Implicit Gender Bias: Associations with Trial Outcomes for Women Accused of Murder

Tiffany Haineault

Thesis submitted to the University of Ottawa

In partial Fulfillment of the requirements for the

Master of Arts in Criminology

Faculty of Criminology

University of Ottawa

Table of Contents

Abstract

Women accused of murdering their partner when faced with intimate partner violence (IPV) may be perceived in a unique light. However, there is little research on whether people's implicit and explicit gender bias plays a role in how they react or perceive women accused of murdering their partner. Therefore, this research aims to see an association between explicit and implicit gender bias in determining guilt in murder cases involving women suspects.

The methods used for this research are an online survey, an implicit association test, and an ambivalent sexism inventory test. These tests will be put into the Fuzzy Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis.

Some key findings were that the absence of Implicit Association Test and the discrepancy between the two explicit biases were linked to a less severe outcome. In contrast, only one case with a high level of all three gender biases was linked to severe outcomes. These results could be due to more psychologically rigid, naïve, or one-sided mindsets regarding the participants' perceptions of women.

Introduction

The topic chosen for this thesis project is implicit gender bias as it pertains to women accused of murdering their partners. This research focuses on understanding some of the ways people come to decide how women are guilty or innocent of murder. The researcher hopes that these results and conclusions will help criminology academics -anyone interested in this topic- to understand some of the factors at play in the public's representation of gender in determining guilt.

One purpose of this research is to combine criminological knowledge with concepts developed in the field of psychology. Bringing these two perspectives together may produce a novel way of perceiving women accused of murder. In addition, gathering information on how the students perceive these women will generate interesting data, most likely fluctuating based on their age, program, level of education, gender, and more.

It was made clear by researching this topic that there was little to no research on implicit gender attitudes or biases in the criminal justice system within the current literature regarding women accused of murdering their partner. Therefore, the previous research solidified this study and will hopefully bring new knowledge into the criminology realm. Hence, this thesis project provides an excellent foundation for future research on this topic.

This thesis project aims to see if people's implicit gender bias plays a role in how they react to women accused of murdering their partners. Therefore, the main research question is: what are the associations between explicit and implicit gender bias in determining guilt in murder cases involving women suspects? A sub-category follows this question: how do other characteristics such as decision maker's gender and age impact these associations?

The first chapter will concentrate on a general literature review. It will briefly explain Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) to provide context for the four vignettes presented in Chapter Three. The legal aspects regarding IPV will be discussed in the following subsections. These sections will look at how potential legal members perceive and understand women who experience IPV in court and their decisions based on their biases. The following subsection will concentrate on heuristics, allowing for a deeper understanding of judges' decisions. Heuristics that affect decision-making will be explored. This chapter will conclude with a subsection on associations for implicit and explicit biases that people may possess.

Chapter Two will focus on the theoretical framework utilized for this thesis paper. This section will discuss the overarching framework of social psychology and social representation theory, with a sub-concept of intergroup conflict. These frameworks will also be used in relation to heuristics and stereotypes.

Chapter Three will focus on the methodology aspect of this research project. It will discuss and explain the use of the participants that have taken part in this study. An explanation will follow as to why data collection was gathered with an online survey, the reason for choosing these individuals, and the number of participants will be presented as well. The material used will be reviewed in detail. This research will discuss the procedure to provide anyone who decides to recreate this experiment with the necessary information. The tests and questionnaires will be provided in the Appendices section of this paper. The following subsection will discuss how the data collected was analyzed with Fuzzy Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA).

Chapter Four will provide the online survey results, and Chapter Five will have a more in-depth focus on analyzing and discussing these results. In addition, Chapter Five will focus on what the results mean concerning the theoretical framework. Finally, Chapter Six will discuss the limitations of this study and the potential future direction academic criminological research and policy research should consider regarding this topic.

Chapter One - Literature Review

Intimate Partner Violence

Some people use IPV and domestic abuse interchangeably, but they have two overlapping yet distinct definitions for this paper. This paper adopts the definition of IPV by the World Health Organization: “any behaviour within an intimate relationship that causes physical, psychological or sexual harm to those in the relationship” (Carmo, Grams & Magalhaes, 2011:355). It follows a pattern of abuse by an intimate partner, whether past or present, focusing on coercive control to secure or maintain power (Straus & Gozjolko, 2014; West & Merritt, 2008). IPV can occur within a heterosexual or LGBTQ+ relationship (Carmo, Grams & Magalhaes, 2011). In contrast, the researcher defines domestic abuse as abuse between individuals who live within the same residence, not limited to intimate partners.

Though this paper will not be addressing economic/financial, social, or emotional abuse, it is essential to understand that there are more forms of IPV than physical violence. Abuse is not always physically apparent. For example, it is almost impossible to see when someone is prevented from accessing their income (economic) or prohibited from visiting friends and family (social). Likewise, emotional abuse can be hidden behind a smile. Nevertheless, the most common injuries are caused by physical aggression and sexual abuse/coercion (Mannel & Dadswell, 2017; Outlaw, 2009). Therefore, IPV is typically considered in the context of men committing violence against women (Douglas & Hines, 2011; Lundy & Grossmen, 2009; Taskale & Soygut, 2017).

As there are many forms of what can be considered abuse with different levels of severity, defining each form of abuse is essential. Firstly, “[p]hysical abuse is the intentional infliction or attempted infliction of bodily injury toward another person” (Murray, Mobley,

Budford & Seaman-DeJohn, 2006:11). This harm can be caused directly or indirectly by the abuser. It can involve anything from slapping the victim to using weapons.

Secondly, there is sexual abuse, which "involves forcible acts of sexual nature that perpetrators use to assert or sustain their supremacy over their partner" (Murray et al., 2006:11). This abuse often goes hand in hand with emotional or psychological abuse. Being sexually abused can impact a victim's mental well-being (Murray et al., 2006). Emotional abuse involves "comments and actions intended to undermine the victim's self-respect and sense of worth" (Outlaw, 2009:264). In contrast, psychological abuse has the purpose of "undermin[ing] the security of the victim's" agency (Outlaw, 2009:264).

Thirdly, "[s]ocial abuse generally involves an imposed isolation" (Outlaw, 2009:264). This abuse means that the abuser forces the victim to cut contact or limit contact with friends and family. As a result, the victim becomes reliant on the abuser and feels like they cannot contact outsiders for help.

Finally, there is financial or economic abuse, which "involves [the] imposed economic dependence of the abused on the abuser, if not outright stealing by the abusive [partner]" (Outlaw, 2009:264). These individuals are not allowed access to their finances. Therefore, it is harder for the abused to escape since they do not have the funds to establish a new life elsewhere.

Ultimately, with all things considered, IPV is a social problem and not a private or domestic one (Giustina, 2008; Messing, Ward-Lasher, Thaller & Bagwell-Gray, 2015). Making IPV a private problem allows the abuser to abuse the victim without repercussions. Making IPV a social problem allows for the creation of laws to protect the victims and punish the

perpetrators. Since IPV is viewed more as a public problem, some organizations have been designed to help protect women and children from abusers or help them leave an abusive partner. These organizations also fight for victims' rights, leading to new laws and a better understanding of IPV and how to help those in need.

Intimate Partner Violence Towards Women

For generations, women have been viewed as the primary sufferers of IPV. From this viewpoint, abusive men tend to use physical, sexual, emotional, and economic abuse to control women (Simmons, Lehmann &Tension, 2008b). Physical abuse tends to increase the more the women attempt to free themselves from the abuser, which means they will suffer more regularly (West & Merritt-Gray, 2008). Some women have revealed that they were left with no choice but to act in self-defence (Hines, Brown & Dunning, 2007; Simmons, Lehmann & Collier-Tension, 2008b). Men cause more physical injuries to women than vice versa (Harding & Helweg-Larsen, 2008; Straus & Gozjolko, 2014). These injuries can range in severity, from a black eye to hospitalization or death.

Reduction of Abuse

Women try very hard to reduce the amount of IPV they suffer. More specifically, their primary concern is the amount of physical and sexual violence. Vatnar & Bjorkly (2009) have researched how some women who experience IPV try to minimize their aggression. One way they found was by contacting the police. Unfortunately, women try to avoid calling the police because they are afraid of causing the abuser harm or tearing their family apart (Meyers, 2010). Still, sometimes, the violence is so damaging that they do not have another option. Researchers found that when women perceived their life as being in danger, they were three times more

likely to call the police (Vatnar & Bjorkly, 2008). The problem with this is that women underestimate the danger they face (Vatnar & Bjorkly, 2009). This danger is due to abused women constantly suffering from violence and growing accustomed to it. Therefore, when they call the police for help, they consider their lives to be at stake, and it takes a lot for them to believe this. As a result, severe hospitalization or death can occur.

West & Merritt-Gray (2008) found that women try to reduce the physical violence brought upon them by their male partners by appeasing them. This reduction of violence involves doing as told and not asking questions that may upset their partner. In addition to this, Harding & Helweg-Larsen (2008) found that women understood that calling the police puts them at greater personal risk.

Other Victims

This thesis project concentrates on a heteronormative perspective, where women are victims of abuse and men are abusers. The research believes that it is essential to know that victims can be women and men in heterosexual or LGBTQ+ relationships. Research focusing primarily on women as victims of IPV often ignores that women can also be the perpetrators. Simmons, Lehmann & Collier-Tension (2008a) found that women who engaged in IPV towards their male or female partners cited retaliation or revenge as their motivation for using physical violence (Hines & Malley-Morrison, 2001; Hines, Brown & Dunning, 2007). In comparison, Straus & Gozjolko (2014) found that women attack their male partners due to anger and poor communication. When the police are called, these women downplay their use of violence to avoid prosecution (Simmons, Lehmann & Collier-Tensions, 2008a). The stereotypical definitions and associations linked to masculinity in men hinder people from seeing them as victims. Men

who report abuse face social stigma; they are either disbelieved or ridiculed (Carmo, Grams & Magalhaes, 2011; Collinson, 2009; Tsiko, 2016). In social consciousness, men are viewed as physically stronger than women and should not face intimate abuse, particularly physical (Collinson, 2009).

People who are part of the LGBTQ+ community do not often call the police for help. Finneran & Stephenson (2013) found that they feared the removal of children, loss of economic resources, shame/humiliation from the abuse becoming public knowledge, being disbelieved, being wrongly arrested, or being judged for their sexual orientation. Their fear of losing their life structure often outweighed their need for safety.

