain inadequate support received by victims more generally.

Concluding Comment

The #MeToo campaign has highlighted the extent to which the sexual harassment of women by men is an ongoing obstacle to gender equality. Adequately responding to this form of abuse relies on understanding and ultimately overcoming victim-blaming and other related attitudes, which are more likely to be endorsed by men than women (Lonsway et al., 2008). While previous research has highlighted the importance of increasing empathy for victims to facilitate more pro-social responding (Batson & Ahmad, 2009), we have shown that empathy for a male perpetrator contributes to increased victim blame in a clear case of sexual harassment. Perpetrator empathy is typically higher in men (when considering male perpetrators), but it can be increased among women when they take the perspective of a male perpetrator. A greater focus on this negative side to empathy is warranted, and will help us understand why women who are victims of sexual harassment are often blamed, rather than supported, when they experience abuse.

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2013). *Australian Social Trends: Characteristics of Higher Education Students*. cat. no. 4102, ABS, Canberra.
- Australian Human Rights Commission. (2008). *Sexual Harassment: Serious Business*. Retrieved from: www.humanrights.gov.au/sexualharassment
- Australian Human Rights Commission. (2011). *Report on the Review into the Treatment of Women at the Australian Defense Force Academy*. Retrieved from: <https://defencereview.humanrights.gov.au/report-review-treatment-women-australian-defence-force-academy>
- Australian Human Rights Commission. (2012). *Working without Fear: Results of the Sexual Harassment National Telephone Survey 2012*. Retrieved from: <https://www.humanrights.gov.au/chapter-6-working-without-fear-results-sexual-harassment-national-telephone-survey-2012>
- Australian Human Rights Commission. (2014). *Ending Workplace Sexual Harassment: A Resource for Small, Medium and Large Employers*. Retrieved from: https://www.humanrights.gov.au/sites/default/files/document/publication/EWSH_2014_Web.pdf
- Australian Human Rights Commission. (2017). *Change the Course: National Report on Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment at Australian Universities*. Retrieved from: <https://www.humanrights.gov.au/our-work/sex-discrimination/publications/change-course-national-report-sexual-assault-and-sexual>
- Bal, M., & van den Bos, K. (2010). The role of perpetrator similarity in reactions toward innocent victims. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 40*, 957-969. doi:10.1002/ejsp.668

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

38

- 1
2
3 Banyard, V. L., Eckstein, R. P., & Moynihan, M. M. (2010). Sexual violence prevention: The
4 role of stages of change. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*, 111-135.
5
6 doi:10.1177/0886260508329123
7
8
9
10 Barak, A. (2005). Sexual harassment on the internet. *Social Science Computer Review, 23*,
11
12 77-92. doi:10.1177/0894439304271540
13
14
15 Batson, C. D., & Ahmad, N. Y. (2009). Using empathy to improve intergroup attitudes and
16
17 relations. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 3*, 141-177. doi:10.1111/j.1751-
18
19 2409.2009.01013.x
20
21
22 Batson, C. D., Chang, J., Orr, R., & Rowland, J. (2002). Empathy, attitudes, and action: Can
23
24 feeling for a member of a stigmatized group motivate one to help the group?
25
26 *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 1656-1666.
27
28 doi:10.1177/014616702237647
29
30
31 Batson, C. D., Early, S., & Salvarani, D. (1997). Perspective taking: Imagining how another
32
33 feels versus imagining how you would feel. *Personality and Social Psychology*
34
35 *Bulletin, 23*, 751-758. doi:10.1177/0146167297237008
36
37
38 Batson, C. D., Eklund, J. H., Chermok, V. L., Hoyt, J. L., & Ortiz, B. G. (2007). An
39
40 additional antecedent of empathic concern: Valuing the welfare of the person in need.
41
42 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 65-74. doi:10.1037/0022-
43
44 3514.93.1.65
45
46
47 Batson, C. D., Polycarpou, M. P., Harmon-Jones, E., Imhoff, H., J., Mitchener, E. C., Bednar,
48
49 L. L., . . . Highberger, L. (1997). Empathy and attitudes: Can feeling for a member of
50
51 a stigmatized group improve feelings toward the group? *Journal of Personality and*
52
53 *Social Psychology, 72*, 105-118. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.72.1.105
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

