

## Claremont Colleges Scholarship @ Claremont

---

Scripps Senior Theses

Scripps Student Scholarship

---

2013

# The Role of Emotional Intelligence in Sympathizing with Rape Victims

Alexis Barab  
*Scripps College*

---

### Recommended Citation

Barab, Alexis, "The Role of Emotional Intelligence in Sympathizing with Rape Victims" (2013). *Scripps Senior Theses*. 296.  
[http://scholarship.claremont.edu/scripps\\_theses/296](http://scholarship.claremont.edu/scripps_theses/296)

This Open Access Senior Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Scripps Student Scholarship at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scripps Senior Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact [scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu](mailto:scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu).

The Role of Emotional Intelligence in Sympathizing with Rape victims

Alexis Barab

Scripps College

## Abstract

This study examined the relationships among participants' emotional intelligence and participants' sympathy for an alleged rape victim<sup>1</sup>, sympathy for a defendant, and verdict in a mock rape case. Participants were 219 (127 female, 92 male) United States jury eligible individuals between the ages of 18 and 66. Participants were given a rape trial summary accompanied by a manipulated emotional facial expression of the alleged rape victim (angry, sad, afraid, or neutral), or no photograph. Participants were asked to render an individual case verdict and complete a questionnaire with measures to test sympathy for the alleged rape victim, sympathy for the defendant, self-emotional intelligence, other-emotional intelligence, and rape-myth acceptance. Results provided evidence that self and other-emotional intelligences are positively correlated; sympathy for rape victim and sympathy for the defendant do have an effect on case verdict; and, participant characteristics including gender, age, and race are predictive of rape myth acceptance, sympathy for the defendant, sympathy for the victim, and emotional intelligence. Further research should expand on emotional intelligence as a juror characteristic in the United States as well as internationally.

---

<sup>1</sup> The term rape victim, rather than rape survivor, is used in this study to refer to an individual's victim status in the context of the legal system.

### The Role of Emotional Intelligence in Sympathizing with Rape Victims

There has been a significant body of psychological research surrounding victim blame and mock juror verdict decisions regarding rape victims in rape cases. These studies often correlate mock jurors' verdicts or feelings towards rape victims with juror characteristics including gender, age, and race or with the rape victims' situation, race, age, dress, economic status, and actions (Abbey & Harnish, 1995; Field, 1978; Field 1979; Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Krahe, 1988; Rempala & Geers, 2009).

The purpose of this study is to assess a relatively unexamined topic: the relationships among participants' emotional intelligence and participants' sympathy for a survivor of rape, sympathy for a defendant, and verdict in a rape case. Historically, research in the psychology of law and research in the psychology of emotional intelligence have not often overlapped. Research on emotional intelligence has focused on personal relationships, work relationships and success, and educational and health outcomes (Akerjordet & Severinsson, 2007; Austin, 2010; Salovey & Grewal, 2005). Studying emotional intelligence as it relates to the psychology of law could shed light on whether or not emotional intelligence is predictive of juror decision-making within the legal system. Relevant research in the psychology of law will be discussed followed by psychological research of rape trials and juror decision-making. Emotional intelligence theories and research will then be presented followed by the present study's design and hypotheses.

### **Psychology of Law**

Psychology of law includes the psychological study of the legal system and actors within the legal system including jurors, judges, lawyers, witnesses, defendants, victims and, in civil cases, plaintiffs. The fields of psychology of law and psychology of emotion often overlap, especially in cases with emotionally charged content such as rape cases. Rape cases can be emotionally charged experiences not only for the survivor and defendant but also for the court's gallery, judge, lawyers, and jurors. Jurors in trials for violent crimes, such as rape, can be exposed to emotional testimony and emotionally disturbing evidence such as photographs and tapes (Salerno & Bottoms, 2009). It is important to investigate emotional factors within criminal trials such as emotional testimony and emotionally disturbing evidence because these factors potentially affect jurors' attributions of guilt and blame to and feelings of sympathy for victims and defendants, which in turn can affect jurors' case verdicts. After reading rape case summaries, mock jurors who attributed more blame to the rape victim were less likely to be sympathetic towards the victim (Krahé, 1988). In addition, mock jurors who reported less sympathy for the victim were less likely to find the defendant guilty (Sperry, 2009). A few important factors that can affect jurors' sympathy for the rape victim and the defendant will be discussed in detail: jurors' attribution of blame, victim and defendant displayed emotion at trial, jurors' perception of intentionality, and emotional evidence or testimony.

**Attribution of blame.** One factor that may affect jurors' levels of sympathy towards a rape victim in a rape case could be jurors' use of attribution of blame. Attribution theory refers to the process by which individuals explain the cause of

behavior and events. Attributions can either be internal or external. When person A exhibits behavior B, an internal attribution would be that person A caused behavior B; an external attribution would be that an external factor C (or any number of external factors D, E, and F) caused person A to exhibit behavior B (Heider, 1944).

In addition to explaining the cause of behavior, individuals' attributions affect the way in which people judge outcomes and assign blame (Grubb & Harrower, 2009). A number of attribution biases could help explain the way in which jurors' assign blame to defendants and victims in rape cases including, but not limited to, the fundamental attribution error and the defensive attribution theory (Grubb & Harrower, 2009).

According to the fundamental attribution error, when individuals are evaluating the behaviors of others, they are more likely to over-value personality explanations (internal attributions) while under-valuing situational explanations (external attributions) (Heider, 1958; Ross, 1977 as cited in Langdrige & Butt, 2004). This attribution error is an ego defense mechanism, which protects individuals so they can believe that something bad that happens to another person is the result of that person's personality flaws, when, in reality, the situation could have been caused by external factors beyond the individual's control (Grubb & Harrower, 2009). In order to protect their own world views, jurors in a rape case may attribute the blame for a rape to the rape victim, thinking that the rape victim had control over her own situation and could have stopped the rape if she so desired. According to the defensive attribution theory, individuals attribute less blame to individuals with whom they feel similar (Shaver, 1970, as cited in Grubb & Harrower, 2009). The influence of similarity between mock jurors and defendants and mock jurors

and victims is discussed in the section regarding juror, victim, and defendant joint characteristics.

Jurors may attribute blame to the rape victim for any number of reasons including, but not limited to, the fundamental attribution theory, the defensive attribution theory, and acceptance of rape myths and belief in a just world, which will be discussed below. Studies have shown that regardless of the reason for mock jurors' attribution of blame, attribution of blame to the rape victim is negatively correlated with sympathy for the rape victim and attribution of blame to the defendant is negatively correlated with sympathy for the defendant and positively correlated with sympathy for the rape victim (Grubb & Harrower, 2009; Hammond & Rodriguez, 2011; Krahe, 1988; Sinclair & Bourne, 1998).

**Defendant and victim displayed emotion.** People learn what types of emotions are acceptable for given situations; these culturally appropriate emotions are called emotional norms (Ekman, 2005; Ekman & Friesen, 1969, as cited in Rose et al., 2006). Law enforcement personnel often make judgments about defendants and victims based on whether or not the defendant or victim fits emotional norms (Heath, 2009). For example, a rape victim may be perceived as lying or less believable if her emotional expressions are incongruent with the crime committed against her or if she is not, according to the viewer, appropriately upset by her situation (Heath, 2009). When law enforcement personnel apprehend suspects who, regardless of their guilt, fit the law enforcement norms for guilty criminals, they may stop investigating other leads and assume the suspects' guilt (Heath, 2009).

Law enforcement personnel are not the only ones who evaluate suspects and victims based on emotional norms. Studies have shown that mock jurors expect victims

to display certain emotions depending on the crime committed against them (Rose et al., 2006). When the type of emotion displayed by the victim is incongruent with the crime committed against him or her, the victim becomes less credible in the eyes of the mock jurors (Rose et al., 2006). In addition to the valence of the emotional norm, mock jurors expect for the intensity of the emotion displayed to be proportional to the gravity of the crime (Rose et al., 2006). In Rose et al.'s study (2006), the higher the intensity of the emotion, given that it is proportional to the crime, the more sympathy the victim will receive from mock jurors and the harsher the sentencing against the defendant will be. For example, if jurors were to see the same brutal rape case with two survivors, one who appeared mildly upset and one who appeared extremely upset, jurors would likely be more sympathetic towards the rape victim who appeared extremely upset than they would be towards the rape victim who appeared mildly upset.

When a victim displays intense negative emotions, mock jurors are less likely to attribute the blame to the victim because the victim's intense negative emotions signal to the mock jurors that being a victim of this type of crime is inconsistent with that person's fundamental identity (Rose et al., 2006). When the victim displays low intensity negative emotions or neutral emotions, mock jurors are likely to perceive the victim as someone who is used to the "victim role" (Rose et al., 2006). In the hypothetical given above, jurors would likely attribute more blame to the rape victim who appeared mildly upset as compared to the rape victim who appeared extremely upset because the jurors would see the extremely upset victim as being less used to the "victim role" and therefore more distraught with her condition as a "victim."



Jurors also have similar emotional norms for defendants. To gain sympathy from jurors, defendants should display the “appropriate emotion” for the occasion (sorrowful rather than happy or sad), and the defendants’ emotion displayed should be proportional to the crimes committed (Heath, 2009). A low intensity show of emotion may also signal to jurors that the defendant is guilty; defendants who show little or no emotion may be regarded by jurors as deceptive and therefore guilty (Heath, 2009). Despite the evidence regarding defendant and victim fit with emotional norms on individual juror decision-making, this effect can be mediated by juror group deliberation (Dahl et al., 2007). This is important to note because many psychological studies in law examine independent variables (in this case congruence or incongruence of defendant’s and victim’s display of emotional norms) on individual participant decision-making in simulated trials rather than juror group deliberation, which more closely mirrors the United States’ legal system.

**Emotional evidence.** There is psychological and neurological evidence that the presence of increased emotional load in a trial whether it is from emotional evidence like photographs of a woman after being raped and beaten, graphic emotional testimony given by the victim, or even intense emotional expressions demonstrated by the victim or defendants, could cause mock jurors to make decisions based on their own emotions rather than their cognitive processes (Salerno & Bottoms, 2009). Neuroimaging evidence compiled and reviewed by Salerno & Bottoms (2009) shows that as the emotional load of a trial increases, mock jurors typically feel increasingly emotional. Salerno & Bottoms (2009) argue that the increase in emotional evidence presented against the defendant in a trial leads jurors to feel increasingly emotional which then leads the jurors to find the defendant guilty and increase punitive consequences when possible.

Congruent with the findings by Salerno & Bottoms (2009), a study done by Petersen (2010) provides evidence that mock jurors' positive and negative emotions elicited during a trial can affect their sympathy for a defendant. Increased sympathy for a defendant would decrease punitive action while decreased sympathy for a defendant would increase punitive consequences (Sperry, 2009).