Sadly, the laws currently in place mainly protect heterosexual women (Baker, Buick, Kim, Moniz & Nava, 2013; Cho, 2012; Seelau, Seelau & Poorman, 2003). This means that men, whether in heterosexual or LGBTQ+ relationships and women part of the LGBTQ+ community are not protected. The LGBTQ+ community does not always feel as though the police will protect them. They feel like they may be judged negatively (Rolle, Giardina, Caldarera, Gerino & Brustia, 2018).

Heuristics

Heuristics reduce complex inferential tasks in everyday life. The goal is to simplify a cognitive thought process (Cervone & Peake, 1986; Saks & Kidd, 1980; Tversky & Kahneman, 1973). However, the simplified decision-making version can lead to unnecessary errors due to a lack of logical thinking. Moreover, these heuristics, which can be changed throughout life, are mental shortcuts based on cultural or social knowledge (MacGillivray, 2014). Therefore, people who grow up in different regions may possess different unconscious thought processes when

observing the same situation. These mental shortcuts are heavily influenced by socialization and life experiences.

Heuristics allow for a fast approach to judging without looking at or considering all information (Kelman, 2013; Sunstein, 2005). This method is not ideal in all situations, particularly those with people's lives hanging in the balance, such as policies and court decisions. In other words, heuristics are used as mental "shortcuts" by people who are assessing a particular person or object to make it easier to understand/categorize them without becoming overwhelmed by the quantity and complexity of the information to be processed (Marder & Pina-Sanchez, 2018; Sunstein, 2005).

Legal Responses to Intimate Partner Violence

Seelau, Seelau & Poorman (2003) conducted a study to determine how jurors viewed non-traditional couples being abused. They found that most jurors were biased against LGBTQ+ couples. This is because they have heuristic views of male-on-female abuse as more negative (or more "normative") than any other type. It was established that most male jurors were more accepting of abuse regardless of the gender of the perpetrator (Seelau, Seelau & Poorman, 2003). In addition to this, jurors found abuse directed at female victims to be more severe than that of male victims, no matter the gender of the perpetrator (Seelau, Seelau & Poorman, 2003). Following this, the jurors thought that the victim was more at fault if the abuser was a woman (Seelau, Seelau & Poorman, 2003). This can be the heuristic constructions surrounding IPV, where it is deemed 'normal' for men to be aggressive/violent and for women to be 'victims.' This also explains why LGBTQ+ or male victims are not well received because it does

not fit within the heuristic of men being assertive and aggressive and women being weak and victims.

Seelau & Seelau (2005) found that sexual orientation and the gender of the victim influence whether police decide to intervene when they receive a call. The criminal justice system sees "non-prototypical domestic violence as less problematic or worthy of intervention" (Seelau & Seelau, 2005:364). The researchers found that if the victim was female, the severity of the situation was viewed as very high compared to a male victim, which follows the heuristic pathway mentioned above.

Seelau & Seelau's study is consistent with Perrin's (2017) research, which looked at how male judges decide whether to allow fathers partial custody of their children when the women accuse them of IPV. From the researcher's findings, male judges seemed to rely heavily on their implicit stereotypes regarding gender. Some male judges have blamed the female victim for their domestic abuse (Perrin, 2017). This finding would support the idea that some male judges hold a patriarchal view that women 'belong' to men. There is also a widespread belief that abused women should leave and seek safety, which is often impossible. Most of the time, the women are financially trapped or are physically threatened. McKeig & Madden (2019) found that judges rarely access abuse services, whether for heterosexual or LGBTQ+ couples. In other words, they do not give information to the victims on how to protect themselves or who they can contact for help to leave their abuser. This is an excellent example as to how heuristics can negatively impact decision-making at the judicial level, therefore influencing the outcome of trials and sentencing for victims and perpetrators.

Types of Heuristics

There are three main types of heuristics used in everyday life and decision-making. The first one is 'Representativeness.' This heuristic "is a simple assessment of how much a specific person, object or event is similar in nature or occurrence to a larger sample or population" (Norris, 2015:122; Tversky & Kahneman, 1973; Tversky & Kahneman, 1983). In other words, this means that the person will take pre-existing knowledge and assess the degree of congruence between a particular case and their knowledge.

This type of heuristic is often associated with the risk of a conjunction fallacy: "the belief that two events that occur in sequence are more likely than those which occur singularly" (Norris, 2015:122). This can become a problem when it comes to decision-making. The conjunction fallacy relies on the time between events as indicating a link between them when this is not always the case. The frequency of events happening in sequence does not mean that they have more in common than two events that had a long gap between them: "[R]epresentative heuristics suggests that we [tend] to ignore or downplay the chance that a particular event (or sequence of events) could […] occur in favour of those which we can more readily recreate" (Norris, 2015:124; Tversky & Kahneman, 1973) or that are assessed as having more resemblance (Sunstein, 2005; Saks & Kidd, 1980; Tversky & Kahneman, 1973; Bodenhausen, 1990). The conjunction fallacy allows people to ignore fundamental similarities or essential information, favouring perceived similarity based on frequency and probability, which can cause issues that relate to sentencing. This can also lead to an 'illusion of validity,' when "people tend to make intuitive predictions by selecting the outcome that is more similar to their stereotypes" (Saks & Kidd, 1980:135).

The 'Availability' heuristic "is another frequent decision bias which […] demonstrates how people overestimate the ease with which a particular event or association can be brought to mind" (Norris, 2015:122; Saks & Kidd, 1980; Tversky & Kahneman, 1973). It is used not necessarily based on frequency but on the availability of a memory (Saks & Kidd, 1980; Sunstein, 2005). The more memory is readily available to someone, the more likely they are to associate it with a person, event, or object (Tversky & Kahneman, 1973; Rothbart, Fulero, Jensen, Howard & Bierrell, 1977). Thus, associating two events that can be easily recalled is much easier than associating events that are considered rare or unique. This particular heuristic will be observed in many cases because people tend to make decisions in the fastest, most economical way rather than considering all relevant details.

Both 'Representative' and 'Availability' heuristics are easily used in any given situation, making them perfect for investigating judgments and decision-making (Norris, 2015). Norris (2015) indicates that jurors and judges use these because they do not retain as much information in court hearings as they believe. Therefore, they rely heavily on readily accessible information that may not be accurate or pertinent to a case. This accessibility can lead to decisions that are not representative of the individual on trial.

It should also be noted that those who use intuition to make decisions are more likely to use 'Representative' and 'Availability' heuristics (Tversky & Kahneman, 1983). Intuitive judgments are not typically extensive because people rarely make exhaustive lists (Tversky & Kahneman, 1983) or think logically through events. In other words, "stereotypes can be viewed as judgemental heuristics that are sometimes used to simplify the cognitive tasks confronted by the social perceiver" (Bodenhausen, 1990:319). They have more chances to be used when

people are less motivated to manage or engage in more systemic/careful judgmental strategies or if the cognitive load associated with the task is too much of a burden (Bodenhausen, 1990). Judgmental heuristics routinely carry out assessments daily to make associations easier, based on intuitive judgments for estimation or prediction (Tversky & Kahneman, 1983).

The third and final important heuristic is 'Anchoring and Adjustment.' People use this when they make adjustments to an initial value, either up or down, but are biased towards an anchoring value, which is the initial one (Cervone & Peake, 1986; Saks & Kidd, 1980). Thus, the initial value assumed by a person will affect the final estimate, a tendency called "anchoring." Saks & Kidd (1980) have found that the initial value will impact the final value after such an adjustment (Cervone & Peake, 1986). Furthermore, Cervone & Peake (1986) found that anchoring can be used to judge the self or others. This means that 'Anchoring and Adjustment' heuristic can influence behaviours and actions depending on the specific situation.

An example of this is when a person goes to a car dealership to buy a vehicle. A car salesman initially gives a very high asking price that is not fair or low. The initial asking price is the anchoring value. Even after the adjustments, which is the price negotiation, the final price will be closer to the initial high asking price than the fair amount the car is worth. This outcome occurs because the person purchasing the vehicle will be biased towards the initial anchoring value, leading to them paying more for the vehicle.

Debates on Heuristics

There are two types of schools of thought pertaining to heuristics. The first is interested in the associations between heuristics and bias. This approach suggests that people miscompute probabilities (Kelman, 2013). This is because people are unable to take all

information into account. Instead, they rely on memories and knowledge they already have and can easily retrieve, such as stereotypes. Thus, people are perceived as failing to assess possibilities accurately, attempting to make rational choices, but failing "because they lack the internal resources such as time, attention, and computational power" (Kelman, 2013:347). Therefore, they may rely on stereotypes or common knowledge to assess a situation, person, or object. Sometimes these assessments may be correct, but many times they are not.

The second school of thought suggests that people who use heuristics are more interested in their own achievements and negate others in the situation. Researchers within this school "emphasize the degree to which the heuristics that we use will more typically […] not only be adequate to the decision-making tasks at hand but typically even be superior to formally rational decision-making, given the interplay between our capacity sets and the actual features of the problems that we confront in the environments in which we must solve problems" (Kelman, 2013:346). In other words, people make decisions to maximize their personal satisfaction rather than what may be best in each situation for others. As a result, they will avoid logical thinking and take the easiest path to benefit themselves while ignoring the needs of others.

Decision-Making

There is a consensus among most researchers that heuristics can be helpful for everyday life but also not suitable for legal or professional decision-making. Heuristics in everyday life can help people make quick decisions that benefit them. MacGillivray (2014) believes that everyday heuristics should be removed from legal decision-making. This is because using heuristics allows lawmakers to come to swift decisions. According to MacGillivary (2014), this should be avoided.

Decisions pertaining to legal or professional work environments should be analyzed and researched deeply before coming to a conclusion. Heuristics have no place in legal and professional decisions. Using heuristics could hinder the creation of laws and decisions.

MacGillivray (2014) also found that people tend to use "the identifying properties of a class to categorize" (775). His research findings describe how judges decide on sentences for a person by associating specific characteristics to this person based on a broader common perception about a group of people.