39

- 1
2
3 Berdahl, J. L., Magley, V. J., & Waldo, C. R. (1996). The sexual harassment of men?
4
5 *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20, 527-547. doi:10.1111/j.1471-
6
7 6402.1996.tb00320.x
8
9
- 10 Bergman, M. E., Langhout, R. D., Palmieri, P. A., Cortina, L. M., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2002).
11
12 The (un)reasonableness of reporting: Antecedents and consequences of reporting
13
14 sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 230-242. doi:10.1037/0021-
15
16 9010.87.2.230
17
18
- 19 Bitton, M. S., & Danit, B. S. (2013). Perceptions and attitudes to sexual harassment: An
20
21 examination of sex differences and the sex composition of the harasser-target dyad.
22
23 *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43, 2136-2145. doi:10.1111/jasp.12166
24
25
- 26 Blumenthal, J. A. (1998). The reasonable woman standard: A meta-analytic review of gender
27
28 differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Law and Human Behavior*, 22(1), 33-
29
30 57. doi:0147-7307/98/0200-0033\$15.00/1
31
32
- 33 Bongiorno, R., McKimmie, B. M., & Masser, B. M. (2016). The selective use of rape-victim
34
35 stereotypes to protect culturally similar perpetrators. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*,
36
37 40, 398-413. doi:10.1177/0361684316631932
38
39
- 40 Brown, S. (2018). *Why The #IBelieveHer Movement Is Now More Critical Than Ever*.
41
42 Retrieved from <https://studybreaks.com/thoughts/i-believe-her/>
43
44
- 45 Bull, A., & Rye, R. (2018). *Silencing Students: Institutional Responses to Staff Sexual*
46
47 *Misconduct in UK Higher Education*. The 1752 Group/University of Portsmouth.
48
49 Portsmouth, UK. Retrieved from:
50
51 https://1752group.files.wordpress.com/2018/1709/silencing-students_the-1752-
52
53 [group.pdf](https://1752group.files.wordpress.com/2018/1709/silencing-students_the-1752-)
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

40

- 1
2
3 Cesario, B., Parks-Stamm, E., & Turgut, M. (2018). Initial assessment of the psychometric
4 properties of the sexual harassment reporting attitudes scale. *Cogent Psychology*, 5, 1-
5
6 11. doi:10.1080/23311908.2018.1517629
7
8
9
- 10 Chan, D. K. S., Lam, C. B., Chow, S. Y., & Cheung, S. F. (2008). Examining the job-related,
11 psychological, and physical outcomes of workplace sexual harassment: A
12 meta-analytic review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32, 362-376.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Collinsworth, L. L., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (2009). In harm's way: Factors related
to psychological distress following sexual harassment. *Psychology of Women
Quarterly*, 33, 475-490. doi:0361-6843/09
- Commonwealth of Australia. (2016). *Sex Discrimination Act 1984*. (Act No. 4, 1984;
Compilation No. 38 Stat.) Retrived from:
<https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C2016C00880>
- Commonwealth of Australia Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual
Abuse. (2017). *Final Report: Religious Institutions* (Volume 16: Book 1). Retrieved
from:
[https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/final_report_-
_volume_16_religious_institutions_book_11.pdf](https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/sites/default/files/final_report_-_volume_16_religious_institutions_book_11.pdf)
- 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, 401-417.
doi:10.1023/A:1011926027920
- de Vos, B., van Zomeren, M., Gordijn, E. H., & Postmes, T. (2013). The communication of
"pure" group-based anger reduces tendencies toward intergroup conflict because it
increases out-group empathy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39, 1043-
1052. doi:10.1177/0146167213489140