**Perception of intentionality.** Jurors' perception of a defendant's intentionality to commit the crime can elicit strong emotions like anger, if the jurors believe that the defendant did intentionally commit the crime, or compassion, if the jurors believe that the defendant did not intentionally commit the crime (Petersen, 2010). In a study conducted by Petersen (2010), mock jurors' emotions of anger and compassion were also correlated with the individual case verdicts as well as endorsement of punishment for the defendant. This is likely because anger and compassion are considered "moral emotions," or emotions used by people to morally judge others (Haidt, 2003; Fiddick, 2004, as cited in Petersen, 2010). It has not yet been studied whether or not the intensity of jurors' anger or compassion towards a defendant affects their verdict or sympathy for the victim, although this seems likely.

### **Psychology of Rape Trials and Jury Decision-making**

During a rape trial, jurors are exposed to detailed information about the attack, possibly photographs of injuries sustained by the survivor, expert testimony, and a potentially highly emotional victim statement. As discussed in the previous section, this emotional evidence, the emotions of the defendant and victim, and the emotions of the jurors can cause jurors to attribute blame to the defendant and/or victim. Jurors'

attributions of blame to the defendant and/or victim and the final verdict of a trial are also impacted by juror characteristics, victim/defendant characteristics, joint victim/defendant and juror characteristics, and trial characteristics. Also important is the connection among juror characteristics, victim characteristics, defendant characteristics, and trial characteristics (Field, 1979). A common example of an interaction among juror characteristics, defendant characteristics, and victim characteristics would be a hypothetical rape case 50 years ago in which an African American man was accused of raping a Caucasian woman. In this case Caucasian male jurors were especially likely to convict the African American man because of the racial politics.

**Juror characteristics.** Juror characteristics have an extremely important effect on juror decision-making. Important juror characteristics include gender, belief in a just world, and rape myth acceptance.

***Belief in a just world.*** The “Just World Hypothesis” simply stated says that people get what they deserve in life; good things happen to good people, and bad things happen to bad people (Foley & Pigott, 2000; Kerr & Kurtz, 1977, as cited in Grubb & Harrower, 2007). Learning about a rape can challenge an individual’s belief in a just world because rape would not exist in a just world (Foley & Pigott, 2000; Grubb & Harrower, 2007). The realization that rape does exist may leave the individual vulnerable in an unpredictable world where bad things can happen to good people. Jurors have the ability to restore their belief in a just world in one of two ways. First, jurors can attribute blame to the victim so that jurors can believe that the victim deserved whatever crime she or he endured. Alternatively, jurors can alleviate the victim’s suffering so that the jurors will feel that victims are compensated for their suffering (Foley & Pigott, 2000; Grubb &

Harrower, 2007). When there is no opportunity in a criminal rape case for jurors to alleviate the victim's suffering, male and female jurors with a high belief in a just world assign more blame to the victim than do male and female jurors with a low belief in a just world (Foley & Pigott, 2000). Foley & Pigott found in their 2010 study that when mock jurors had the opportunity to alleviate the rape victim's suffering by awarding the victim a monetary amount, women with a high belief in a just world awarded more money to the victim than did those with a low belief in a just world (Foley & Pigott, 2000). Male mock jurors with a low belief in a just world awarded significantly more money to the victim than did those with a high belief in a just world (Foley & Pigott, 2000). Although no explanations were given in the Foley & Pigott study (2000) to explain why male mock jurors and female mock jurors with high and low beliefs in the just world hypothesis responded oppositely to the compensation of the rape victim, two possible explanations are that men and women restore belief in a just world differently or that men and women have different opinions on the effects of victim compensation.

***Rape myth acceptance.*** Rape myth acceptance is a particularly important individual characteristic that may affect jurors' levels of sympathy towards the rape victim and the defendant in a rape trial. Rape myths still common in the United States put forth the belief that women deserve to be raped if they are wearing certain clothes or they act a certain way (Grubb & Harrower, 2007; Payne et al., 1999). There is evidence that mock jurors who buy into the "Just World Hypothesis" often subscribe to standard rape myths (Grubb & Harrower, 2007; Hammond et al., 2011). Previous studies have found that men are more likely than women to endorse rape myths and assign more blame to the rape victim for being raped (Grubb & Harrower, 2007; Hammond et al., 2011). More

specifically, a study done by Kassing et al. (2005) provides evidence that the acceptance of rape myths in males is positively correlated with age and negatively correlated with level of education. Overall, mock jurors who endorse rape myths are less likely to be sympathetic with the rape victim and are less likely to find a defendant guilty of rape than are mock jurors who do not endorse rape myths (Grubb & Harrower, 2007; Hammond et al., 2011).

**Gender.** Women report higher levels of sympathy than do men for the victim in all types of rape scenarios (Sinclair & Bourne, 1998). Perhaps because men report lower levels of sympathy, male mock jurors in rape cases place more blame on the victim in rape scenarios than do female mock jurors (Grubb & Harrower, 2009). Women may feel more similar or connected to the rape victim, especially considering that statistically 1 in 5 women has survived attempted or completed sexual assault (National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, 2010). It is therefore likely that individual women jurors have experienced sexual violence themselves or have a friend who has experienced sexual violence, making them more sympathetic to the rape victim (Sinclair & Bourne, 1998). As noted below, if female jurors do in fact perceive themselves as similar to the rape victim, this similarity could increase women's sympathy for the rape victim and could affect female jurors' individual case verdicts (Grubb & Harrower, 2009).

**Victim/ defendant characteristics.** Many victim and defendant characteristics have a significant effect on mock jurors' attributions of victim and defendant blame. These include the age of the victim, the age of the defendant, the race of the victim, the race of the defendant, the attractiveness of the victim, the attractiveness of the defendant, the victim's sexual history, the victim's alcohol consumption prior to the act, and the

defendant's alcohol consumption prior to the act (Abbey & Harnish, 1995; Borgida & White, 1978; Field, 1979). Because none of these specific victim or defendant characteristics will be manipulated within this study they will not be discussed.

As discussed in the "Defendant and victim displayed emotion" section, individual jurors may be strongly influenced by emotions displayed during trial by the victim and the defendant. Manipulation of the rape victim's emotional facial expression within this study can be found in the "Method" section.

#### **Juror and victim/defendant joint characteristics.**

*Similarity.* One study in 2011 found that individuals were more likely to feel sympathetic towards people to whom they felt similar. The more sympathy the individual felt towards the other individual, the more likely she or he was to exhibit helping behavior towards that individual (Valdesolo & DeSteno, 2011). Research within psychology of law has shown that the more similar a mock juror feels to a victim or defendant the less blame they assign to that similar victim or defendant, which then correlates with the mock juror's individual verdict (Grubb & Harrower, 2009).

#### **Trial characteristics.**

*Type of rape.* There are three general types of rape: seduction rape, date rape, and stranger rape. Date rape, a situation in which the rape victim knows or is acquainted with the perpetrator, is the most common type of rape (Grubb & Harrower, 2009). Male and female mock jurors attribute the most blame to the survivor in cases of seduction rape followed by date rape, and participants attribute the least amount of blame to the survivor in cases of stranger rape (Grubb & Harrower, 2009).

### **Emotional Intelligence**

The previous two sections have explored a number of connections between the psychology of emotion and the psychology of rape trials and juror decision-making. While many studies have examined mock jurors' sympathy for a rape victim as it relates to their individual case verdicts, very little research has been done to look at the actual competency that allows jurors to feel, comprehend, and act upon emotions such as sympathy.

Everybody experiences emotions of different valences and intensities depending on the way their internal processes interact with their environment (Lazarus, 1991, as cited in Brackett et al., 2006). These emotions help guide individuals' thoughts and behaviors. People who are good at identifying, understanding, processing, and regulating their own emotions are thought to be well-adjusted to their social environment, while people who are unable to differentiate, understand, process, or regulate their own emotions are, in many cases, categorized as having mental illnesses and/or personality disorders (e.g., alexithymia, autism spectrum disorders, etc., Brackett et al., 2006). Understanding the emotions of others helps individuals predict the thoughts and behaviors of others. This emotional understanding is useful in social functioning and moral decision-making (Ugazio et al., 2012). Emotional intelligence is the ability to use cognitive and emotional processes to identify, understand, process, and regulate one's own emotions as well as the emotions of others (Akerjordet & Severinsson, 2007; Salovey & Grewal, 2005).

#### **Models of emotional intelligence.**

*The four-step emotional intelligence ability model.* According to the four-step emotional intelligence ability model, emotional intelligence has multiple facets, sometimes thought to be four hierarchical abilities (Salovey & Grewal, 2005). The most basic psychological ability within emotional intelligence is the ability to perceive emotions in self, others, and other stimuli such as artistic works. The next most basic ability is the ability to use emotion in reasoning, problem solving, and decision-making, which is followed by the ability to understand emotion analytically and reflexively. The final ability within this four-step model is the ability to manage emotions within a given situation (Brackett et al., 2006; Salovey & Grewal, 2005). In this four-step model of emotional intelligence, the higher order psychological processes are thought to depend on the more basic processes (Brackett et al., 2006; Salovey & Grewal, 2005). It is expected that these four psychological processes evolve over the course of an individual's life span and are also affected by the level and quality of social interaction experienced by an individual (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, as cited in Brackett et al., 2006; Salovey & Grewal, 2005).

*The mixed model of emotional intelligence.* In addition to the four-step emotional intelligence ability model explained above, there are several additional competing emotional intelligence theories. One additional theory is the mixed model of emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence, according to the mixed model, is not a cognitive ability (Joseph & Newman, 2010). Instead, emotional intelligence is described as the combination of three things: the ability of an individual to perceive one's own emotions, the ability of an individual to perceive other people's emotions, and the individual's personality traits (Joseph & Newman, 2010).



**Measuring Emotional Intelligence.** Research shows that tests to determine individuals' emotional intelligence based on the mixed model theory are highly positively correlated with tests used to determine individuals' emotional intelligence based on the four-step emotional intelligence ability model (MacCann & Roberts, 2008; Brackett et al., 2006). This research provides evidence that while both models consider different processes to contribute to emotional intelligence, the models do test the same concept thought to be emotional intelligence. Although both the mixed model theory and the four-step emotional intelligence ability model include the understanding of self-emotions and the understanding of other-emotions within the definition of emotional intelligence, neither model separates or tests the ability of individuals to distinguish, understand, use, or manage emotions of self versus the ability of individuals to distinguish, understand, use, or manage the emotions of others.

For the purposes of this study, the emotional intelligence of participants will be tested using scales used by both prominent emotional intelligence models; however, emotional intelligence scores will be calculated so as to separate individuals' self-emotional intelligence scores and individuals' other-emotional intelligence scores. In this study, self-emotional intelligence is defined as how well an individual is able to recognize, understand, and regulate his or her own emotions, and other-emotional intelligence is defined as how well an individual is able to recognize, understand, and regulate the emotions of others.