Supporting this perspective, Norris (2015) concluded that attribution is a basic heuristic in criminal trials. According to him, this is because people are generally interested in why people engage in certain behaviours and actions: "We dispose of formal logical inferences about situational factors exerting reasonable and rational forces upon an individual to behave in a particular way, and instead rely on dispositional factors internal to the actor" (Norris, 2015:123). This means that people will ignore personal reasons as to why someone may have behaved in a specific manner and may only consider how the "prototypical person" would react in a similar context.

Norris (2015) also expresses how hindsight bias can influence criminal trials. He indicates that people have a hard time "ignore[ing] outcome information in making predictions about what is likely to occur/has occurred" (Norris, 2015:123). In other words, the jurors or judges know the event's outcome and use this knowledge to analyze the events leading up to the outcome and coming to a decision. These individuals have more clarity than the person on trial had during the event in question. This makes it harder for the judge or the jurors to place themselves within the accused's shoes to understand their position and decisions. This relates

to the availability heuristic because these individuals cannot see multiple versions of a situation due to already having the information.

In addition to this, Sunstein (2005) believes that moral heuristics play a significant part in legal decisions. “The problem [with this] comes when the generalizations are wrenched out of context and treated as freestanding or universal principles, applicable to situations in which their justifications no longer operate” (Sunstein, 2005:531). In law, decision-makers try to find similar features in other cases when faced with particular cases (Sunstein, 2005). This means that the judge or jurors do not take each case as an individual scenario with its factors but rather relate them to cases that readily come to mind, based on being deemed “representative,” as a foundation for decision-making. These heuristic thought processes lead to sentence clusters.

Sentence clustering is “whereby terms of imprisonment are clustered around a small number of specific sentences” (Marder & Pina-Sanchez, 2018:2). Sentence clustering is deemed anti-ethical because criminal cases are meant to be individualized. Heuristics are used in sentencing and courtroom decisions to reduce the time it takes to conclude and the complexity of the task (Marder & Pina-Sanchez, 2018). Judges, for instance, might only use some information from a case, compare it to a few other cases that are considered “similar” or “representative” to this one, and make a judgment based on these elements.

Associations

Associations are connections or relationships between two or more items. These items can be ideas, thoughts, feelings, concepts or more—the experience of “the first item activates a representation of the second” (American Psychological Association, 2020). There are two types

of associations that will be discussed and utilized for this thesis project. They will be explained more in-depth in this subsection. The first is the implicit association, which involves automatic associations occurring outside an individual's consciousness (Greenwald, McGhee & Schwartz, 1998; Greenwald, Nosek & Banaji, 2003). The second is explicit associations, which involve conscious thoughts (Clarke, 2018).

Implicit Bias

Implicit associations are judgments, actions, and stereotypes which automatically or spontaneously bring out behaviours in a given person (Brauer, Wasel & Niedenthal, 2000; Greenwald, McGhee & Schwartz, 1998; Greenwald, Nosek & Banaji, 2003; Kang, Bennett, Carbado & Casey, 2012). The individual in question is unaware of these perceptions because they are ingrained in their everyday actions and beliefs. These associations can influence how people think of either a person or an object. Associations will then guide their reactions and behaviours towards said object or person. It is important to note that these thoughts are not part of conscious awareness.

Parallel to implicit associations are explicit biases. These attitudes or beliefs are similar to those of implicit attitudes, but individuals are consciously aware of them (Brauer, Wasel & Niedenthal, 2000). This means that the individual can become aware of a negative bias towards a person and correct their thoughts or behaviours. This usually happens when the person has time to think about their thoughts and actions.

Socialization is the key to developing implicit biases towards different groups in society. Most researchers who study the impacts of how parents socialize their children and how this shapes their unconscious thoughts and awareness of gender determine how these children will

act in the future. The norms and values passed down stem from cultural biases that connect the self and society (Rudman & Ashmore, 2007). These cultural biases and beliefs are why men, women, and the LGBTQ+ community are treated differently and sometimes unfairly when reporting IPV.

Dunham, Baron & Banaji (2016) have looked deeper into children's roles when surrounded by others. First, they wanted to know if a hierarchy was determined based on the stereotypical gender knowledge the parents have passed down, which is partly achieved through the children observing their parent's behaviours. The researchers found that children have a hierarchal system of gender traits, where male children are at the top and females are at the bottom. Furthermore, it was discovered that these children associated characteristics such as power and prestige with male children and emotional traits with females (Dunham, Baron & Banaji, 2016). This suggests that these children have already internalized the stereotypical views that many adults hold regarding how women and men should behave in everyday life.

Adding to these findings, Cvencek, Greenwald & Meltzoff (2011) have also found supporting evidence that gender stereotypes are ingrained in young children's attitudes, which influence their behaviours (Kang, Bennett, Carbado & Casey, 2012; Schnierle, Christian-Brathwaite & Louisias, 2019), as stated previously. These researchers have also established that children prefer playing with others of their gender and gravitate towards stereotypical toys, clothes, and behaviours (Cvencek, Greenwald & Meltzoff 2011). What differs is the fact that this study found that girls had a stronger preference for playing with other girls, whereas for boys, gender did not play a significant role in determining a playmate.

In a similar vein, Lansu, Cillesseen & Bukowski (2013) have suggested that implicit biases children learn from their caregivers can impact how they interact with other children when they enter the age where they can attend school. These researchers wanted to see if there was an indicator of how people react to children who do not fit the traditional role of being female or male in a school setting (Lansu, Cillessen & Bukowski, 2013). They found that whether a child was male or female was viewed negatively by most other students if they were aggressive towards their peers. These researchers also found that if a female was considered mean, aggressive, or a bully, her peers would rate her significantly worse than a boy in a similar position (Lansu, Cillessen & Bukowski, 2013). These children viewed it as somewhat more acceptable for boys to be mean and aggressive towards other children than girls. This same underlying dynamic can be found in today's society, where we tend to disregard violent women and accept that men are more "naturally" aggressive. This can cause issues when women are brought before a court for a violent crime such as murder. The general societal belief that women are more docile is brought into question.

As children age, it is assumed that learning new information regarding a subpopulation could influence how they are perceived. Therefore, Rudman, Ashmore & Gary (2001) established a seminar that an experimental group of students would enroll in for credits. The seminar revolved around race and how minorities are affected by stereotypes (Rudman, Ashmore & Gary, 2001). These researchers established that their negative implicit biases had decreased after the experimental group of students completed the seminar (Rudman, Ashmore & Gary, 2001). It was even found that the students became more aware of their initial stereotypical thoughts and reactions towards these segments of the population and tried to

prevent this from occurring (Rudman, Ashmore & Gary, 2001). This suggests that educating students about society's cultural stereotypes towards specific populations may influence people's awareness of their previous behaviours and the motivation to change them.

Implicit stereotypes are derived from socialization from a young age and can be changed, but they significantly influence how people perceive the world around them.

Social Perception

People have roles that are socially imposed on them and define their place within the broader social structure. These roles are usually constructed around gender, race, class, and other characteristics that influence how other people behave and interact with and around them. Prescribed roles can also affect how people view themselves, changing their implicit cognitive models to match what they think people want to see (Wittenbrink, Judd & Park, 1997).

Concerning perceived roles, Richeson & Ambaby (2001) were curious to see if women who did not fit the stereotypical gender roles were still seen positively. They mainly tested this hypothesis on males who encountered women holding non-traditional gender roles. Before this, they were given a gender-based measure of implicit associations, determining whether these men unconsciously held more traditional gender views or not (Richeson & Ambaby, 2001). The researchers found that men who attached competence to males and incompetence to females had more implicit gender bias, which showed when they engaged with a female superior (Richeson & Ambaby, 2001). The opposite was also found where men showed favourable behaviours towards women who were not in a position of power (Richeson & Ambaby, 2001). This is most likely because it aligns better with their implicit associations of the

socially prescribed roles to men and women. When people strongly relate gender to specific roles, they react more negatively when they are not met.

Some researchers believe that an individual's context in situations will impact how the person behaves. Stigma is one factor that depends on both elements (Major & O'Brien, 2005). Stereotypes define stigma and negative perceptions ingrained within implicit bias and influence how people behave towards a stigmatized population (Kang, Bennett, Carbado & Casey, 2012; Major & O'Brien, 2001; Schnierle, Christian-Brathwaite & Louisias, 2019). Interreacting with a stigmatized group can negatively influence a person's behaviour towards that group. Negative implicit biases are brought forth (Major & O'Brien, 2001) and impact the interaction. This means that these people will begin to identify with the stereotypes that are generally perceived as part of their roles in society, making their behaviours unconscious (Major & O'Brien, 2001). Due to how people perceive specific subgroups in a society, if their reactions are continuously adverse, said minority group of people would change how they behave to fit this perspective. They change their positive implicit biases about themselves to negative ones, internalizing implicit perceptions projected onto them.

Implicit Bias and Legal Decision-Making

There is a "significant body of research […] [that] supports the notion that higher imprisonment rates for some groups compared with others indicate some degree of bias within the criminal justice system" (Bilotta, Corrington, Mendoza, Watson & King, 2019:234). Thus, these rates could be explained by implicit biases of jurors or judges who rely on their implicit associations to make decisions regarding cases, which can negatively impact minority groups.

Implicit biases are subtle. As a result, they become much harder to pinpoint. “Subtle biases can infect human thought and behaviour, the ultimate result of which can be massive discrepancies in the life trajectories of women and people of colour” (Bilotta, Corrington, Mendoza, Watson & King, 2019:241). These discrepancies can further be explained through interpersonal interactions: “Implicit attitudes may affect interpersonal interactions, which are paramount in criminal defense” (Avery, Stark, Zhong, Avery & Cooper, 2020:11).

Concerning implicit gender bias and decision-making, Perrin (2017) found evidence suggesting that in some cases, male judges believe that mothers fighting for full custody of their children and allege domestic abuse are ‘making up stories.' This means judges who hold negative gender biases towards women can neglect IPV signs when determining custody (McKeig & Madden, 2019). These judges usually state that IPV accusations do not have any place in family court hearings because the fathers have just as much right to see their child regularly as the mothers (Perrin, 2017).