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

41

- 1
2
3 Diehl, C., Glaser, T., & Bohner, G. (2014). Face the consequences: Learning about victim's
4
5 suffering reduces sexual harassment myth acceptance and men's likelihood to sexually
6
7 harass. *Aggressive Behavior*, *40*, 489-503. doi:10.1002/ab.21553
8
9
- 10 Erceg-Hurn, D. M., & Mirosevich, V. M. (2008). Modern robust statistical methods: An easy
11
12 way to maximize the accuracy and power of your research. *American Psychologist*,
13
14 *63*, 591-601. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.591
15
16
- 17 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical
18
19 power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior*
20
21 *Research Methods*, *39*, 175-191. doi:10.3758/BF03193146
22
23
- 24 Fitzgerald, L. F., & Cortina, L. M. (2018). Sexual harassment in work organizations: A view
25
26 from the 21st century. In C. B. Travis, J. W. White, A. Rutherford, W. S. Williams, S.
27
28 L. Cook, & K. F. Wyche (Eds.), *APA Handbook of the Psychology of Women:*
29
30 *Perspectives on Women's Public and Private Lives*. Washington, DC: American
31
32 Psychological Association.
33
34
- 35 Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment:
36
37 Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *17*,
38
39 425-445. doi:10.1207/s15324834basp1704_2
40
41
- 42 Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., . . .
43
44 Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in
45
46 academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *32*, 152-175.
47
48 doi:10.1016/0001-8791(88)90012-7
49
50
- 51 Foubert, J. D., Godin, E. E., & Tatum, J. L. (2009). In their own words: Sophomore college
52
53 men describe attitude and behavior changes resulting from a rape prevention program
54
55 2 years after their participation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *25*, 2237-2257.
56
57 doi:10.1177/0886260509354881
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

42

1
2
3 Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and
4
5 benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70.

6
7
8 doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491

9
10 Haslam, S. A., & Reicher, S. (2012). When prisoners take over the prison: A social
11
12 psychology of resistance. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16, 154-179.

13
14
15 doi:10.1177/1088868311419864

16
17 Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process*
18
19 *analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

20
21 Herzog, S. (2007). Public perceptions of sexual harassment: An empirical analysis in Israel
22
23 from consensus and feminist theoretical perspectives. *Sex Roles*, 57, 579-592.

24
25
26 doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9220-6

27
28 Ilies, R., Hauserman, N., Schwochau, S., & Stibal, J. (2003). Reported incidence rates of
29
30 work-related sexual harassment in the United States: Using meta-analysis to explain
31
32 reported rate disparities. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 607-631. doi:10.1111/j.1744-

33
34
35 6570.2003.tb00752.x

36
37 Jensen, I. W., & Gutek, B. A. (1982). Attributions and assignment of responsibility in sexual
38
39 harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38, 121-136. doi:10.1111/j.1540-

40
41
42 4560.1982.tb01914.x

43
44 Kraut, R., Olson, J., Banaji, M., Bruckman, A., Cohen, J., & Couper, M. (2004).

45
46 Psychological research online: Report of Board of Scientific Affairs' Advisory Group
47
48 on the conduct of research on the internet. *American Psychologist*, 59, 105-117.

49
50
51 doi:10.1037/0003-066X.59.2.105

52
53 LaChance, N. (2016). Media continues to refer to Brock Turner as a "Stanford Swimmer"
54
55 rather than a rapist. *The Intercept*. Retrieved from

56
57
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

43

1
2
3 [https://theintercept.com/2016/2009/2002/media-continues-to-refer-to-brock-turner-as-](https://theintercept.com/2016/2009/2002/media-continues-to-refer-to-brock-turner-as-a-stanford-swimmer-rather-than-a-rapist/)
4 [a-stanford-swimmer-rather-than-a-rapist/](https://theintercept.com/2016/2009/2002/media-continues-to-refer-to-brock-turner-as-a-stanford-swimmer-rather-than-a-rapist/)
5
6
7

8 Langhout, R. D., Bergman, M. E., Cortina, L. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., & Williams,
9
10 J. H. (2005). Sexual harassment severity: Assessing situational and personal
11
12 determinants and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35*, 975-1007.
13
14 doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02156.x
15
16

17 Leach, C. W., Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2007). Group virtue: The importance of morality
18
19 (vs. competence and sociability) in the positive evaluation of in-groups. *Journal of*
20
21 *Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 234-249. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.2.234
22
23

24 Lim, S., & Cortina, L. M. (2005). Interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace: The interface
25
26 and impact of general incivility and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied*
27
28 *Psychology, 90*, 483. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.483
29
30

31 Lonsway, K. A., Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Sexual harassment mythology:
32
33 Definition, conceptualization, and measurement. *Sex Roles, 58*, 599-615.
34
35 doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9367-1
36
37