**Emotional intelligence and sympathy.** It is believed that emotional intelligence is related to the ability of humans to sympathize with others; however, there is debate as to the definition of sympathy and whether or not having sympathy or feeling sympathetic

towards another requires recognizing emotion, experiencing emotion, or both (Reniers et al., 2011).

A sympathetic reaction to another individual seems to require a certain amount of both self-emotional intelligence and other-emotional intelligence. Before having a sympathetic reaction towards another, one must first identify the emotion of the other person and then have an emotional reaction in response (Brackett et al., 2006). According to Ekman (2005), most people learn over time what certain emotions feel like and under what circumstances certain emotions arise. Through this personal understanding of emotions, individuals can assume when and why other people experience certain emotions (Ekman, 2005). Some individuals, such as many individuals with Autism spectrum disorders, may learn how other people experience emotion through social interaction over a period of time as opposed to learning about other-emotions through the understanding of self-emotions (Brackett et al., 2006; Rieffe et al., 2008).

The present study differentiates self-emotional intelligence and other-emotional intelligence to potentially help clarify some of the emotional processes that lead individuals to feel sympathy for others. The specific sympathy tested in this study was sympathy towards a rape victim. To do this, each participant in the study read a summary of a simulated rape trial and then responded to questions regarding the defendant and the rape victim.

The psychology regarding perceptions of rape victims and mock juror decision-making in rape trials is rich and leads to many potential confounding principles which could interfere with this study's purpose. Still, studying jurors' sympathy towards rape victims is a good method to research the role of emotional intelligence in sympathy for

others. As noted above, in the United States, one in six women have been the victim of rape or attempted rape within her lifetime (National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, 2009), and yet, rape and other sexual assault trials have a very low conviction rate compared to other types of criminal cases (RAINN, 2009). Mock jurors' sympathy towards the rape victim and the defendant have been found to be highly correlated with their individual case verdicts (Grubb & Harrower, 2009).

**Emotional intelligence research.** In terms of past research on emotional intelligence, gender and age are known to have significant effects on both self and other emotional intelligence scores. Generally, women and older adults score higher on the emotional intelligence scores than do men and younger individuals (Goldenberg et al., 2006; Petrides & Furnham, 2000; Tsaousis & Kazi, 2013). Goldenberg et al. (2006) found one caveat to the generalization that women score higher than men on emotional intelligence tests; while women do score higher than men on performance-based emotional intelligence tests, men score higher than women on emotional intelligence tests which are self-rated measures. These results have led Goldenberg et al. (2006) to hypothesize that while women have higher emotional intelligence, men are more confident in their emotional intelligence than are women.

Research describing the relationship between self-emotional intelligence, other-emotional intelligence, and rape myth acceptance is lacking. There exist gaps in the literature as to the potential connection between jurors' sympathy for rape victims and jurors' self-emotional intelligence, other-emotional intelligence, and sympathy felt towards rape victims and defendants.

### **Design and Hypotheses**

The present study has three aims: to examine the connection between self-emotional intelligence and other-emotional intelligence, to assess whether a participant's self-emotional intelligence or other-emotional intelligence can be added as a participant characteristic that can help predict the amount of sympathy a participant will feel towards a rape victim or defendant, and to assess whether a rape victim's emotional facial expression affects the degree of sympathy a participant will feel towards a rape victim or defendant.

In this study, participants will read a rape trial summary. Each participant will randomly be assigned to one of four emotional facial expression photographs of the rape victim (anger, fear, sadness, or neutral) that will accompany the trial summary or will be assigned to have no photograph of the rape victim accompany the trial summary. Participants will be asked to render an individual verdict and answer other questions about the defendant and alleged rape victim including the degree of sympathy they feel towards the victim and defendant. The participants will then complete two scales designed to test participants' self-emotional intelligence and two scales designed to test participants' other-emotional intelligence. Finally, participants will complete a version of a rape myth acceptance scale in order to control for rape myth acceptance.

It is hypothesized that there is a direct relationship between self-emotional intelligence and other-emotional intelligence; a direct relationship between self-emotional intelligence and sympathy for the rape victim; and an indirect effect between self-emotional intelligence and sympathy for the rape victim mediated by other-emotional intelligence. It is also hypothesized that participants will report the highest levels of rape

victim sympathy in the rape summary scenario accompanied by the photograph of the “sad,” “angry,” and “afraid” rape victim as compared to the rape summary scenario accompanied by the “neutral” rape victim photograph and the scenario with no victim photograph. This is hypothesized because it is assumed that the participants acquaint the sad, angry, and afraid rape victim with their victim emotional norm. It is hypothesized that the rape summary scenario not accompanied by a rape victim photograph will elicit the least rape victim sympathy because the participants will feel less compassion and similarity to a visually unidentifiable victim. Results from this study could provide additional insight into whether jurors’ emotional intelligence is an indicator for sympathy towards rape victims. Results could also shed light on jurors’ interpretations of rape victims’ facial emotional cues and what those emotional interpretations mean in terms of sympathy for the rape victim.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

Jury-eligible United States citizens were selected as participants and recruited with a posting on Amazon Mechanical Turk (Mturk), Amazon’s online service which pairs “requesters” who pay people to complete tasks with “workers” who complete tasks for a fee. Mturk has increasingly been used by psychological researchers to find participants quickly on a low budget (Johnson & Borden, 2012). Participants used in this study identified themselves as jury-eligible citizens living in the United States. The final sample included 219 participants, 127 female (58%) and 92 male (42%). The mean age of the participants was ( $M=32.59$ ,  $SD=10.42$ ), with participants ranging in age from 18 to

66. One hundred and fifty-three participants identified as Caucasian (70%); 24 participants identified as African American (11%); 9 participants identified as Latino/Latina (4%); 20 participants identified as Asian (9%); 10 participants identified as Other or Mixed Race (5%); and 3 participants opted not to report their racial identities (1%).

### **Materials**

**Trial summary.** Materials included a summary of a mock rape trial, in which participants were asked to read about a rape trial and act as jurors in the case. See Appendix A for the one-page trial summary of approximately 500 words. In the summary, the alleged rape victim and the defendant, both college students, testified that they met at a house party held by a mutual friend. They met and talked for a while and then moved to an empty bedroom in the house. Both the defendant and the alleged rape victim testified that they were making out and that sexual intercourse happened in the bedroom. However, the alleged rape victim testified that she did not consent to having sex with the defendant, while the defendant testified that the intercourse was consensual. A friend of the alleged rape victim testified that she picked the alleged rape victim up at the house and took her to the hospital. Finally the doctor who treated the alleged rape victim in the hospital testified that she was in shock and was referred to a rape crisis center. Each participant was randomly assigned to see either a photograph of the alleged victim displaying a neutral, a sad, an angry, or a scared emotional facial expression or no photograph of the alleged victim. See Appendix B for the photograph used in each of the

conditions. Each participant in all conditions saw the photograph (or no photograph) accompanied by the same rape trial summary.

**Dependent measures.** After reading the trial summary, participants were asked to complete several measures. First, the participants were asked render an individual verdict of “guilty” or “not guilty” in the rape case (“On the count of rape in the first degree, how do you find the defendant?”). The participant’s sympathy for the alleged rape victim (“How much sympathy do you feel towards the alleged victim?”) and the defendant (“How much sympathy do you feel towards the defendant?”) were also measured. Responses to these questions were evaluated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1-*No sympathy* and 5- *A lot of sympathy*). For the complete list of items and instructions see Appendix C.

**Tests for emotional intelligence and rape myth acceptance.** Participants were also asked to respond to measures to determine the participants’ self and other emotional intelligences. Both self-emotional intelligence and other-emotional intelligence were determined using two scales. The Emotional Awareness Questionnaire (Rieffe et al., 2008) was used to help determine the participants’ self-emotional intelligence. The questionnaire included 20 statements such as “I am often confused or puzzled about what I am feeling” and “It is difficult to know whether I feel sad or angry or something else.” Participants were asked to rate the degree to which the statement characterized themselves on a 3 point scale (1-*Not True* to 3-*Often True*). Rieffe et al., 2008 reported that The Emotional Awareness Questionnaire has internal reliability of .5 to .74 and good criterion validity with a related measure for emotional self-efficacy, a component of self-emotional intelligence that relates to how confident one is at identifying, understanding,

and managing emotions. For the complete list of items used from the Emotional Awareness Questionnaire and instructions see Appendix D.

The Self-Rated Emotional Intelligence Scale-Revised (Brackett et al., 2006) was also used to determine participants' self-emotional intelligence. This scale included 19 items with statements such as "I am aware of the nonverbal messages other people send." Participants were asked to rate the degree to which the statement described themselves on a 5 point Likert-type scale (1-*Very Inaccurate* and 5-*Very Accurate*). The Self-Rated Emotional Intelligence Scale-Revised has high internal consistency and test-retest reliability at  $\alpha = .84$  (Brackett et al., 2006). For the complete list of items used from the Self-Rated Emotional Intelligence Scale-Revised and instructions see Appendix E.

The Situational Test of Emotional Understanding (MacCann & Roberts, 2008) was one of two measures used to determine participants' other-emotional intelligence. This scale included 42 multiple choice questions such as

- Regret is most likely to occur when?
- (a) Events are unexpected
  - (b) You have caused something you didn't want to happen and cannot change it
  - (c) Circumstances have caused something you didn't want to happen
  - (d) You have caused something you didn't want to happen and are trying to change it
  - (e) Events are getting beyond your control

Alpha reliability for the Situational Test of Emotional Understanding is .71 (MacCann & Roberts, 2008). Participants were given a total score which was a percentage computed by dividing the number of correct answers, as provided by MacCann & Roberts (2008), by the total number of questions in the test. For the complete list of items used from the Situational Test of Emotional Understanding and instructions see Appendix F.



The Faces Test (Baron-Cohen, 1997) is a facial emotion recognition task used as the second measure to determine participants' other-emotional intelligence. In this test, participants were shown 20 photographs of the same woman displaying various emotional facial expressions. Participants were asked to label each photograph with the corresponding emotion displayed from a multiple-choice set of responses. Neither reliability nor validity data was provided for this measure. This test was scored as a percentage of the number of correct answers divided by the total number of photograph identifications.

The Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Payne et al., 1999) was used to determine the degree to which participants endorse rape common myths. This 18-item scale included statements such as "Many women secretly desire to be raped" and "If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say that it was rape." Participants were asked to identify the degree to which they agreed with the statements given on a 7 point Likert-type scale (1-*Not at all agree* and 7-*Very much agree*). The Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale and each of its subscales are highly reliable with  $\alpha$  averaging .79 (Payne et al., 1999). This scale also has high construct validity (Payne et al., 1999). Scores on the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale have been shown to be highly correlated with sex-role stereotyping, sexism, adversarial sexual beliefs, hostility toward women, and acceptance of violence (Payne et al., 1999). For the complete list of items used from the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale and instructions see Appendix G.