Explicit Bias

Explicit association is expressed through spoken, written, “or otherwise conveyed to some audience by words or symbols” (Clarke, 2018: 513). “Explicit biases are [..] attitudes that people formulate, process, and hold within their conscious awareness.” (Avery, Stark, Zhong, Avery & Cooper, 2020:3). For example, an individual will actively attribute particular characteristics or attributes to a specific population. This can be based on gender, race, or ethnicity (Clarke, 2018). Hence, explicit bias can be directly understood by asking someone about their perceptions about a given group.

Explicit bias can be specific to one particular characteristic. In this case, this thesis focuses on gender. Research on 'explicit gender bias' is curious as to the sexist perceptions that people hold toward women and men, as "[s]exism is a form of complex prejudice" (Ibabe, Arnoso & Elgorriaga, 2016:1). There are two forms of gender bias. The first is hostile sexism, which believes that women cannot be agentic and should be restricted to domestic roles, whereas men can control their lives and work in the social world (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 2011). The second is benevolent sexism, which is used to rationalize that women's domestic roles exist for "the betterment of humanity" or "their own good." It emphasizes stereotypical beliefs about women's emotions, attitudes, and roles that are subjectively positive but forces the belief that women should stay in domestic roles (Glick & Fiske,1996; Glick & Fiske, 2011).

It has been established that both hostile and benevolent sexism "are known to guide individual reactions to women in the workplace but in different ways" (Girvan, Deason, & Borgida, 2015:526). People who use gender bias tend to use justifications for their stereotypical associations. These justifications allow individuals to relate their prejudices to social norms (Clarke, 2018). For example, "people who express justifications may be attempting to legitimize their prejudices to an audience—justifying discrimination against black people by their supposed lack of work ethic, against women by the fact that "women get pregnant" and "leave the workplace, or against Muslims by the threat of terrorism" (Clarke, 2018:520). Hence, justifications can be used to make themselves feel better about having negative prejudices, or justifications can garner sympathy from others about their preconceptions. When these types

of negative stereotypes "become acceptable […], particular forms of discrimination are not seen as morally problematic." (Clarke, 2018:521).

Explicit and Legal Decision-Making

Whether in courts or laws, explicit bias in legal decision-making leads to classifying someone as a second-class citizen. These people are perceived as less worthy of concern or respect (Clark, 2018). Ultimately, these individuals do not receive a fair trial and cannot change their outcome. For example, Clark (2018) found that during equal protection cases, the courts tended to turn a blind eye to apparent instances in which racial or religious stereotypes (explicit bias) were utilized as a form of discrimination. Allowing explicit biases to propagate at the legal level normalizes prejudice and discrimination targeted at minority groups (Clarke, 2018). This presents unique dangers that become harmful for minority groups when "employers or government entities offer explicitly discriminatory rationales for harmful decisions" (Clarke, 2018:513). This is an apparent failure to recognize the legalization given to prejudices and discrimination (explicit bias).

In addition, "judges are wary of accusing discriminators of bigotry. Perhaps because accusations of prejudice are such grave indictments, courts have erected barriers to recognizing explicit bias" (Clark, 2018:539). In contrast, it would appear that courts do not have a problem utilizing explicit statements as evidence against discrimination. "This may reflect judicial empathy for insiders accused of discrimination and lack of empathy for outsiders who are victims of discrimination" (Clarke, 2018:539). Hence, the continued legitimization of explicit negative biases further disregards minority groups.

Chapter Two – Theoretical Framework

Social Psychology

Social representation and intergroup conflict fall within social psychology and will be utilized to analyze the results of this research. Some criminologists believe criminology to be its own field, independent of other social science domains. Though this is true, criminology is also a domain of study that takes from many fields in social sciences; one such field is psychology. Some criminological theories rely heavily on psychology, including labelling theory[1]. This theory relies heavily on social-psychological concepts such as group identity, stereotypes/prejudices, and perceptions/attitudes towards individuals or locations. Thus, the reason why this research utilizes social psychology concepts and theories.

The Implicit Association Test and the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory are assessment procedures that indicate how people perceive others. Social psychology incorporates aspects of people's internalized thoughts, such as stereotypes/heuristics, creating social representations and leading to intergroup conflict. Although the researcher does not have access to people on a jury, students from the University of Ottawa were asked to provide their feelings, perspectives, and thoughts regarding the four vignettes explained in the Methods Chapter.

The survey and tests used in this study allow for analyzing concepts that people associate with internalized stereotypes/biases (Greenwald, Banaji, Rudman, Farnham, Nosel &

[1] Labelling theory stems from a sociological perspective. It involves the symbols of labels that people are given who then internalize these labels and acts accordingly (https://www.britannica.com/topic/labelling/theory). Labelling theory would have been an interesting theory to utilize for this research. Instead of using students, I could have given a survey to convicted women accused of murder. This would have given a completely different data set that would have shed some light regarding why and how these women perceive themselves.

Mellot, 2002), which are social representations. These associations allow for an analysis of how people understand others who are similar or different from themselves or their group.

Social Psychology within Criminology

As mentioned above, criminology is not entirely its own field; it utilizes other social science knowledge. Therefore, embracing this notion should deepen the understanding of internalized stereotypes and biases that can seep into everyday life. For example, much social psychological research looks at attitudes and behaviours, which can be observed in legal processes (Kovera & Borgida, 2010). These internalized ways of thinking can potentially impact the outcome of a trial. There has been research conducted that is similar to this project in that "[r]esearch on explicit and implicit gender prejudice represents an example of scientific research that has been presented to legal fact finders" (Kovera & Borgida, 2010:1343). Such research can help make the court system fairer to the defendants and the victims by potentially reducing biased attitudes.

Attitudes are the most critical concept in social psychology, according to Greenwald & Banaji (1995). Ultimately, the entirety of this project relies heavily on the participants' attitudes regarding women and murder. Therefore, mobilizing knowledge from social psychology, especially self-preservation theory, is important because the concept of attitudes originated from this field.

Advantages of Social Psychology

Incorporating knowledge[2] from social psychology into criminology to understand a particular phenomenon can be productive. Social psychology uses the knowledge and activities

[2] Another theory that would have been interesting to incorporate, but that was ultimately left out would have been Foucault's governmentality theory. This would have allowed for a different understanding of how power

of everyday life "that structure and regulates how people think and behave" (Emiliani & Passini, 2016:85). Knowledge of social psychology helps understand how people perceive and interpret the behaviours of women accused of murder. The knowledge generated can help researchers understand whether internalized social representations of women impact how potential jurors or legal actors interpret murder cases. The idea of trying to understand what students may see when it comes to women who have murdered their spouse could lead to an interesting understanding of how jurors, or these future jurors, will come to understand a trial and how it could potentially influence the outcome.

Utilizing the IAT, ASI, and the social-psychological concepts of stereotypes, group identities, and attitudes (Krieger, Carney, Lancaster, Waterman, Kosheleva & Banaji, 2010; Perugini, Gorman & Prestwich, 2007)[3] can explain how women's trial outcomes are impacted. These concepts already carry much weight in psychology and criminology within specific theories. This allows the current study to have more explanatory heft that can be more acceptable to the broader social science community.

In criminology, socialization involves passing on everyday attitudes and beliefs shared with the broader society of minority groups to maintain the status quo (Rudman & Ashmore, 2007). This allows the researcher to utilize concepts to frame the data that has been collected

dynamics can influence how people come to understand and perceive women. The knowledge about women and the law in relation to murder trials also could have led to interesting conclusions.

[3] Feminist theory could have been used to understand how people may come to understand women accused of murdering their spouses. Patriarchy and paternalistic perspectives towards women in murder trials would have been an interesting lens to take to analyze the data collected. I would like to see future research potentially take a more feminist lens regarding women accused of murder.

for this research in a more precise manner regarding internalized stereotypes/biases that lead to the creation of social representations and heuristics.

Social Representation Theory

Social representation is a theory within social psychology that "conceptualizes the interplay of social processes" (Wagner, 2016:26), such as cultural and collective memory. Social representations can include values, ideas, metaphors, beliefs and practices. These representations can establish and guide communication amongst members of groups and communities (Sammut & Howarth, 2013; Moscovici, 1981). Therefore, this can be considered a form of common knowledge that involves "the agency of individuals, and is concerned with both content and process" (Chryssides, 2008; Cohrs, Ulug, Stahel & Kishoglu, 2015; Morant & Edwards, 2011:283; Norris & Franklin, 1997; Wagner, 2016). In other words, social representation does not focus on the rationality of people to make decisions. Instead, it focuses on the notion that individuals will base their decisions on attitudes they hold towards others' knowledge, values, and beliefs (Moscovici, 1981), similar to that of heuristics. Unfortunately, these perceptions are not necessarily accurate; socialization can influence people to perceive others differently from the "ingroup" (Rudman & Ashmore, 2007). This creates a biased society towards those deemed lesser than the dominant group. Therefore, general negative forms of social representations can be damaging to minorities.

Social representations are created and are subject to evolution. These representations are made by the majority (Cohrs, Ulug, Stahel & Kishoglu, 2015). These social representations do not necessarily benefit the majority, but they help influence how society interacts with different populations. These representations can be based on constructed stereotypes

(Dunham, Baron & Banaji, 2016), leading to discrimination and intergroup conflict. These constructions will be internalized into the broader society and influence people's attitudes and behaviours towards minority groups. Though these social representations can change over time (Moscovici, 1981), ultimately, they are hard to remove.

Social representations are internalized and learned through experiences and contexts (Ackermann & Mathieu, 2015; Lansu, Cillesseen & Bukowski, 2013; Wagner, 2016). For example, when a child listens to how an adult speaks about a minority group, they will internalize this thought process and associate specific terms with said group. This means that society can impact how people come to understand minority groups. For example, Lansu, Cillesseen & Bukowski's (2013) research established that children learn social representations from their primary caregivers. These representations are created through socialization from their caregivers regarding stereotypical behaviours based on gender and how they should behave in the everyday environment.

Over time, the more people are exposed to social representations, the more they become automatic (Chryssides, 2008; Cvencek, Greenwald & Meltzoff, 2011). As a result, implicit attitudes about people will begin to take shape. Though people may not be aware that they hold attitudes, beliefs, or values about others, they are present within their interactions and how they perceive their environment and the people within.

Conventional Use of Social Representation

Social psychologists see social representation as a far-reaching structure with sub-divisions, including attitudes and opinions (De Rosa, 1993). Others see this theory as existing independently, with no relation to discrimination, stereotypes, prejudice, or intergroup conflict.