38 Martinez, T., Wiersma-Mosley, J., Jozkowski, K., & Becnel, J. (2018). "Good guys don't
39
40 rape": Greek and non-Greek college student perpetrator rape myths. *Behavioral*
41
42 *Sciences, 8*, 60, 1-10. doi:10.3390/bs8070060
43
44

45 McCabe, M. P., & Hardman, L. (2005). Attitudes and perceptions of workers to sexual
46
47 harassment. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 145*, 719-740.
48
49 doi:10.3200/SOCP.145.6.719-740
50
51

52 McDonald, P., Graham, T., & Martin, B. (2010). Outrage management in cases of sexual
53
54 harassment as revealed in judicial decisions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 34*,
55
56 165-180. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2010.01559.x
57
58
59
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

44

- 1
2
3 McKimmie, B. M., Masser, B. M., & Bongiorno, R. (2014). What counts as rape? The effect
4
5 of offense prototypes, victim stereotypes, and participant gender on how the
6
7 complainant and defendant are perceived. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*,
8
9 2273-2303. doi:10.1177/0886260513518843
10
11
- 12 Megarry, J. (2014). Online incivility or sexual harassment? Conceptualising women's
13
14 experiences in the digital age. *Women's Studies International Forum, 47*, 46-55.
15
16 doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2014.07.012
17
18
- 19 Paludi, M. A., & Paludi, C. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Academic and workplace sexual harassment: A*
20
21 *handbook of cultural, social science, management, and legal perspectives*. Westport,
22
23 CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.
24
25
- 26 Parratt, K. A., & Pina, A. (2017). From “real rape” to real justice: A systematic review of
27
28 police officers' rape myth beliefs. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 34*, 68-83.
29
30 doi:10.1016/j.avb.2017.03.005
31
32
- 33 Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance
34
35 orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of*
36
37 *Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 741-763. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741
38
39
- 40 Raihani, N. (2017). Safety in numbers. *New Scientist, 236*(3149), 24-25. doi:10.1016/S0262-
41
42 4079(17)32115-2
43
44
- 45 Reicher, S. (2004). The context of social identity: Domination, resistance, and change.
46
47 *Political Psychology, 25*, 921-945. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00403.x
48
49
- 50 Reicher, S., Cassidy, C., Wolpert, I., Hopkins, N., & Levine, M. (2006). Saving Bulgaria's
51
52 Jews: An analysis of social identity and the mobilisation of social solidarity.
53
54 *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 49-72. doi:10.1002/ejsp.291
55
56
- 57 Reicher, S., Haslam, S. A., & Smith, J. R. (2012). Working toward the experimenter:
58
59 Reconceptualizing obedience within the Milgram paradigm as identification-based
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

45

1
2
3 followership. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7, 315-324.

4
5 doi:10.1177/1745691612448482

6
7
8 Reicher, S., Hopkins, N., Levine, M., & Rath, R. (2005). Entrepreneurs of hate and
9
10 entrepreneurs of solidarity: Social identity as a basis for mass communication.
11
12 *International Review of the Red Cross*, 87(860), 621-637.

13
14
15 doi:10.1017/S1816383100184462

16
17 Rosenthal, M. N., Smidt, A. M., & Freyd, J. J. (2016). Still second class: Sexual harassment
18
19 of graduate students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40, 364-377.

20
21
22 doi:10.1177/0361684316644838

23
24 Rotundo, M., Nguyen, D. H., & Sackett, P. R. (2001). A meta-analytic review of gender
25
26 differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86,
27
28 914-922. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.914

29
30
31 Russell, B. L., & Trigg, K. Y. (2004). Tolerance of sexual harassment: An examination of
32
33 gender differences, ambivalent sexism, social dominance, and gender roles. *Sex Roles*,
34
35 50, 565-573. doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000023075.32252.fd

36
37
38 Schewe, P. A. (2002). Guidelines for developing rape prevention and risk reduction
39
40 interventions. In P. A. Schewe (Ed.), *Preventing violence in relationships:*
41
42 *Interventions across the life span* (pp. 107-136). Washington, DC: American
43
44 Psychological Association.