## **Procedure**

Each participant was recruited using the online MTurk recruitment link that takes participants to a survey created using SurveyMonkey, an online survey tool that allows researchers to create, administer, and derive data from surveys. Before beginning the survey, all participants were required to give informed consent.

The first part of the survey asked the participants questions regarding their age, race, gender, nationality, state of residence, and level of education. Next, participants were randomly assigned to one of five conditions (sad, angry, afraid, neutral emotional facial expression, or no photograph) and asked to read the summary of a simulated rape trial. After reading the summary, each participant was asked to render an individual verdict in the case and to answer questions regarding their sympathy towards the defendant and the alleged rape victim. The next part of the survey tested the participants' self-emotional intelligence followed by tests to determine their other-emotional intelligence. The last part of the survey determined the participants' rape myth acceptance. Following the completion of the survey, all participants were debriefed, thanked for their time, and compensated.

### **Design**

The study was a between-participants design. The one manipulated independent variable in this study was the emotional facial expression (afraid, angry, neutral, sad, or no photograph) of the portrayed rape victim. All other aspects of the survey were held constant across conditions. The three quasi-independent variables were participants' self-emotional intelligence, their other-emotional intelligence, and their rape myth acceptance.

There were three dependent variables: the participants' verdict in the rape case, their sympathy for the rape victim, and their sympathy for the accused rapist.

### **Results**

Every participant completed two self-emotional intelligence tests and two other-emotional intelligence tests. The two self-emotional intelligence scores were standardized and then averaged to create a composite "self-emotional intelligence score" for each participant. The two other-emotional intelligence scores were standardized and then averaged to create a composite "other-emotional intelligence score" for each participant.

Throughout all of the scales and demographic questions, missing values were not replaced. There were no more than three missing values out of 219 for any of the questions for which missing values existed.

#### **Scale Reliability**

Cronbach's alpha for the composite "self-emotional intelligence score" was moderate ( $\alpha=.55$ ), which indicates that the scale is a low to moderately reliable measure of self-emotional intelligence.

Cronbach's alpha for the composite "other-emotional intelligence score" was also moderate ( $\alpha=.60$ ), which indicates again that the scale is a low to moderately reliable measure of other-emotional intelligence.

Because both the composite self-emotional intelligence score and the composite other-emotional intelligence score had low reliability and poor internal consistency, the composite scores will not be used in subsequent analyses. Instead the four emotional intelligence scores will be examined as separate measures.

Cronbach's alpha for the Emotional Awareness Questionnaire was acceptable ( $\alpha=.75$ ), indicating that the scale is a moderately reliable measure of self-emotional intelligence.

Cronbach's alpha for the Self-rated Emotional Intelligence Test was poor ( $\alpha=.49$ ), indicating that this scale is not a reliable measure of self-emotional intelligence.

Cronbach's alpha for the Situational Test of Emotional Understanding was moderate ( $\alpha=.75$ ), indicating that the scale is a moderately reliable measure of other-emotional intelligence.

Cronbach's alpha for the Faces Test was also poor ( $\alpha=.60$ ), indicating that the scale is an insufficient measure of other-emotional intelligence.

### **Manipulation Check**

Ninety-three participants (42.5%) correctly identified the emotion presented by the rape victim, while 126 participants (57.5%) incorrectly identified the emotion presented by the rape victim. A Chi-square test of independence was then performed to examine if participants in the five experimental conditions were equally likely to correctly identify the emotional facial expression of the rape victim in the photograph that accompanied the rape trial summary. There were significant differences among the conditions with regard to the expected versus actual number of participants who correctly identified the emotional facial expression of the rape victim,  $X^2(4, N=219) = 32.50$ ,  $p < .001$ . Participants in the condition with the afraid emotional facial expression photograph were the most likely to correctly identify the rape victim's emotional facial expression, while participants in the condition with the neutral emotional facial

expression were the least likely to correctly identify the rape victim's emotional facial expression.

The fact that the majority of participants did not correctly identify the emotion presented by the rape victim will effect hypotheses related to the emotional facial expression manipulation. However, this manipulation will have no affect on the analyses regarding the relationships among participants' self-emotional intelligence, participants' other-emotional intelligence, participants' acceptance of rape myths, and participant characteristics (age, gender, and racial identity).

### **Hypotheses**

It was first hypothesized that there would be a direct relationship between self-emotional intelligence and other-emotional intelligence. A Pearson correlation was computed to determine the direction and strength of the relationship between the two self-emotional intelligence scales and the two other-emotional intelligence scales. In support of this hypothesis, there was a significant positive linear relationship between participants' scores on the self-emotional intelligence test, the Emotional Awareness Questionnaire ( $M=.005$ ,  $SD=1.00$ ) and participants' scores on the other-emotional intelligence test , the Situational Test of Emotional Understanding ( $M=.02$ ,  $SD=.98$ ),  $r(215)=.28$ ,  $p<.001$ . There was also a significant positive linear relationship between participants' scores on the Emotional Awareness Questionnaire and participants' scores on the second other-emotional intelligence test, the Faces Test ( $M=.02$ ,  $SD=.98$ ),  $r(217)=.27$ ,  $p<.001$ .

The second hypothesis was that there would be a positive correlation between self-emotional intelligence and sympathy for the rape victim. A Pearson correlation showed no significant correlation between the participants' scores on the Self-rated Emotional Intelligence Test ( $M=.002$ ,  $SD=1.00$ ) and participants' sympathy towards the rape victim ( $M=3.98$ ,  $SD=1.01$ ),  $r(215)=-.021$ ,  $p=.377$ . In support of the hypothesis, a Pearson correlation showed a significant positive correlation between participants' scores on the Emotional Awareness Questionnaire and participants' sympathy towards the rape victim,  $r(217)=.12$ ,  $p=.038$ .

The third hypothesis was that there would be an indirect effect between self-emotional intelligence and sympathy for the rape victim as mediated by other-emotional intelligence. Baron & Kenny (1986)'s mediational model states that to establish mediation between an initial variable and an outcome variable one needs to first establish that the initial variable, in this case self-emotional intelligence, the mediator variable, in this case other-emotional intelligence, and the outcome variable, in this case sympathy for the rape victim, are all correlated. While there was a significant correlation between self-emotional intelligence and other-emotional intelligence and a significant correlation between self-emotional intelligence and sympathy for the rape victim, a Pearson correlation showed no significant correlation between other-emotional intelligence and victim sympathy. The correlation between participants' scores on the Faces Test and victim sympathy were not significant,  $r(215)=.05$ ,  $p=.243$ . The correlation between participants' scores on the Situational Test of Emotional Understanding and victim sympathy were also not significant,  $r(213)=.08$ ,  $p=.119$ . Together, these correlations

show that there cannot be an indirect effect between self-emotional intelligence and sympathy for the rape victim as mediated by other-emotional intelligence.

The final hypothesis was that participants would report the highest levels of rape victim sympathy in the “sad” rape victim condition as compared to the other conditions. Because participants were inconsistent in their interpretation of the photographed rape victim’s emotional expression for each of the four photograph conditions and no photograph condition, a one-way ANOVA was carried out on sympathy for the rape victim as a function of participants’ identification of the rape victim’s emotional facial expression (i.e., either neutral, happy, sad, angry, afraid, disgusted, or no emotion displayed) rather than based on the photograph (or no photograph) provided to participants. This tested whether or not participants who interpreted the rape victim to be neutral, happy, sad, angry, afraid, disgusted, or no emotion displayed, differed in the amount of sympathy they reported for the rape victim. There was no significant mean difference in sympathy for the rape victim between participants who believed the survivor’s emotional facial expression to be neutral ( $M=4.09$ ,  $SD=1.30$ ), happy ( $M=3$ ), sad ( $M=3.98$ ,  $SD=1.14$ ), angry ( $M=3.73$ ,  $SD=1.09$ ), afraid ( $M=4.06$ ,  $SD=.94$ ), disgusted ( $M=4.09$ ,  $SD=.83$ ), or no emotion displayed ( $M=4.04$ ,  $SD=1.01$ ),  $F(6, 210)=.67$ ,  $MSE=1.04$ ,  $p=.673$ .

In order to control for rape myth acceptance, a partial correlation was used to find the strength and direction of the relationships among participants’ sympathy for the rape victim, participants’ sympathy for the defendant ( $M=1.83$ ,  $SD=.97$ ), and participants’ case verdict ( $M=1.21$ ,  $SD=.41$ ). A significant negative partial correlation was found between participants’ sympathy for the defendant and participants’ guilty verdicts,

$r(207)=-.20, p=.003$ . A significant positive partial correlation was found between participants' sympathy for the rape victim and the participants' guilty verdicts,  $r(207)=.21, p=.002$ . There was also a significant negative correlation found between participants' sympathy for the rape victim and participants' sympathy for the defendant,  $r(207)=-.39, p<.001$ .

### Supplementary Analyses

**Gender differences.** Potential gender differences were examined for rape myth acceptance, self-emotional intelligence, and other-emotional intelligence. An independent-samples ANOVA was carried out on self-emotional intelligence as a function of gender. Females' scores on the Emotional Awareness Questionnaire ( $M=.25, SD=.09$ ) were significantly higher than males' self-emotional intelligence scores ( $M=-.32, SD=.10$ ),  $F(1,217)=18.63, MSE=.93, p<.001$ .

An independent-samples ANOVA was carried out on other-emotional intelligence as a function of gender. Females' scores on the Faces Test ( $M=.15, SD=.09$ ) were significantly higher than males' scores on the same test ( $M=-.16, SD=.10$ ),  $F(1,217)=5.47, MSE=.95, p=.02$ . Females' scores on the Situational Test of Emotional Understanding ( $M=.20, SD=.09$ ) were significantly higher than males' scores on the same test ( $M=-.23, SD=.10$ ),  $F(1,215)=10.25, MSE=.93, p=.002$ .

Finally, an independent-samples ANOVA was carried out on rape myth acceptance as a function of gender. Females' rape myth acceptance scores ( $M=-.30, SD=.79$ ) were significantly lower than males' rape myth acceptance scores ( $M=-.38, SD=1.13$ ),  $F(1,214)=24.20, MSE=.89, p<.001$ .



**Age differences.** Potential age differences were also examined with regard to self-emotional intelligence, other-emotional intelligence, and rape myth acceptance. A Pearson correlation showed a significant positive correlation between participant age and Emotional Awareness Questionnaire scores,  $r(219)=.14, p=.017$ . A second Pearson correlation showed significant positive correlations between participant age and other-emotional intelligence scores: the correlation between participant age and scores on the Faces Test was significant,  $r(219)=.16, p=.009$  and the correlation between participant age and scores on the Situational Test of Emotional Understanding scores,  $r(217)=.16, p=.008$ . A final Pearson correlation found a significant negative correlation between age and rape myth acceptance scores,  $r(214)=-.12, p=.041$ .