For this research, social representation is perceived as a theory holistically encompassing many concepts, such as attitudes (implicit and explicit), stereotypes, prejudices, discrimination and intergroup conflict.

This theory can involve the use of heuristics (De Rosa, 1993). As mentioned in Chapter One, heuristics simplify the thought process in everyday life (Cervone & Peake, 1986; Saks & Kidd, 1980; Tversky & Kahneman, 1973). Heuristics intertwined with social representations can lead to fascinating decisions or perceptions. People can use their internalized social representations of a person. It can be based on their gender, ethnicity, social class, or a mix of these categories to come to understand a person. The social representations come to the forefront of the person's mind using cognitive shortcuts (heuristics), which can then impact a person's behaviour (Bodenhausen & Morales, 2012). In other words, this makes the mental process implicit and automatic, allowing for easier access to information about a particular group. These concepts can be, for example, gender and stereotypical behaviours or traits that are meant to be associated with them.

Conventionally, social representations are perceived "as 'ways' of knowledge peculiar to social reality, that arise in daily life in […] interpersonal communication and are aimed at understanding and controlling the physical-social environment" (De Rosa, 1993:4). Social representation as a heuristic framework is utilized within the criminal justice system or criminology. Criminology focuses on the social representations created by the majority, which involve meaning-making or symbols. This can be in the form of laws or rulings that determine what crime is and who is a criminal. In a sense, social representations are a way to create social order and orient people within a society to behave a certain way (Moscovici, 1981). Such that

certain crimes are associated more with minority groups who are poor due to the social representations created regarding that group. However, social representation is based on the majority creating meaning and societal norms (Kelman, 2013). Hence, this concept is from social psychology but can be easily integrated into criminology research.

Utility of Social Representation

Social representation theory is helpful because it perceives stereotypes "as clichés of common sense socially constructed and shared and their stability of change is related to social rather than individual aspects" (Emiliani & Passini, 2016:90). This means that one person does not just create social representations; multiple people make them. The people who create social representations change over time, depending on who is part of the majority. This means that there is a form of stability in that social representations will change over time. It is all dependent on who is in possession of the power to change people's perceptions. This ability to change people's perception of others allows those in power to control minority populations.

Concerning this research paper, it is essential to note that the participants' attitudes, biases, and stereotypes will be taken individually and compared at the group level. Thus, social representation theory will aid the researcher's understanding of how people express more prominent societal beliefs and attitudes individually. This will specifically be shown with the IAT since it is meant to pick up on the implicit attitudes and understandings the individuals have internalized.

This theory revolves around social thoughts, usually leading someone to anchor new information to pre-existing information (Emiliani & Passini, 2016), which are implicit associations. For example, suppose someone is presented with information of an unusual or

"novel" nature. The individual in question will use internalized information, such as stereotypes or prejudices, to inform their understanding of the events. Thus, instead of creating a new category for the information, people will use an existing category to create their account of what happened.

In addition to this, social representation theory relies on stimuli to bring forth such common-sense knowledge (implicit associations or attitudes) about people (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Moscovici, 1981; Wagner, 2016). This stimulus is specific to each situation and can involve actions, behaviours, or words. This stimulus triggers the automatic retrieval of unconscious heuristic information regarding the people involved in the situation. For this research, the activation stimuli will be the Implicit Association Test and the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, which will follow four vignettes about women and murder. This should theoretically bring implicit attitudes, such as stereotypes and prejudices, about the social representations of women forward.

An essential aspect of social representation, which was briefly discussed above, is that it can "be shared to maintain a sense of continuity through time on the one hand, while being able to adjust to social changes on the other hand" (Emiliani & Passini, 2016:88). If the person who has these implicit attitudes or associations has the motivation and the opportunity, they may decide to change their behaviour (Rudman, Ashmore & Gary, 2001). This could be interesting if the data shows that people show a high implicit bias in their IAT or ASI than in their responses to the vignettes. It can demonstrate that though the participants have been socialized with certain social representations (stereotypes) about women, they may ultimately

not act upon them due to impression management. Hence, the person does not want to portray themselves negatively.

Importance for Criminology

Social representation theory may be beneficial for analyzing the results of this research because the "social background of members has the power to influence" role perceptions and attitudes towards members of a population (Alexander & Levin, 1998; Norris & Franklin, 1997:185). This statement suggests that people's background, experiences, and memories will influence the social representations formed and internalized. Systemic racism and sexism can lead to discriminatory laws and policies. For instance, gender bias is found in legislation and the judicial processes "when legal issues evoke gender roles and stereotypes" (Orthwein, Packman, Jackson & Bongar, 2010:526). These individuals hold particular social representations of women that do not fit the situation. The social order represented in this situation does not allow for an adequate trial either by judge or jury (Foster, 1993).

Furthermore, social representations impact communication between different population members (Moscovici, 19881), which can negatively impact the outcome of a situation. In addition, it seems that gender bias appears at all levels of the judicial system, even among attorneys and judges (Orthwein, Packman, Jackson & Bongar, 2010). This can lead to the court system being unjust, leading to judges relying on an internalized version of how women should behave, such as "the 'good mother,' the 'superwoman,' and the 'frivolous, uncommitted professional" (Foster, 1993:135).

Social psychology can enhance existing criminological theories within criminology or create new theories (grounded theory). This is because many social psychology and criminology

theories utilize similar concepts, such as people's understanding of others based on their class, location, race, or ethnicity. Thus, instead of just getting an overall experience of the chosen group, social psychology can help criminologists have a deeper, more meaningful understanding of the selected population. For example, women have been observed in contexts where they are criminalized. In these situations, they were frequently portrayed as "children acting out." Nowadays, the criminal justice system and society still perceive criminalized women as submissive and prone to infantile acting out (Dunham, Baron & Banaji, 2016), though less violently than their male counterparts. In addition, women are perceived as having more emotional and verbal reactions, whereas men are more physical.

Intergroup Conflict

Intergroup conflict not only relies on the constructed implicit social representations but is also influenced by ingroup versus outgroup identity. To use social representations, one must identify with a particular group with similar values, similar to labelling theory. As the person associates with a group, their identity shifts to match them (DeSteno, Dasgupta, Bartlett & Cajdrie, 2004; Greenwald, Banaji, Rudman, Farnham, Nosel & Mellot, 2002). Ascribing similar characteristics to oneself and others is called ingroup assimilation (Riketta 2005:97). In other words, the person becomes attached to the group and slowly transforms their cognitive perception of themselves to match that group. Once this bond is strong, intergroup conflict can occur. This conflict happens when people outside the group hold negative thoughts or stereotypes about their group or challenge their group identity. The attachment people within this group feel toward one another will influence them to defend themselves from negative perceptions. It becomes a them versus us conflict.

People would rather negative characteristics be placed on other groups; this is called outgroup contrast. In other words, it is “the tendency to ascribe opposite characteristics to self or ingroup on the one hand and outgroup on the other,” creating cognitive links (Riketta 2005:97). These social representations happen both at the personal and interpersonal levels. These links can be created in two ways. The first is when a person forms a cognitive link or social representation between the characteristics of a group and themselves. The shared positive features allow them to include themselves within that particular group (ingroup). The second cognitive link is when someone understands that another group has different, usually negative, characteristics from themselves and their group, leading the second group to become the ‘other.’ This creates a divide between the two groups (out-group) (Riketta, 2005).

Intergroup conflict occurs based on the social representations that groups of people have of others. This conflict happens when both groups hold rigid attitudes and beliefs about the other group. Cohrs, Ulug, Stahel & Kishogly (2015) define the ‘Ethos of Conflict’ as “a configuration of central, socially shared beliefs […] that are connected to the respective dominant narrative [of each group] about the conflict” (33). Both groups view themselves as the dominant group, leading to social representations of the other group and self-preservation. These representations are created due to “mistrust, hostility, a sense of threat between the conflict parties” (Cohrs, Ulug, Stahel & Kishoglu, 2015:34). Intergroup conflict may arise when these implicit biases are faced with conflicting behaviours from a given group. For example, women are constructed as being sensible, caring, and submissive. Therefore, when someone is faced with a woman accused of murdering their spouse, these social representations are challenged. This may create conflict between the groups, resulting in people holding firm with

their internalized stereotypes because it is easier to fit new information into an existing box (Emiliani & Passini, 2016). Hence, intergroup conflict occurs when one group challenges another's social representation of themselves or when the 'other' no longer fits within their existing box.

Utility of Intergroup Conflict

It is essential to note that "in-group membership plays different roles in the formation and maintenance of the self-concept at different levels" (Brewer & Garsher, 1996:85). This can be a mediator between intergroup conflict and social representation. Simon (2020) understands intergroup conflict as "the critical implications of the union of collective identity and value is that collective identity is first and foremost a claim to collective self-worth, or worthy collective self-definition for the matter, not a claim to superiority over out-group" (149). People understand their self-worth based on the identities they associate with based on their group. The more positive that identity is, the higher their perceived self-worth and the more likely they are to protect that identity.

Intergroup conflict can occur due to "categorizing individuals into groups" (Alexander & Levin, 1998:630). This is because these categorizations turn into the main template for the evaluation of people belonging to outgroups. The differential in worth is the source of antagonization and intergroup conflict. This can be seen between mothers and fathers when they try to fight for custody of their children. For example, Perrin's (2017) article found that some male judges had a more challenging time believing that women have faced abuse by their partners and thought them to be making up stories. This could be explained by intergroup conflict, as some male judges did not acknowledge the negative characteristics of the male

abusers. It is assumed that these male judges help a strong association with their male counterparts. Therefore, some judges reacted more hostile towards the other group, women, by minimizing their complaints and worries. It should be noted that this was not found with all-male judges.

Collective identities can play an essential part in people identifying themselves as part of a particular group. People associate the most with group identities similar to their self-described characteristics (Brewer & Garsher, 1996; Crisp, 2008; Simon, 2020). People want the most positive or important part of their identity to represent themselves. Therefore, group conflict is highlighted more when the targeted group attempts to defend their salient group characteristics.