45
46
47 Solnit, R. (2018). Rebecca Solnit on the #MeToo Backlash: Stop telling us how to confront
48
49 an epidemic of violence and abuse [Web log message]. Retrieved from
50
51 <https://lithub.com/rebecca-solnit-on-the-metoo-backlash/>

52
53
54 Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston, MA:
55
56 Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

46

- 1
2
3 Tajfel, H. (Ed.) (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social*
4
5 *psychology of intergroup relations*. London, England: Academic Press.
6
7
8 Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G.
9
10 Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (Rev ed.,
11
12 pp. 33-47). Monterey: Brooks/Cole.
13
14
15 Tarrant, M., Calitri, R., & Weston, D. (2012). Social identification structures the effects of
16
17 perspective taking. *Psychological Science, 23*, 973-978.
18
19 doi:10.1177/0956797612441221
20
21
22 Tarrant, M., Dazeley, S., & Cottom, T. (2009). Social categorization and empathy for
23
24 outgroup members. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 48*, 427-446.
25
26 doi:10.1348/014466608X373589
27
28
29 Tata, J. (2000). She said, he said. The influence of remedial accounts on third-party
30
31 judgments of coworker sexual harassment. *Journal of Management, 26*, 1133-1156.
32
33 doi:10.1177/014920630002600604
34
35
36 The Australia Institute. (2015). *Everyday sexism: Australian women's experiences of street*
37
38 *harassment*, Retrieved from:
39
40 http://www.tai.org.au/sites/default/files/Everyday_sexism_TAIMarch2015_2010.pdf
41
42
43 Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S., & Wetherell, M. S. (Eds.). (1987).
44
45 *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, England: Basil
46
47 Blackwell.
48
49
50 Vanman, E. J. (2016). The role of empathy in intergroup relations. *Current Opinion in*
51
52 *Psychology, 11*, 59-63. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.06.007
53
54
55 Vescio, T. K., Sechrist, G. B., & Paolucci, M. P. (2003). Perspective taking and prejudice
56
57 reduction: The mediational role of empathy arousal and situational attributions.
58
59 *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 455-472. doi:10.1002/ejsp.163
60

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

47

1
2
3 Willness, C. R., Steel, P., & Lee, K. (2007). A meta-analysis of the antecedents and
4
5 consequences of workplace sexual harassment. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 127-162.

6
7
8 doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00067.x
9

10 Zapp, D., Buelow, R., Soutiea, L., Berkowitz, A., & Dejong, W. (2018). Exploring the
11
12 potential campus-level impact of online universal sexual assault prevention education.
13

14
15 *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance online publication.

16
17 doi:10.1177/0886260518762449
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

48

Table 1

Study 1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Victim Blame, Female-Victim Empathy and Male-Perpetrator Empathy

Study 1	Range	Skewness index [^]	M (SD)		1	2	3
			Men	Women			
1. Victim blame	1-5.75	1.34	3.15 (1.03)	2.44 (1.20)	–	-.37**	.28*
2. Victim empathy	2.75-7	-3.31	5.33 (1.10)	5.73 (.98)	-.55**	–	.04
3. Perpetrator empathy	1-4.75	4.18	2.35 (1.02)	1.82 (.87)	.12	-.07	–

Note. Correlations for men reported on bottom left and for women on top right. [^]Skewness index is the Skewness statistic divided by its standard error.

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

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

49

Table 2

Study 2 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Victim Blame, Female-Victim Empathy and Male-Perpetrator Empathy


Study 2	Range	Skewness index [^]	<i>M (SD)</i>		1	2	3
			Male Perspective	Female Perspective			
1. Victim blame	1-6.5	1.67	3.35 (1.24)	2.79 (1.05)	–	-.37**	.26*
2. Victim empathy	2.25-7	-3.75	5.33 (1.19)	5.72 (.97)	-.17	–	.02
3. Perpetrator empathy	1-6.25	4.00	3.10 (1.04)	2.34 (1.03)	.35**	.02	–

Note. Correlations for male perspective reported on bottom left and for female perspective on top right. [^]Skewness index is the Skewness statistic divided by its standard error

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

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

50




Note. Unstandardized coefficients (SE); *ns* = non significant.

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

Figure 1. Mediation model from Study 1 showing the effect of participant gender on victim blame mediated by empathy for the female victim and empathy for the male perpetrator.

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR EMPATHY

51



Note. Unstandardized coefficients (SE); ns = non-significant

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

Figure 2. Mediation model from Study 2 showing the effect of perspective-taking on victim blame mediated by empathy for the female victim and empathy for the male perpetrator.