**Race differences.** Potential differences were also examined among self-identified racial groups in terms of rape myth acceptance, self-emotional intelligence scores, other-emotional intelligence scores, sympathy for the defendant, and sympathy for the rape victim. An independent-samples ANOVA was conducted to examine rape myth acceptance as a function of race. Self-identified Asian participants ( $M=1.04, SD=1.25$ ) had significantly higher rape myth acceptance than self-identified African American participants ( $M=-.08, SD=1.02$ ), self-identified Caucasian participants ( $M=-.14, SD=.87$ ), and self-identified “other/mixed” race participants ( $M=-.18, SD=.96$ ),  $F(4,211)=7.32, MSE=.90, p<.001$ . Because of unbalanced sample sizes, an independent-samples ANOVA was carried out on rape myth acceptance as a function of a recoded form of race (either Caucasian or non-Caucasian). Self-identified Caucasian participants had significantly lower rape myth acceptance scores than did self-identified non-Caucasian participants ( $M=.32, SD=1.2$ ),  $F(1,214)=9.88, MSE=.96, p=.002$ .

Finally, an independent-samples ANOVA was conducted to examine other-emotional intelligence scores as a factor of race. Because of unbalanced sample sizes, an independent-samples ANOVA was carried out on other-emotional intelligence using the recoded version of race (either Caucasian or non-Caucasian). Self-identified Caucasian participants had significantly higher Faces Test scores ( $M=-.14$ ,  $SD=.78$ ) than did self-identified non-Caucasian participants ( $M=-.27$ ,  $SD=1.32$ ),  $F(1,217)=7.98$ ,  $MSE=.94$ ,  $p=.005$ . Self-identified Caucasian participants also had significantly higher Situational Test of Emotional Understanding scores ( $M=-.21$ ,  $SD=.87$ ) than did self-identified non-Caucasian participants ( $M=-.46$ ,  $SD=1.08$ ),  $F(1,215)=23.34$ ,  $MSE=.88$ ,  $p<.001$ .

No significant differences were found among self-identified racial groups in terms of self-emotional intelligence, sympathy for the defendant, or sympathy for the rape victim.

**Interaction effects.** A 2x2 between-participants ANOVA was carried out on rape myth acceptance as a function of race (self-identified Caucasian vs. self-identified non-Caucasian) and gender (male vs. female). There was a significant interaction between participant race and gender,  $F(1, 212)=10.52$ ,  $MSE=.81$ ,  $p=.001$ ,  $\eta^2=.05$ . Rape myth acceptance for self-identified Caucasian women ( $M=-.33$ ,  $SD=.74$ ) and for self-identified non-Caucasian women ( $M=-.21$ ,  $SD=.88$ ) did not differ significantly,  $t(123)=-.80$ ,  $p=.423$ ; rape myth acceptance for self-identified non-Caucasian males ( $M=1.11$ ,  $SD=1.24$ ) and for self-identified Caucasian males did differ significantly,  $t(89)=-4.16$ ,  $p<.001$ .

A 2x2x2 between-subjects ANOVA was carried out on rape victim sympathy as a function of race (self-identified Caucasian vs. self-identified non-Caucasian), gender

(male vs. female), and other-emotional intelligence (high vs. low scores on the Situational Test of Emotional Understanding). There was a significant interaction between participant race, gender, and other-emotional intelligence,  $F(1, 207)=8.02$ ,  $MSE=.998$ ,  $p=.005$ ,  $\eta^2=.04$ . Self-identified Caucasian males with low other-emotional intelligence ( $M=3.66$ ,  $SD=.81$ ) and self-identified Caucasian males with high other-emotional intelligence ( $M=4.27$ ,  $SD=.84$ ) differed significantly in their sympathy for the rape victim,  $t(64)=-3.00$ ,  $p=.004$ .

A 2x2x2x2 between-subjects ANOVA was carried out on defendant sympathy as a function of race (self-identified Caucasian vs. self-identified non-Caucasian), gender (male vs. female), self-emotional intelligence (high vs. low scores on the Emotional Awareness Questionnaire), and other emotional intelligence (high vs. low scores on the Situational Test of Emotional Understanding). There was a significant interaction between participant race, gender, and other-emotional intelligence,  $F(1, 200)=4.22$ ,  $MSE=.91$ ,  $p=.041$ ,  $\eta^2=.02$ . Self-identified Caucasian males with low other-emotional intelligence ( $M=2.24$ ,  $SD=.95$ ) and self-identified Caucasian males with high other-emotional intelligence ( $M=1.78$ ,  $SD=.82$ ) differed significantly in their sympathy for the defendant,  $t(64)=2.10$ ,  $p=.04$ . There was also a significant interaction between participant race, gender, and self-emotional intelligence,  $F(1, 200)=9.39$ ,  $MSE=.91$ ,  $p=.002$ ,  $\eta^2=.05$ . Self-identified Caucasian males with low self-emotional intelligence ( $M=2.23$ ,  $SD=.92$ ) and self-identified Caucasian males with high self-emotional intelligence ( $M=1.59$ ,  $SD=.75$ ) differed significantly in their sympathy for the defendant,  $t(64)=2.97$ ,  $p=.004$ .

A 2x2x2x2 between-subjects ANOVA was carried out on participants' case verdict as a function of race (self-identified Caucasian vs. self-identified non-Caucasian),

gender (male vs. female), self-emotional intelligence (high vs. low scores on the Emotional Awareness Questionnaire), and other-emotional intelligence (high vs. low scores on the Situational Test of Emotional Understanding). There was a significant interaction between participant gender and other-emotional intelligence,  $F(1, 199)=9.72$ ,  $MSE=.167$ ,  $p=.002$ ,  $\eta^2=.05$ . Follow up tests showed no significant differences at  $p<.05$ . There was also a significant interaction among participant gender, race, self-emotional intelligence, and other-emotional intelligence,  $F(1, 199)=6.37$ ,  $MSE=.167$ ,  $p=.012$ ,  $\eta^2=.03$ . Self-identified non-Caucasian female participants with high self-emotional intelligence and low other-emotional intelligence ( $M=1.50$ ,  $SD=.53$ ) and self-identified non-Caucasian female participants with high self-emotional intelligence and high other-emotional intelligence ( $M=1.00$ ,  $SD=.00$ ) significantly differed in their case verdict,  $t(16)=2.98$ ,  $p=.009$ . Self-identified non-Caucasian female participants with low self-emotional intelligence and low other-emotional intelligence ( $M=1.40$ ,  $SD=.55$ ) and self-identified non-Caucasian female participants with high self-emotional intelligence and high other-emotional intelligence ( $M=1.05$ ,  $SD=.21$ ) significantly differed in their case verdict,  $t(25)=2.44$ ,  $p=.022$ .

### Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships among self-emotional intelligence, other-emotional intelligence, sympathy for a rape victim, sympathy for a defendant, and individual case verdicts. Although there is no one agreed upon method to measure self and other-emotional intelligence, the construct of emotional intelligence in psychology is used generally to describe the ability to read, understand,

and manage one's own emotions (self-emotional intelligence) and the emotion's of others (other-emotional intelligence) (Lyusin, 2006). Thus far there has been little research surrounding the connection between self-emotional intelligence, other-emotional intelligence and decision-making as a sympathetic reaction to a given stimulus. This study looked at the connection between self-emotional intelligence, other-emotional intelligence, and a rape case verdict as a potential reaction to sympathy for the rape victim and/or sympathy for the defendant. The results of this study also examined the effect of gender, age, and race on self-emotional intelligence, other-emotional intelligence, sympathy for a rape victim, sympathy for the defendant, and case verdict.

When looking at the relationship between the Emotional Awareness Questionnaire, the self-emotional intelligence scale with moderate reliability, and the Situational Test of Emotional Understanding, the other-emotional intelligence scale with moderate reliability, this study provides additional evidence there is a significant positive relationship between self-emotional intelligence and other-emotional intelligence.

Participants who were high in self-emotional intelligence were less likely to endorse rape myths, and rape myth acceptance was negatively correlated with rape victim sympathy. Thus, it follows that using the Emotional Awareness Questionnaire as the self-emotional intelligence measure rather than the non-reliable Self-rated Emotional Intelligence Test, self-emotional intelligence was positively related to sympathy for the rape victim. These findings agree with research done on mock jurors' sympathy for the rape victim and acceptance of rape myths.

The hypothesis that there would be an indirect effect between self-emotional intelligence and sympathy for the rape victim mediated by other-emotional intelligence

was rejected in this study. It is possible that this correlation was not statistically significant due to low variation in rape victim sympathy evidenced in the sample or due to insufficient questions used in this survey to determine participant's sympathy towards the rape victim. Additional questions to test for participant's sympathy towards the rape victim could include questions such as "To what extent would you be willing to help the rape victim in this case?" and "If given the chance, would you compensate the rape victim? If so, how much would you compensate the rape victim?"

The hypothesis that participants would report the highest levels of rape victim sympathy in the rape summary scenario accompanied by the photograph of the "sad," "angry," and "afraid" rape victim as compared to the scenario accompanied by the photograph of the "neutral" rape victim and the condition with no victim photograph was also rejected possibly due to the fact that participants were largely unable to identify the emotional facial expression of the rape victim in the photograph given. While the inability of participants to decipher the rape victim's emotional facial expression provided inconclusive results for this study, it is possible that this situation mirrors more realistic circumstances in rape trials where jurors may be unable to categorize the rape victim's emotions overall as either angry, sad, neutral, or fearful.

It was easiest for participants in this study to recognize the rape victim's scared emotional facial expression and hardest for participants to recognize the rape victim's neutral emotional facial expression. This could be due to participants' conscious or subconscious expectation of how a rape victim should feel or express emotions within the context of a rape trial. If this is the case, participants may find it easiest to identify the emotional facial expression of a scared rape victim because the participants expect for a

rape victim to be scared at her rape trial, and participants may find it hardest to identify a rape victim's neutral emotional facial expression as neutral because the participants expect for the rape victim to display a more intensely negative emotion at her trial. If true, this explanation would fit with Ekman's theory of emotional norms discussed above.

### **Supplementary Analyses and Interaction Effects**

Age, gender, and race significantly predicted emotional intelligence scores and rape myth acceptance. Consistent with past research, female participants had higher scores than did male participants on both the self-emotional intelligence scale and the other-emotional intelligence scales, whereas male participants had higher scores on the rape myth acceptance scale (Petrides & Furnham, 2000; Hammond et al., 2011). The interaction effects found could suggest that emotional intelligence can be developed over time and likely through gender socialization.