Importance for Criminology

When people identify as part of a particular group, previous research has shown that this can lead to differential treatment. This means that a specific group will begin to favour people they view as part of their group (Greenwald & Pettigrew, 2014), leading to intergroup discrimination. The people who are part of a particular group will receive more leniency than other groups. As mentioned in the previous sub-section, “individuals tend to increase their use of stereotyping when their self-image is being threatened by negative feedback” (Sarine, 2012:1367). Using stereotypes to engage in discriminatory behaviours can lead to intergroup conflict. Both groups want to maintain a positive self-image and therefore resort to expressing opposing viewpoints. This happens within trials where people are trying to ‘expose’ the defendant as different from society. They are considered different because they engaged in non-normative behaviour that led to what is regarded as a “bad outcome.” Legal actors do not

consider that person's experiences or that the law may have been created to put them at a disadvantage (Alexander & Levin, 1998). For example, we currently have policies and regulations around gender work that do not help women who experience abuse.

Chapter Three - Methodology

This section will provide an in-depth discussion of the methods used to collect and analyze the raw data. Firstly, the researcher's target population will be discussed in detail, including how participants were recruited, their demographic, and why they were targeted for this research. Secondly, the measures used to collect data will be described, including a broad discussion of the changes made to the data collection, ultimately leading to creating an online survey. This survey included an IAT, ASI, four vignettes with questions and a background questionnaire. Thirdly, the procedure used to make the online survey to gather and hold the data collected will be explained. Fourthly, how the data collected will be analyzed is discussed. Finally, the purpose and benefits of the software used will be described.

Participants

The researcher decided that the best course of action for this thesis project was to have students from the University of Ottawa take an online survey. These students were from different programs within the University and at any year or level. It was considered that having individuals from various fields would give this research and the conclusions more coverage and breadth. This also allowed for a better understanding of implicit biases between education and programs.

The intended number of participants was approximately 30, enabling the researcher to gather enough information that could be easily analyzed and compared. In addition, one of the benefits of having a smaller sample is its leniency in the amount of time it took to run the numerical results through the fsQCA program and code and categorize the responses[4]. This

[4] This will be explained more in-depth later in this chapter, under the data analysis section.

allowed for a balance between obtaining enough information to analyze the data collected adequately and the timeframe set by the University to graduate within three years.

Secondly, QCA is designed for small to medium sample sizes. This is because the data gathered can be quantitative and qualitative (Kane et al., 2014). It is significantly easier to analyze a large group when the results involve numbers, whereas it becomes harder to analyze qualitative responses. It not only takes longer to read the answers, but the researcher must also invest more time in finding the underlining meaning rather than just surface-level understanding. A 30-person sample size is large enough to gather various data but is also small enough for the researcher to obtain an in-depth analysis of the QCA results (Kane et al., 2014). This is done through the researcher being able to know and understand the participants' qualitative responses on a more intimate level to analyze the meaning from the QCA data, which will support the quantitative data.

The people recruited for this thesis project were students attending the University of Ottawa. Gaining access to these students required a lot of work and was a lengthy process. Once the Bureau of Ethics approved, the researcher contacted potential participants to see if they would like to participate in this project.

The students were recruited through online social media outlets, such as Facebook, Twitter, and a criminology blog. The criminology blog, University Twitter, and the University Facebook page were sent a short description of this research project, which asked students to participate in this study (Appendix 1). The post had a link to the online survey. This allowed the participating students to remain anonymous, which was essential for this project. This was intended to enable them to feel safe and give them the ability to elaborate more honestly with

their answers. The only time the participant may have been revealed is if they contacted me through email. The researcher's email was included on the online questionnaire if the participant had any questions. It should be noted that no participants contacted the researcher. The online survey was set up to keep the participant anonymous.

Some of the student participants were recruited by the researcher through Facebook. This was done by the investigator, who contacted individuals that she knew to be students at the University of Ottawa, asking them if they would like to participate in this experiment. These individuals were given the same information as mentioned above. If they wanted to participate, they could click the link attached to the message, bringing them to the online survey (Appendix 2). These individuals were also asked to forward the message they received to people they know who attend the university. This sampling method is called snowballing[5] and allowed the researcher to garner enough participants for this study. The researcher asked that the participants not mention if they would participate in the research, as instructed by the institutional board of ethics. In addition to this, the researcher could not determine which survey was theirs since their name did not appear, giving them as much anonymity as possible. Nevertheless, with these two recruitment methods, enough information was gathered for an in-depth analysis.

Exclusion Criteria

There were specific exclusion criteria for participants for this experiment. These criteria were to ensure that the information gathered was as internally valid as possible. Firstly, the

[5] This is used within research where a researcher will ask a potential participant to give their contact information or information about an experiment to people who fit the criteria for the study and may want to participate. This gives the researcher a wider data pool.

data collection was maintained until a desirable sample size was achieved, at which point access to the survey was discontinued.

Secondly, people who could not speak or understand English could not participate. This was because the tests and surveys were created for people who had a reasonably good mastery of the English language. Therefore, the study was limited to fluent English-speaking students.

Lastly, questionnaires were excluded from this research if they did not include both the IAT and ASI within their submitted survey. These two tests were essential for this research since they are the primary outcome variables needed to analyze the data.

Measures

Online Survey

Initially, this research was created to be an interview and not an online survey. This has changed since the onset of the pandemic. The study has gone through a couple of changes, such as moving everything online and ensuring that it could gather participants through social media. The most crucial difference was ensuring that the survey made sense for those taking it at a distance from the researcher. One of the main reasons the research was originally going to be an interview was to make sure that they could ask for clarification if they did not understand something. Moving to an online format forced the researcher to ensure that the questions were as straightforward as possible. This may have helped enhance the research because the survey was created from a distance without anyone hovering over the participant's shoulder, making them feel more comfortable answering questions honestly.

The survey began with a consent form that relays all the relevant information about the student’s participation, the benefit and goals of the study, the benefits and potential risks to the student, letting them know that they could stop the survey at any point and finally stating

that they will remain anonymous. The participants needed only to answer “yes” to participate in this research. Nowhere on the survey did their name appear, and thus, they remained as anonymous as possible. This was followed by the Implicit Association Test (IAT) and Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) assessments. These had links attached to take the tests. Once completed, the participants returned to the survey and gave their results. Following these tests were four vignettes with follow-up questions. Once this section had been completed, the participant was asked a few background questions to provide additional information that may be useful in the analysis section of this experiment (Appendix 2).

Implicit Association Test

The IAT was created to understand unconscious stereotypes and prejudices concerning race. Using the IAT to understand various concepts, such as gender, age, ethnicity, and more, is novel. Utilizing this test to understand discrimination is also novel (Krieger, Carney, Lancaster, Waterman, Kosheleva & Banaji, 2010). Discrimination, in this sense, is an attitude and not just potential behaviour. Some used the IAT to try and bring forth implicit attitudes related to stereotypes leading to discrimination.

It should be mentioned that some researchers have tried to use the IAT to determine if it is possible to predict discriminatory behaviour (Carlson & Agerstrom, 2016; Kang, Bennett, Carbado & Casey, 2012; Major & O’Brien, 2001; Schnierle, Christian-Brathwaite & Louisias, 2019). The IAT is not a tool to determine or predict actual discriminatory behaviours. Instead, it brings forth implicit attitudes regarding categories and associated traits (Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann & Banaji, 2009), such as gender, race, ethnicity, age, etc. It should be noted that people can actively change their implicit attitudes if they have the motivation and opportunity

to do so in each situation (Rudman, Ashmore & Gary, 2001). The IAT demonstrates that people hold internalized attitudes, stereotypes or biases towards people or groups. However, this does not mean they act on their biases, which will be an interesting analysis paired with self-preservation theory.

Measurements and Implicit Attitudes

The IAT test was helpful for this research because it allowed for measurable data to be gathered to help understand the participants' implicit biases about gender. The IAT was the first test the individual had to take during the online survey. SurveyMonkey had a link that guided the participants to a Harvard version of the test. It brought them directly to the correct gender test (Appendix 3). The test starts with a short paragraph explaining how the test functions. What keys they will need to use, and when they should press them. It should also be mentioned that the IAT is randomly generated and provides a more accurate picture of how the participants unconsciously think about gender.

This IAT was developed by using two specific categories; in this case, it was gender, female and male, and common sexist stereotypes for each gender. The stereotypes used must be the most commonly utilized in our society to determine a person's level of unconscious gender bias correctly. The IAT is a time-based test that does not allow participants to think about their answers; it forces them to react and rely on their implicit biases. The scores are based on the participants' speed to select the correct answers for each category. Therefore, the faster a participant associates the correct concept to the correct category, the higher their implicit bias. Whereas the slower or more mistakes the participant makes, the lower their implicit score.

The four categories used in this test are family, career, male and female. Each category had words that were stereotypically associated with them. Family was associated with garden, kitchen, marriage, laundry, home, children, and relatives. Career was associated with office, manager, salary, job, briefcase, profession, and employees. Male was associated with man, he, men, him, his and gent. Finally, female was associated with woman, she, women, her, girl, hers, and lady. These categories are randomly generated, and the participants had to associate these words with each category. For example, if the two categories presented are female and male and the word the participant is presented with is laundry, the correct answer is female.

In contrast, if the word were strong, the correct association would be male. The tests take the participants' time and errors to determine how much they hold sexist heuristics. Therefore, speed for this test was essential.

This study asked that the participant use two keys to categorize the words. Seven blocks mixed the categories. The first two blocks were utilized to prepare the participants by familiarizing themselves with the program's keys and functions. The following five were monitored, and the participant was provided with their unconscious bias score.

This assessment took approximately 5 to 10 minutes, which depended on the participant's speed. Once the test was completed, the participant was given their result, which they had to take a screenshot of and download to the survey. SurveyMonkey was helpful because it allowed the researcher to create a study that allowed the participants to download their results instead of manually entering their scores, preventing them from modifying their actual scores. This was helpful for the subsequent parts of the analysis.

The IAT involved four different categories and traits that are stereotypically related to each concept (Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann & Banaji, 2009). The presumed assumption regarding the IAT is that the person would process these categories and traits automatically, using their implicit bias (Brauer, Wasel & Niedenthal, 2000; Greenwald, McGhee & Schwartz, 1998; Greenwald, Nosek & Banaji, 2003; Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann & Banaji, 2009; Nunes, 2005). The IAT works with visual cues, in this case, words though it can be pictures and sounds. The participant must match the traits to the concepts a couple of times. For example, the test will sometimes ask them to associate feminine traits with males and masculine traits with females and vice versa. In this case, the test is doing the opposite when scoring. Therefore, the faster a participant can associate the opposite concepts to the opposite category, the lower their implicit score. In contrast, the slower or more errors the participant makes, the higher their implicit bias.