Emotional intelligence is not as useful to some people as it is to others. For example, it may be more important for women in American culture to be high in emotional intelligence because they are expected to listen, understand, and care for others to a greater extent than are men.

Racial differences seen with rape myth acceptance could speak to cultural differences and popular understandings of rape culture, blame, and responsibility. Significant racial differences with regard to other-emotional intelligence could point out a bias in the other-emotional intelligence tests making it easier for Caucasian participants to score higher than those of other racial identities. The emotional intelligence tests used in this study focused on two kinds of interpreting emotional information: through text

based prompts and through viewing static emotional facial expressions. It is likely that some participants were put at a disadvantage by these tests, when they were stronger at identifying emotions through interpersonal contact or auditory stimulation for example.

Interaction effects found on rape myth acceptance, sympathy for the victim, and sympathy for the rape survivor as a factor of gender, race, and emotional intelligence suggest that many significant differences lie between Caucasian men and non-Caucasian men. Future research may find significant differences between Caucasian and non-Caucasian men with regard to emotional intelligence, sympathy for victims and defendants in rape cases, and victims and defendants in other legal cases such as murder or negligent homicide.

### **Limitations of the Research**

For the purposes of this study, the ideal participants were US juror eligible persons. For the purposes of psychological research, comparative studies have found Mturk samples to be more diverse and representative of the broader US population than collegiate samples (Johnson & Borden, 2012). It has been shown that the average Mturk participant is younger and more liberal than the average US participant (Johnson & Borden, 2012). As discussed above, age is correlated with rape myth acceptance and emotional intelligence scores, which means that the Mturk sample used in this study may make the results of this study not extrapolative to the intended population of United States jurors.

Several methodological limitations presented within this study. Alpha reliability for the instruments used to test for self-emotional intelligence were significantly



correlated with the two instruments used to test for other-emotional intelligence, however only moderately so. Both the Faces Test and the Self-rated Test of Emotional Intelligence had very low reliability. This suggests that these scales were not necessarily the most accurate tests of emotional intelligence. Adding additional reliable self and other-emotional intelligence tests may give a more holistic view of participants' self and other-emotional intelligence.

Another methodological limitation with respect to this study was the lack of consistency with regard to how the participants interpreted the emotional facial expression of the rape victim. Because participants were inconsistent in their views of the emotional facial expression of the rape victim, no results could be gathered regarding the expected connection between the rape victim's emotional facial expression and the sympathy the participants felt for the rape victim. Future researchers who wishes to understand the correlation between the emotional expression of the rape victim and sympathy towards the rape victim should use photographs of the emotional facial expression of the rape victim that are easier for participants to decipher.

### **Future Directions**

Future researchers who wish to study how the process of jury decision-making is connected with sympathy measurements or emotional intelligence measures in rape cases should consider using a full rape trial transcript or a video of a simulated or real rape trial rather than a short trial summary. Giving participants longer and more in-depth exposure to the rape victim and/or defendant could potentially affect the sympathy participants feel for the rape victim and/or defendant.

Another idea for future research is to compare the connection among self and other-emotional intelligence, rape myth acceptance, gender, urban or rural location, and sympathy for rape victims in different countries. India, for example, would be a very interesting place to replicate this study due to the high levels of patriarchy, low gender equality, and recent public rape cases that have become international news. It is expected that participants in India would report higher levels of rape myth acceptance and lower sympathy for rape victims than participants in the United States; however, rape myth acceptance and sympathy for rape victims may be shifting due to recent rape cases that have made worldwide headlines in late 2012/early 2013.

This study adds to the sparse literature on the relationship between emotional intelligence and sympathetic reactions in the legal arena. This study found significant relationships among gender, race, age, self-emotional intelligence, other-emotional intelligence, rape myth acceptance, sympathy for a rape victim, sympathy for defendant, and case verdict with practical implications for understanding juror decision-making as well as emotional intelligence. Results from this study were limited due to limitations of measuring emotional intelligence and its facets, and low reliability of emotional intelligence scales used. Once self and other-emotional intelligence is more fully understood, it is possible that certain scales will reliably quantify emotional intelligence. This will make it easier to understand the connection between self-emotional intelligence and other-emotional intelligence and the connection between emotional intelligence and other variables such as sympathy and rape myth acceptance.

Jurors in a United States court of law are instructed to base their verdict solely on the evidence presented and the law. Research from psychology and law gives mounting

evidence as to the numerous factors that affect jurors' verdicts in addition to the evidence presented and the law. The understanding of human emotion as it relates juror decision-making in highly charged criminal trials is critical and may be helpful for lawyers representing defendants and the State.

## References

- Abbey, A., & Harnish, R. J. (1995). Perception of sexual intent: The role of gender, alcohol consumption, and rape supportive attitudes. *Sex Roles, 32*(5-6), 297-313. doi:10.1007/BF01544599
- Akerjordet, K., & Severinsson, E. (2007). Emotional intelligence: A review of the literature with specific focus on empirical and epistemological perspectives. *Journal Of Clinical Nursing, 16*(8), 1405-1416. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2702.2006.01749.x
- Austin, E. J. (2004). An investigation of the relationship between trait emotional intelligence and emotional task performance. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*(8), 1855-1864. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2003.07.006
- Austin, E. J. (2010). Measurement of ability emotional intelligence: Results for two new tests. *British Journal Of Psychology, 101*(3), 563-578. doi:10.1348/000712609X474370
- Baron-Cohen, Simon; Wheelwright, Sally; Jolliffe, Therese. (1997) Is there a "language of the eyes"? Evidence from normal adults, and adults with autism or Asperger syndrome. *Visual Cognition, 4*(3), 311-331. doi:10.1080/713756761
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1173-1182.
- Besel, L. S., & Yuille, J. C. (2010). Individual differences in empathy: The role of facial expression recognition. *Personality and Individual Differences, 49*(2), 107-112. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.03.013

- Borgida, E., & White, P. (1978). Social perception of rape victims: The impact of legal reform. *Law and Human Behavior*, 2(4), 339-351. doi:10.1007/BF01038986
- Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., Shiffman, S., Lerner, N., & Salovey, P. (2006). Relating emotional abilities to social functioning: A comparison of self-report and performance measures of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(4), 780-795. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.91.4.780
- Dahl, J., Enemo, I., Drevland, G. B., Wessel, E., Eilertsen, D., & Magnussen, S. (2007). Displayed emotions and witness credibility: A comparison of judgments by individuals and mock juries. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 21(9), 1145-1155. doi:10.1002/acp.1320
- Ekman, P. (1993). Facial expression and emotion. *American Psychologist*, 48(4), 384-392. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.48.4.384
- Feild, H. S. (1978). Juror background characteristics and attitudes toward rape: Correlates of jurors' decisions in rape trials. *Law and Human Behavior*, 2(2), 73-93. doi:10.1007/BF01040385
- Feild, H. S. (1979). Rape trials and jurors' decisions: A psycholegal analysis of the effects of victim, defendant, and case characteristics. *Law and Human Behavior*, 3(4), 261-284. doi:10.1007/BF01039806
- Fiori, M. (2009). A new look at emotional intelligence: A dual-process framework. *Personality And Social Psychology Review*, 13(1), 21-44. doi:10.1177/1088868308326909

Foley, L. A., & Pigott, M. A. (2000). Belief in a just world and jury decisions in a civil rape trial. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*(5), 935-951.

doi:10.1111/j1559-1816.2000.tb02504.x

Goldenberg, I., Matheson, K., & Mantler, J. (2006). The assessment of emotional intelligence: A comparison of performance-based and self-report methodologies.

*Journal Of Personality Assessment, 86*(1), 33-45. doi:10.1207/s15327752j

pa8601\_05

Grubb, A., & Harrower, J. (2009). Understanding attribution of blame in cases of rape:

An analysis of participant gender, type of rape and perceived similarity to the victim. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 15*(1), 63-81. doi:10.1080/135526008

02641649

Hammond, E. M., Berry, M. A., & Rodriguez, D. N. (2011). The influence of rape myth acceptance, sexual attitudes, and belief in a just world on attributions of

responsibility in a date rape scenario. *Legal and Criminological Psychology,*

*16*(2), 242-252. doi:10.1348/135532510X499887

Heath, W. P. (2009). Arresting and convicting the innocent: The potential role of an inappropriate' emotional display in the accused. *Behavioral Sciences and The*

*Law, 27*(3), 313-332. doi:10.1002/bsl.864

Heider, F. F. (1944). Social perception and phenomenal causality. *Psychological Review,*

*51*(6), 358-374. doi:10.1037/h0055425

Hoerger, M., Chapman, B. P., Epstein, R. M., & Duberstein, P. R. (2012). Emotional intelligence: A theoretical framework for individual differences in affective

forecasting. *Emotion, 12*(4), 716-725. doi:10.1037/a0026724

- Johnson, D. R., & Borden, L. A. (2012). Participants at your fingertips: Using Amazon's Mechanical Turk to increase student-faculty collaborative research. *Teaching of Psychology, 39*(4), 245-251. doi:10.1177/0098628312456615
- Joseph, D. L., & Newman, D. A. (2010). Emotional intelligence: An integrative meta-analysis and cascading model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(1), 54-78. doi:10.1037/a0017286
- Kassing, L. R., Beesley, D., & Frey, L. L. (2005). Gender role conflict, homophobia, age, and education as predictors of male rape myth acceptance. *Journal Of Mental Health Counseling, 27*(4), 311-328.
- Koven, N. S. (2011). Specificity of meta-emotion effects on moral decision-making. *Emotion, 11*(5), 1255-1261. doi:10.1037/a0025616
- Krahé, B. (1988). Victim and observer characteristics as determinants of responsibility attributions to victims of rape. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 18*(1), 50-58. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1988.tb00004.x
- Langdrige, D., & Butt, T. (2004). The fundamental attribution error: A phenomenological critique. *British Journal Of Social Psychology, 43*(3), 357-369. doi:10.1348/0144666042037962
- Loewenstein, G., & Small, D. A. (2007). The Scarecrow and the Tin Man: The vicissitudes of human sympathy and caring. *Review of General Psychology, 11*(2), 112-126. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.11.2.112
- Lyusin, D. B., & Favorov, N. (2006). Emotional intelligence as a mixed construct: Its relation to personality and gender. *JournaloOf Russian and East European Psychology, 44*(6), 54-68. doi:10.2753/RPO1061-0405440604

- MacCann, C., & Roberts, R. D. (2008). New paradigms for assessing emotional intelligence: Theory and data. *Emotion, 8*(4), 540-551. doi:10.1037/a0012746
- Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research In Personality, 33*(1), 27-68. doi:10.1006/jrpe.1998.2238
- Petersen, M. (2010). Distinct emotions, distinct domains: Anger, anxiety and perceptions of intentionality. *The Journal of Politics, 72*(2), 357-365. doi:10.1017/S002238160999079X
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2000). Gender differences in measured and self-estimated trait emotional intelligence. *Sex Roles, 42*(5-6), 449-461. doi:10.1023/A:1007006523133
- Petrides, K. V., Furnham, A., & Martin, G. (2004). Estimates of emotional and psychometric intelligence: evidence for gender-based stereotypes. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 144*(2), 149-162. doi:10.3200/SOCP.144.2.149-162
- Pfeiffer, S. I. (2001). Emotional intelligence: Popular but elusive construct. *Roeper Review: A Journal On Gifted Education, 23*(3), 138-142. doi:10.1080/02783190109554085
- RAINN: Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network. (2009). Reporting Rates. Retrieved November 28, 2012, from <http://www.rainn.org/get-information/statistics/reporting-rates>



- Rempala, D. M., & Geers, A. L. (2009). The effect of victim information on causality judgments in a rape trial scenario. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 149*(4), 495-512. doi:10.3200/ SOCP.149.4.495-512
- Reniers, R. P., Corcoran, R., Drake, R., Shryane, N. M., & Völlm, B. A. (2011). The QCAE: A questionnaire of cognitive and affective empathy. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 93*(1), 84-95. doi:10.1080/00223891.2010.528484
- Rieffe, C., Oosterveld, P., Miers, A. C., Terwogt, M., & Ly, V. (2008). Emotion awareness and internalizing symptoms in children and adolescents: The Emotion Awareness Questionnaire revised. *Personality and Individual Differences, 45*(8), 756-761. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2008.08.001
- Rietti, S. (2009). Emotional intelligence and moral agency: Some worries and a suggestion. *Philosophical Psychology, 22*(2), 143-165. doi:10.1080/09515080902802793
- Rose, M. R., Nadler, J., & Clark, J. (2006). Appropriately upset? Emotion norms and perceptions of crime victims. *Law and Human Behavior, 30*(2), 203-219. doi:10.1007/ s10979-006-9030-3
- Salerno, J. M., & Bottoms, B. L. (2009). Emotional evidence and jurors' judgments: The promise of neuroscience for informing psychology and law. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 27* (2), 273-296. doi:10.1002/bsl.861
- Salovey, P., & Grewal, D. (2005). The science of emotional intelligence. *Current Directions In Psychological Science, 14*(6), 281-285. doi:10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00381.x

- Scherer, K. R., & Scherer, U. (2011). Assessing the ability to recognize facial and vocal expressions of emotion: Construction and validation of the Emotion Recognition Index. *Journal Of Nonverbal Behavior*, 35(4), 305-326. doi:10.1007/s10919-011-0115-4
- Sinclair, H., & Bourne, L. r. (1998). Cycle of blame or just world: Effects of legal verdicts on gender patterns in rape-myth acceptance and victim empathy. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22(4), 575-588. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1998.tb00178.x
- Spackman, M. P., Belcher, J. C., Cramer, L., & Delton, Y. (2006). A qualitative investigation of mock-jurors' theories of emotion and reason. *Cognition and Emotion*, 20(5), 671-693. doi:10.1080/02699930500304738
- Tsaousis, I., & Kazi, S. (2013). Factorial invariance and latent mean differences of scores on trait emotional intelligence across gender and age. *Personality And Individual Differences*, 54(2), 169-173. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.08.016
- Ugazio, G., Lamm, C., & Singer, T. (2012). The role of emotions for moral judgments depends on the type of emotion and moral scenario. *Emotion*, 12(3), 579-590. doi:10.1037/a0024611
- Valdesolo, P., & DeSteno, D. (2011). Synchrony and the social tuning of compassion. *Emotion*, 11(2), 262-266. doi:10.1037/a0021302
- Wiener, R. L., Wiener, A., & Grisso, T. (1989). Empathy and biased assimilation of testimonies in cases of alleged rape. *Law and Human Behavior*, 13(4), 343-355. doi:10.1007/BF01056407

## Appendix A

## Scenario Describing the Rape Trial

Instructions: Please read the following account of a 2005 criminal trial involving an alleged rape as though you were serving on the jury.

The event occurred on the night of March 20, 2005, at a residence near the campus of University of Georgia. The alleged victim is 22-year-old Jennifer O'Brian, a 5'5" 130-pound female. She is a student at the University of Georgia majoring in Economics. The defendant is Jack Carlson, a 6'2 male, also a student at the University of Georgia. Mr. Carlson is 23 years old and majoring in business. Mr. Carlson and Ms. O'Brian agreed in their statements that they had sexual intercourse on the night in question. The alleged victim claims that she was coerced into having sex and did not consent, while the defendant claims that the sex was consensual.

The basic trial testimony indicates that the alleged victim and the defendant were at a house party hosted by a mutual friend. The two recognized each other, however both agree that before March 20, the two had never made any type of contact, verbal or otherwise. At the house party on March 20, the alleged victim and defendant testify that they spent the majority of their time chatting with each other about mutual interests. Towards the middle of the night, the defendant and alleged victim moved to a quieter room upstairs to continue their conversation. After about half an hour upstairs, they began to kiss.

The alleged victim testified that she insisted that she did not want to go any further than kissing with the defendant. She claims that she pushed the defendant away when he started to fondle her. She said that she resisted the defendant to the point of fatigue at which point she submitted to intercourse, fearing that continuing to resist would risk her personal safety. The alleged victim testified that she made it clear to the victim that she was not consenting to having sex with the defendant. The defendant testified that the alleged victim did not make it clear she was an unwilling participant. After the incident, both parties agreed that the defendant left the alleged victim alone in the room and rejoined the party.

The alleged victim testified that instead of going back to the party, she called her friend who took her to the doctor. The alleged victim's friend who accompanied her to the hospital also testified for the court. She testified that she was not at the house party, and when she arrived to pick up the alleged victim, the alleged victim was extremely upset and said she had been raped. The doctor testified that the alleged victim's examination revealed evidence of sexual intercourse as well as minor bruises on the neck, shoulders, and face. The doctor claimed that the plaintiff was given a mild sedative because she was in a state of shock. The alleged victim was then released to her friend and given the

information of a local Rape Crises Center.

After the prosecution and defense made their closing statements, the judge's instructions for the jury included the need for the prosecution to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant Mr. Carlson did rape the alleged victim, Ms. O'Brian.

Appendix B

Photographs of the 4 Emotional Facial Expression Conditions



Afraid Emotional Facial Expression



Sad Emotional Facial Expression



Neutral Emotional Facial Expression



Angry Emotional Facial Expression

## Appendix C

## Questionnaire Regarding Scenario of Rape Trial

1. What is the emotion displayed by the alleged victim in this case?

- a) Neutral
- b) Happy
- c) Sad
- d) Angry
- e) Afraid
- f) Disgusted

3. How much sympathy do you feel towards the defendant?

- |             |   |   |   |                   |
|-------------|---|---|---|-------------------|
| 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| No sympathy |   |   |   | A lot of sympathy |

4. How much sympathy do you feel towards the alleged victim?

- |             |   |   |   |                   |
|-------------|---|---|---|-------------------|
| 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| No sympathy |   |   |   | A lot of sympathy |

5. Based on the rape trial summary, how do you find the defendant?

- a) Not guilty
- b) Guilty

## Appendix D

## Modified Emotion Awareness Questionnaire (Rieffe et al., 2008)

Instructions: Please rate the degree to which each item is true about you on a three-point scale (1=not true, 2= sometimes true, 3= often true)

Differentiating Emotions

I am often confused or puzzled about what I am feeling.  
It is difficult to know whether I feel sad or angry or something else.  
I never know exactly what kind of feeling I am having.  
Sometimes, I feel upset and I have no idea why.  
I often don't know why I am angry.  
I don't know when something will upset me or not.

Acting out Emotions

When I am angry, I just let it out.  
I always try to suppress my anger as fast as possible.  
When I am upset, I like to show it to everybody.  
I feel ashamed when other people notice that I am upset.  
I do not like strong feelings.  
I like to show my feelings as they happen.

Attending to Others' Emotions

It is important to know how my friends are feeling.  
I don't want to know how my friends are feeling.  
If a friend in my class is upset, I try to understand why.  
I don't care about how my friends are feeling inside.  
If a friend is upset, I just look the other way.  
I always know how my friends are feeling.  
I do not like it when my friends show how they are feeling.



## Appendix E

## Self-Rated Emotional Intelligence Scale-Revised (Brackett et al., 2006)

Instructions: The following set of items pertain to your insight into emotions. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. Please read each statement carefully, and then write the number that corresponds to how inaccurately or accurately each statement describes you.

1= Very inaccurate, 2=Moderately inaccurate, 3=Neither nor, 4= Moderately accurate, 5= Very accurate

1. By looking at people's facial expressions, I recognize the emotions they are experiencing.
2. I am a rational person and I rarely, if ever, consult my feelings to make a decision.
3. I have a rich vocabulary to describe my emotions.
4. I have problems dealing with my feelings of anger.
5. When someone I know is in a bad mood, I can help the person calm down and feel better quickly.
6. I am aware of the nonverbal messages other people send.
7. When making decisions, I listen to my feelings to see if the decision feels right.
8. I could easily write a lot of synonyms for emotions words like happiness or sadness.
9. I can handle stressful situations without getting too nervous.
10. I know the strategies to make or improve other people's moods.
11. I can tell when a person is lying to me by looking at his or her facial expression.
12. I am a rational person and don't like to rely on my feelings to make decisions.
13. I have to vocabulary to describe how most emotions progress from simple to complex feelings.
14. I am able to handle most upsetting problems.
15. I am not very good at helping others to feel better when they are feeling down or angry.
16. My quick impressions of what people are feeling are usually wrong.
17. My "feelings" vocabulary is probably better than most other persons' "feelings" vocabularies.
18. I know how to keep calm in difficult or stressful situations.
19. I am the type of person to whom others go when they need help with a difficult situation.

## Appendix F

## Situational Test of Emotional Understanding (MacCann &amp; Roberts, 2008)

Instructions: The following questions each describe a situation, and ask you to choose which of five emotions is most likely to result from that situation.

*Here is an example:*

Clara receives a gift. Clara is most likely to feel?

- (a) happy
- (b) angry
- (c) frightened
- (d) bored
- (e) hungry

If you think Clara would feel happy, you would mark option A and then move to the next question. There are 42 questions.

1. A pleasant experience ceases unexpectedly and there is not much that can be done about it. The person involved is most likely to feel?