The students completed these small association sections, which encompassed the IAT. The concepts and traits appeared randomly on the screen in front of the participant to ensure that the amount of time it took to answer was not due to repetition but their implicit attitudes (Kand, Bennett, Carbado & Casey, 2012). This left little room for the person to think about their responses thoroughly. Instead, they responded spontaneously and automatically, making it harder for the participants to give embellished answers to sound more appealing to the researcher (Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann & Banaji, 2009). The IAT prevented the participant from thinking rationally and clearly about their answers (Kang, Bennett, Carbado & Casey, 2012). Therefore, it only allows for unconscious and implicit attitudes to be utilized.

The IAT tries to measure implicit biases that people may possess. An implicit association consists of judgments, actions, stereotypes, or prejudices that are automatically and spontaneously activated (Brauer, Wasel & Niedenthal, 2000; Greenwald, McGhee & Schwartz, 1998; Greenwald, Nosek & Banaji, 2003; Kang, Bennett, Carbado & Casey, 2012). This means that people hold certain beliefs that are not part of their conscious awareness. Researchers believe that these unconscious attitudes can affect people's understanding of the world around them, their decision-making in given situations and their behaviours without them realizing it (Kang, Bennett, Carbado & Casey, 2012; Schnierle, Christian-Brathwaite & Louisias, 2019). Kang, Bennett, Carbado & Casey (2012) have demonstrated that implicit biases impact the world. This is found in discriminatory and prejudiced behaviours, influence by implicit biases, towards people who are viewed as inferior, such as women and minorities. Using this test helped establish the unconscious attitudes of the participants, which were then compared to the ASI results and their responses to the vignettes.

If individuals hold more negative stereotypes, beliefs, or thoughts about a particular population, whether based on race or gender, they can retrieve negative views faster (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Levinson, Cai & Young, 2010) by answering the IAT. When people are under a time constraint, they will automatically reach for their implicit biases to reduce the cognitive load (Greenwald & Banaji: 1995). IATs allow researchers to determine the association's strength, "which is inferred from response latencies (or reaction time) on various categorization tasks" (Nunes, 2005:19), as well as selecting the wrong answer. Both reactions are essential for the final bias score. The 'correct' answers are gender stereotyped answers pre-

determined by the person who created the IAT. They are the most common gender stereotypes in North America.

Researchers studying implicit attitudes can change the traits within a given IAT to target implicit biases people may have based on specific stereotypes. For example, these tests can be about race, gender, religion, sexuality, etc. Depending on the topic of study, the associations can differ depending on how strong the participant's heuristics and associations are with the concepts associated with the subject. In addition, the researcher's implicit associations influence the traits the researcher decides to include in the IAT. In other words, the researcher may choose to include specific terms that the researcher may view as being more related to the concept. Regardless, the participants in this study received different results; therefore, background questions were included to help account for these differences.

The researcher was aware of many different gender-related IATs that could be used within this research. Therefore, several of them were examined, and ultimately the Harvard IAT was deemed the best for this research. Most of the IAT tests examined were practically the same. However, slight differences were found in each category's words used for concepts. The main deciding factor in the researcher choosing the Harvard IAT was the test being accessible and easy for participants to navigate and use. The other tests were well created and similar in content, but the Harvard site was user-friendly.

Research on IATs suggests that it is a valid measurement of implicit associations and is suitable for use in the current study. Slight changes in the IAT and test group may change the results to a small degree, but that is expected when different populations from different locations are used. Therefore, this specific research is not generalizable to a broader population

outside that of the University of Ottawa. This study should mainly be used as a jumping-off point for future research relating to this topic of study.

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

The Association section (Chapter One) mentioned the conscious awareness of stereotypes, judgment, prejudice, and actions termed explicit bias. These are part of an individual's conscious mental activity (Brauer, Wasel & Niedenthal, 2000). Explicit measurements revolve around self-report data (Kang, Bennett, Carbado & Casey, 2012), allowing the participant to consciously think about the questions, ultimately reporting their biases, stereotypes, and attitudes. In addition, self-report questionnaires allow for enough time for participants to 'correct' any potentially negative thoughts, making this type of assessment more vulnerable to conscious efforts to skew the results in a socially desirable direction or biased reporting due to lack of self-awareness.

The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory was used to make the participant reflect upon their perceptions of gender as a social construct. The answers given in this section were used as an additional indicator along with the IAT, the vignette answers and the background questionnaire for the analysis.

The survey had a link that directed the participant to the ASI. There were 22 questions they needed to answer, which were rated on a scale of 0 to 5 (Appendix 4). 0 indicated that they strongly disagreed with a statement, and 5 indicated that they strongly agreed. At the end of the questionnaire, the participant was given their results. They needed to take a screenshot of their results and download them onto SurveyMonkey. The ASI typically took no longer than 15 minutes to answer.

This test helped determine whether the participant adhered to relatively hostile or benevolent stereotypical perceptions of women. These types of sexism are both considered to be detrimental. They both share the idea that women are meant to hold "restricted domestic roles and are the weaker [gender]" (Glick & Fiske, 1996:492). Hostile and benevolent sexism are positively correlated (Glick, Fisk, Mladinic, Saiz, Abrams et al., 2000; Ibabe, Arnos & Elgorriaga, 2016) because ambivalent sexists have "positive and negative attitudes [towards women, which reflect] complementary and mutually reinforcing ideologies" (Glick & Fiske, 2011:532). Benevolent sexism allows people to perceive women in traditional roles, whereas hostile sexism, when these roles are resisted, believes that women should be punished to reinforce traditional roles (Glick, Fiske, Mladinic, Saiz, Abrams et al., 2000; Glick & Fiske, 2001; Glick & Fiske, 2011).

It was assumed that the sexism score should be fairly low among the participants since they are university students. This is because previous research has shown that the higher the level of education, the lower the score for sexism (Garaigordobil & Aliri, 2013). However, many factors can influence this score; therefore, the background questionnaire was used to collect data, pointing to possible sources of influence with this sample.

This questionnaire was chosen because it has proven helpful in determining how people consciously perceive women. Since the vignettes being used are women who murder their abusive partners, this type of test would be beneficial to see whether explicit sexism was connected to decision-making in this type of scenario.

Implicit and Explicit Attitudes Differ

Some researchers believe that the explicit and implicit tests should demonstrate a correlation to obtain reliable IAT data. This correlation will indicate that implicit attitudes can be related to actual responses. In other words, implicit attitudes can influence the way people behave or act in everyday life. Some researchers compare implicit associations, through the IAT, with explicit associations, with the ASI to demonstrate a correlation between the two measurements. Hence, researchers aim to obtain a form of convergent validity. This research understands that there can be a correlation between these two measurements but that the participants may also change their explicit answers to appear more socially acceptable. It is much harder to change an unconscious measure, especially if it is time-based. Therefore, this research is looking to explain the correlation between the two tests and why they may differ.

It should be noted that the implicit and explicit associations often do not relate to one another. This does not mean that neither is true but instead demonstrates a difference between the unconscious and conscious thoughts. Fazio & Olson (2003) found that these explicit and implicit measurements often do not relate because of the order in which the tests are administered. They suggested that the tests be administered in a single sequential manner to ensure that the IAT results are not skewed. They indicate that the IAT should be administered first, then the explicit self-report questionnaire, followed by an interaction where the behaviours of a participant can be observed if the researcher so desires (Fazio & Olson, 2003). This would prevent the participant from assuming what the researchers are trying to measure. If the participant answered the self-report first, they would be conscious of what they are being tested for and may have more capacity to change their answers for the IAT. This would, in turn, skew the data for this procedure. Priming the individual helps the person

activate their implicit attitudes, so the implicit tests must be administered first (Fazio & Olson, 2003).

Another reason implicit and explicit tests may not correlate is because the IAT could validly measure the concepts in question (Fazio & Olson, 2003; Hofman, Gawronski, Gschwendner, Le & Schmitt, 2005), whereas explicit measurements cannot. In addition, explicit measurements can be altered based on how the participant wants to be perceived by the researcher (Fazio & Olsen, 2003; Hofman, Gawronski, Gschwendner, Le & Schmitt, 2005). There is also the possibility that these two tests do not measure the same concept. The IAT measures the strength associated with a given concept, whereas the ASI measures what the participant consciously thinks about a topic. The implicit test asks the participant to answer spontaneously about their unconscious attitudes and thoughts. In contrast, when participants take an explicit association test, they are prone to impression management and social desirability.

Conrey, Sherman, Gawronski, Hugenberg & Groom (2005) hypothesized multiple layers to understand and measure implicit and explicit attitudes. It was suggested that previous researchers could not find a relation between implicit and explicit data because they measured them independently when they should have been looking at them as a set.

Conrey et al. (2005) wanted to look at how implicit and explicit attitudes work together in determining how a person may behave. They suggested that researchers must take every possibility into account to measure implicit and explicit attitudes accurately. According to them, four components lead to how an individual may answer either an IAT or a self-report.

For the IAT, Conrey et al. (2005) suggested that researchers must consider two components: the activation of an association between a concept and traits and the fact that

there may not be any implicit attitude available for the individual who will then revert to the last thing they answered or take a guess (Conrey et al., 2005). The first one is self-explanatory, but the latter suggests that the individual may not have any preconceived unconscious stereotype or attitude associated with a concept and traits, which leaves them needing to find an answer. As a result, they may revert to the last thing they answered on the IAT because it was their most recent thought to guess the answer and hope it is correct. This may be considered a limitation for this research, and so this is why the IAT was the first test the participants were to take in the survey. This was in the hope that they would pull directly from their implicit bias rather than reverting to the last thing they answered, especially since this test does not allow for a considerable time delay to think.

There are also two components to the explicit measures: overcoming the automatic associations and determining how to act (Conrey et al., 2005). Both are conscious thoughts that allow people to regulate their behaviour and answer a self-report inaccurately. The first component requires a lot of willpower and motivation to move away from an automatic association. This change in the association would generally be done to avoid a negative stereotype. Over time, this modification will become automatic. The latter, determining how to act, is based on the person's automatic association. Therefore, whatever association someone has will influence a person's behaviour in a given situation.