- (a) Ashamed
- (b) Distressed
- (c) Angry
- (d) Sad
- (e) Frustrated

2. Xavier completes a difficult task on time and under budget. Xavier is most likely to feel?

- (a) Surprise
- (b) Pride
- (c) Relief
- (d) Hope
- (e) Joy

3. An irritating neighbor of Eve's moves to another state. Eve is most likely to feel?

- (a) Regret
- (b) Hope
- (c) Relief
- (d) Sadness
- (e) Joy

4. There is great weather on the day Jill is going on an out-door picnic. Jill is most likely to feel?

- (a) Pride
- (b) Joy
- (c) Relief
- (d) Guilt
- (e) Hope

5. Regret is most likely to occur when?

- (a) Events are unexpected
- (b) You have caused something you didn't want to happen and cannot change it
- (c) Circumstances have caused something you didn't want to happen
- (d) You have caused something you didn't want to happen and are trying to change it
- (e) Events are getting beyond your control

6. Edna's workmate organizes a goodbye party for Edna, who is going on holidays. Edna is most likely to feel?

- (a) Surprise
- (b) Gratitude
- (c) Pride
- (d) Hope
- (e) Relief

7. Something unpleasant is happening. Neither the person involved, nor anyone else can make it stop. The person involved is most likely to feel?

- (a) Guilty
- (b) Distressed
- (c) Sad
- (d) Scared
- (e) Angry

8. If the current situation continues, Denise's employer will probably be able to move her job to a location much closer to her home, which she really wants. Denise is most likely to feel?

- (a) Distress
- (b) Joy
- (c) Surprise
- (d) Hope
- (e) Fear

9. Song finds out that a friend of hers has borrowed money from others to pay urgent bills, but has in fact used the money for less serious purposes. Song is most likely to feel?

- (a) Anger
- (b) Excitement

- (c) Contempt
- (d) Shame
- (e) Horror

10. Somebody is most likely to feel surprised after?

- (a) Something unexpected happens.
- (b) Something unfamiliar happens.
- (c) Something unusual happens.
- (d) Something scary happens.
- (e) Something silly happens.

11. Leya works as a trouble-shooter. She is presented with a standard looking problem but cannot work out how to solve it. Leya is most likely to feel?

- (a) Confused
- (b) Frustrated
- (c) Surprised
- (d) Relieved
- (e) Distressed

12. Charles is meeting a friend to see a movie. The friend is very late and they are not in time to make it to the movie. Charles is most likely to feel?

- (a) Depressed
- (b) Frustrated
- (c) Angry
- (d) Contemptuous
- (e) Distressed

13. Rashid needs to meet a quota before his performance review. There is only a small change that he will be able to do so and there isn't much he can do to improve the outcome. Rashid is most likely to feel?

- (a) Irritated
- (a) Scared
- (c) Distressed
- (d) Sad
- (e) Hopeful

14. Someone believes that another person harmed them on purpose. There is not a lot that can be done to make things better. The person involved is most likely to feel?

- (a) Dislike
- (b) Rage
- (c) Jealousy
- (d) Surprise
- (e) Anxiety

15. Phil's workmate Bart asks Phil to lie for him about money Bart has been stealing from the company. Phil does not agree. Phil is most likely to feel?

- (a) Excitement
- (b) Anger
- (c) Horror
- (d) Contempt
- (e) Shame

16. Jim enjoys spending Saturdays playing with his children in the park. This year they have sporting activities on Saturdays and cannot go to the park with him any more. Jim is most likely to feel?

- (a) Angry
- (b) Sad
- (c) Frustrated
- (d) Distressed
- (e) Ashamed

17. If all goes well, then it's fairly likely that Derek's house will increase in value. Derek is most likely to feel?

- (a) Distress
- (b) Fear
- (c) Surprise
- (d) Joy
- (e) Hope

18. Sheila's workmate intentionally does not give Sheila some important information about applying for a raise. Sheila is most likely to feel?

- (a) Depressed
- (b) Contemptuous
- (c) Frustrated
- (d) Angry
- (e) Distressed

19. Megan is looking to buy a house. Something happened and she felt regret. What is most likely to have happened?

- (a) She didn't make an offer on a house she wanted, and now she is trying to find out if it is too late.
- (b) She found a house she liked that she didn't think she would find.
- (c) She couldn't make an offer on a house she liked because the bank didn't get her the money in time.
- (d) She didn't make an offer on a house she liked and now someone else has bought it.
- (e) She made an offer on a house and is waiting to see if it is accepted.

20. Mary was working at her desk. Something happened that caused her to feel surprised. What is most likely to have happened?

- (a) Her work-mate told a silly joke.
- (b) She was working on a new task she hadn't dealt with before.
- (c) She found some results that were different from what she thought they would be.
- (d) She realized she would not be able to complete her work.
- (e) She had to do a task she didn't normally do at work.

21. Garry's small business is attracting less and less clients and he can't tell why. There doesn't seem to be anything he can do to help matters. Garry is most likely to feel?

- (a) Scared
- (b) Angry
- (c) Sad
- (d) Guilty
- (e) Distressed

22. Someone thinks that another person has deliberately caused something good to happen to them. They are most likely to feel?

- (a) Hope
- (b) Pride
- (c) Gratitude
- (d) Surprise
- (e) Relief

23. Kevin has been working at his current job for a few years. Out of the blue, he finds that he will receive a promotion. Kevin is most likely to feel?

- (a) Pride
- (b) Relief
- (c) Joy
- (d) Hope
- (e) Guilt

24. By their own actions, a person reaches a goal they wanted to reach. The person is most likely to feel?

- (a) Joy
- (b) Hope
- (c) Relief
- (d) Pride
- (e) Surprise

25. An unwanted situation becomes less likely or stops altogether. The person involved is most likely to feel?

- (a) Regret
- (b) Hope
- (c) Joy
- (d) Sadness
- (e) Relief

26. Hasad tries to use his new mobile phone. He has always been able to work out how to use different appliances, but he cannot get the phone to function. Hasad is most likely to feel?

- (a) Distressed
- (b) Confused
- (c) Surprised
- (d) Relieved
- (e) Frustrated

27. Dorian's friend is ill and coughs all over him without bothering to turn away or cover his mouth. Dorian is most likely to feel?

- (a) Anxiety
- (b) Dislike
- (c) Surprise
- (d) Jealousy
- (e) Rage

28. Although she has been careful to avoid all risk factors, Tina has contracted cancer. There is only a small chance that the cancer will be benign and nothing Tina does now can make a difference. Tina is most likely to feel?

- (a) Scared
- (b) Distressed
- (c) Irritated
- (d) Sad
- (e) Hopeful

29. Quan and his wife are talking about what happened to them that day. Something happened that caused Quan to feel surprised. What is most likely to have happened?

- (a) His wife talked a lot, which did not usually happen.
- (b) His wife talked about things that were different to what they usually discussed.
- (c) His wife told him that she might have some bad news.
- (d) His wife told Quan some news that was not what he thought it would be.
- (e) His wife told a funny story.

30. An upcoming event might have bad consequences. Nothing much can be done to alter this. The person involved would be most likely to feel?

- (a) Sad

- (b) Irritated
- (c) Distressed
- (d) Scared
- (e) Hopeful

1. It is clear that somebody will get what they want. They are most likely to feel?

- (a) Pride
- (b) Relief
- (c) Joy
- (d) Hope
- (e) Guilt

32. By chance, a situation arises where there is the possibility that a person will get what they want. The person is most likely to feel?

- (a) Distress
- (b) Hope
- (c) Surprise
- (d) Joy
- (e) Fear

33. A supervisor who is unpleasant to work for leaves Alfonso's work. Alfonso is most likely to feel?

- (a) Joy
- (b) Hope
- (c) Regret
- (d) Relief
- (e) Sadness

34. The nature of Sara's job changes due to unpredictable factors and she no longer gets to do the portions of her work that she most enjoyed. Sara is most likely to feel?

- (a) Ashamed
- (b) Sad
- (c) Angry
- (d) Distressed
- (e) Frustrated

35. Leila has been unable to sleep well lately and there are no changes in her life that might indicate why. Leila is most likely to feel?

- (a) Angry
- (b) Scared
- (c) Sad
- (d) Distressed
- (e) Guilty



36. A person feels they have control over a situation. The situation turns out badly for no particular reason. The person involved is most likely to feel?

- (a) Confused
- (b) Relieved
- (c) Surprised
- (d) Frustrated
- (e) Distressed

37. Someone believes another person has deliberately caused something good to stop happening to them. However, they feel they can do something about it. They are most likely to feel?

- (a) Angry
- (b) Contemptuous
- (c) Distress
- (d) Depressed
- (e) Frustrated

38. The new manager at Enid's work changes everyone's hours to a less flexible work pattern, leaving no room for discussion. Enid is most likely to feel?

- (a) Dislike
- (b) Rage
- (c) Jealousy
- (d) Surprise
- (e) Anxiety

39. Someone believes that another person has caused harm to them, due to that person's bad character. They think they can probably handle the situation though. The harmed person is most likely to feel?

- (a) Contempt
- (a) Anger
- (c) Horror
- (d) Excitement
- (e) Shame

40. Pete gets home late, after his favorite TV show has ended. Pete's partner has taped the show for him. Pete is most likely to feel?

- (a) Surprise
- (b) Hope
- (c) Pride
- (d) Relief
- (e) Gratitude

41. Matthew has been at his current job for six months. Something happened that caused him to feel regret. What is most likely to have happened?

- (a) He did not apply for a position he wanted, and has found out that someone else less qualified got the job.
- (b) He did not apply for a position he wanted, and has started looking for a similar position.
- (c) He found out that opportunities for promotion have dried up.
- (d) He found out that he didn't get a position he thought he would get.
- (e) He didn't hear about a position he could have applied for and now it is too late.

42. Penny's hockey team trained hard and won the championship. Penny is most likely to feel?

- (a) Hope
- (b) Pride
- (c) Relief
- (d) Joy
- (e) Surprise

## Appendix G

## Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale- Short Form (Payne et al., 1999)

Instructions: Please read each statement below and then indicate to what extent you agree with the statement.

1= Very much disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Moderately disagree, 4= Neither agree nor disagree, 5= Moderately agree, 6= Agree, 7=Very much agree

1. If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.
2. Although most women wouldn't admit it, they generally find being physically forced into sex a real "turn-on."
3. If a woman is willing to "make out" with a guy then it is not big deal if he goes a little further and has sex.
4. Many women secretly desire to be raped.
5. If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say that it was rape.
6. Men from nice middle-class homes almost never rape.
7. Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at men.
8. It is usually only women who dress suggestively that are raped.
9. If the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it a rape.
10. Rape is unlikely to happen in the woman's own familiar neighborhood.
11. Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.
12. A lot of women lead a man on and then they cry rape.
13. It is preferable that a female police officer conduct the questioning when a woman reports a rape.
14. A woman who "teases" men deserves anything that might happen.
15. When women are raped, it's often because the way they said "no" was ambiguous.
16. Men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.
17. A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tries to force her to have sex.
18. Rape happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control.