According to Conrey et al. (2005), the environment chosen for the participant can impact how they respond to an implicit and explicit test. The most common influence for an implicit test is when the participant is placed under a time constraint (Conrey et al., 2005). This allows the researchers to control which bias they will most likely research, which is implicit.

Coney et al. (2005) also suggested that answering a self-report questionnaire will have a high potential of influencing the participant to report answers that would be more in line with social norms. In this sense, the researcher's presence would impact how the individual responds. Therefore, one must be aware of multiple aspects to receive the most accurate implicit and explicit measurements.

With all this information regarding implicit and explicit tests, in agreement with Fazio & Olsen's (2003) suggestion, the survey created by the researcher was administered in a precise sequence. The online survey was organized with the IAT first, followed by the ASI, then the questions relating to four neutral vignettes describing four women accused of murder, and finished with the background questionnaire. This ordering provided the best possible outcome to obtain valid data then analyzed. The IAT sets the stage for what is being studied. At the same time, it also prevented the participant from becoming aware of the exact content being researched. The ASI, questions for the vignettes and the background questionnaire followed since the participants were mindful of what was being studied. They now had time to think about their choices.

Vignettes

The third section in the online survey pertained to four vignettes and several questions that allowed the participants to elaborate on their thoughts and opinions. These responses will be used as anecdotal evidence to understand what the participants' potential thoughts could be regarding the vignettes. The possible length of the participants' explanation for their views is solely limited by their ability or want to explain their thought processes. A vignette is generally used in qualitative studies or complementing other data gathering methods. Vignettes are

understood in this study to be short scenarios that may or may not be hypothetical, "to whose situation the [participant] is invited to respond" (Barter & Renold, 1999:1). The vignettes created for this study involve women accused of murdering their partners. The researcher created these vignettes using the information found from the actual court cases. These cases were found through the Lexis Advance Quicklaw database.

Once the four cases were chosen, the researcher made four neutral vignettes to ensure that the amount of information regarding the cases was manageable. The essential aspects of each case were kept in the one-page, single-spaced vignettes. This involved giving details about the crime scene, the events before the crime, prior arrests, the situation that unfolded as the crime took place, and what happened after the crime occurred (police being called or if the victim was helped or attended to by police or the offender).

The goal of the vignettes is to "elicit perceptions, opinions, beliefs and attitudes from responses or comments to [scenarios]" (Barter & Renold, 1999:2). To ensure that the participant would not be led into thinking a particular way about the offender, which would influence their answers to the questions, the researcher made sure the language used within the vignettes was as neutral as possible. This was done by avoiding dialogue from other witnesses or specific negative action-based terms. For example, three of the vignettes described women who experienced abuse by their partners, and most judges posed the question as to why the defendant never left. In some cases, the prosecutors would point out that the defendant could go and did not. This emphasized victim-blaming and was removed from the vignettes to be more neutral. The vignettes were set up to give the participant the basic information about the case, stripped of opinions from the judge or other court members.

As the researcher finished writing the vignettes, she had one of her peers read them to make sure they sounded neutral and considered any suggestions. As the vignettes were nearing their finalized versions, the researcher's supervisor took a final look and corrected them to be as neutral as possible. The names of the victims and perpetrators were removed to keep them anonymous and prevent the participants from searching for them online.

Before the participants could read and answer the questions regarding the vignettes, there was a section entitled 'Legal Context for the Study.' This section explained what first- and second-degree murder is, followed by a definition of manslaughter to ensure that the participant understood the questions within the study. These definitions can be found in Appendix 2. Again, this was to help the participant elaborate on their opinion as to why the perpetrator deserved the sentence they accorded to them.

The first vignette (R vs. M.B.) differed from the next three. The first vignette is different to understand how the participants come to understand and explain their thoughts and opinions regarding the scenario. This vignette is used to slowly ease the participants into what to expect in the following vignettes and questions. It is the only scenario that does not involve a couple, where the male is dead, and the woman is the accused. However, it is similar to the following three vignettes because the situations still view the mother as the potential offender.

It was about a mother being sentenced for the death of one of her infant daughters. She had no previous criminal record. The general context was that she found one of her twin daughters dead, then proceeded to call her husband at his place of employment, explaining that she believed the child to be dead. The husband called for paramedics, and an ambulance was dispatched. The paramedics were the ones who called the police after it was determined

that the infant was not breathing. They tried to resuscitate her but were unable to. The other twin sister was found in starvation and could not move because she had lost a lot of muscle mass. There was also a four-year-old boy who was found in perfect health. The mother explained that her two-year-old daughter moved a couch from the stairs and fell. However, it was found that she also, like her twin, was in an advanced stage of starvation and had little muscle mass. The vignette and the questions for it can be found in Appendix 5.

R. vs. R. involved a woman who attempted to take out a contract on her husband's life. The person she approached was an undercover cop who then arrested her. She had no previous criminal records. She cited in court that her husband was abusive and that she was scared for her life. It was also stated that the emails exchanged between the couple, as they were separated for nearly a year, indicated that they were civil towards one another. It was also found that they had not had contact for several months. That was the last time that he threatened her. The woman was able to support herself and had the support of friends and family. She stated that she wanted to take out a contract on her husband's life because the accused believed contacting the police would do nothing since she had contacted the police before. She stated that he was controlling and abusive. She initially would not leave him because she feared for her safety, even though he left her alone on multiple occasions. After all, he was a part of the Canadian Armed Forces. She believed that her love could make him a better person since she thought he was denied love when he was a child. Finally, she got the nerve to leave and take their daughter with her one day but still felt unsafe. The complete vignette can be found with the questions in Appendix 6.

R. vs. H. involved a woman charged with the murder of her husband to whom she had been married for 35 years. She had no previous criminal records. The defendant stated that her husband was verbally, physically, and sexually abusive throughout their marriage. They also had four children together who were adults at the time of the incident. The accused and the deceased did not sleep in the same bedroom. This night, the charged and the victim were drinking and having dinner at the husband's sister's house. The couple got into an argument about sending money to the victim's ill sister. The accused thought sending money was wrong since their account was frozen. As the argument escalated, the accused decided to drive home and went to sleep. The victim drove home not long after and entered her room demanding sex. She declined, but he did not take 'no' as an answer. The wife removed a knife from under her pillow and told him no. The husband had done this before and would generally leave her alone once the knife was involved. However, on this night, he did not back down. A struggle ensued, and the knife found itself in the husband's abdomen. The wife called for the police, but the husband later died. The complete vignette with the questions can be found in Appendix 7.

The final vignette is that of R vs. P. This involved a woman accused of murdering her partner. In this case, the couple was both drinking and high at the time of the incident. This case has a witness, and it is the accused cousin. The couple was arguing in the hallway about their recent separation. It should be noted that they recently got back together at the time of the incident. The fight was over the male having a relationship with other women and the female not liking how controlling the male was. The couple would often be verbally and physically abusive towards one another. The cousin separated them and told the defendant to go into the kitchen and the deceased into a nearby bedroom. Not long after being separated,

the victim left the bedroom trying to explain to the cousin how mean the accused was towards him. This is when the defendant grabbed a knife from the kitchen, walked toward the victim, reached around the cousin, and stabbed her partner in the chest. He was pronounced dead at the scene. The defendant called the police and was then arrested. She appeared very calm when the police arrived. It was also found that she lied about the fight. The victim threw a mug at her, hitting the wall. The cousin did not support these claims, and no broken mug was found at the scene. She also stated that her partner was chasing her, and the cousin also denied these allegations. The vignette and the questions relating to it can be found in Appendix 8.

Background Questionnaire

The final section of the online survey gathered some background information on the participant. This information helped the researcher establish links between the data collected via the survey and the participants' socio-demographic characteristics. The information gathered in this section pertains to students' age, gender, program and year, income, and political affiliations. The Background questionnaire can be found at the end of Appendix 2.

Procedure

There were many steps to this research project. Firstly, the researcher needed to do some background research on the chosen topic. This process helped the researcher pinpoint the direction that they wanted to pursue. The information gathered helped the researcher decide that she wanted to concentrate on women perpetrators and how her peers would perceive these individuals.

Following this, the researcher then had to decide how she would gather her data. She initially decided on gathering the data through open-ended interviews. However, due to the

pandemic, this strategy had to be changed. Therefore, after discussing this dilemma with her supervisor, it was determined that using SurveyMonkey to collect data was the best alternative. This way, the researcher could contact more people through multiple forms of social media, such as blogs, Twitter, and Facebook. In addition, students from different years and programs would be able to participate in this research, potentially generating a wider variety of data.

Once the type of participant was established and the number of participants needed, approximately thirty, the researcher had to contact the ethics board and get approval. This took a lot of time and required a lot of detailed information. In addition, since this project has human subjects involved, the board wanted to ensure that these subjects did not incur any severe risks from their participation. What ended up being the most challenging problem to fix was how the researcher would recruit participants. Initially, the researcher was going to ask professors to enter their class and present the study to the student body and leave her contact information for the students who wanted to participate. This was changed to asking the professors to forward an email or post on Brightspace a recruitment script. However, the ethics board barred using email addresses, citing an invasion of privacy and suggesting contacting people through their social media profiles. Hence, the change to contacting the criminology blog, the University of Ottawa Twitter and Facebook pages, contacting individuals through their Facebook profiles and using a snowball sampling by asking them to let their friends know about the study.

Once the ethics board approved this research project, the people who manage the pages for the criminology blog and the university's Twitter and Facebook pages were contacted. They were given information about the project and the recruitment script to be posted online.

In addition to this, the researcher contacted some students from Facebook and asked them if they would like to participate or if they knew of people who potentially would. Once all the data was gathered, the survey was closed, and no one else had access to it. This left the researcher with sufficient data to carry out the analyses.

The researcher contacted more than 100 students from the University of Ottawa who could participate in this study. The same message was sent to all potential candidates (Appendix 1). This message explained the purpose of this study, asking them if they were willing to participate and if they were willing to pass on this message to others they thought may be interested. This was intended to facilitate access to students in different programs that otherwise may not have been contacted. A total of 30 participants were determined to be needed for this research. The more people were contacted, the more likely that number would be reached. To make sure that no more than 30 individuals participated, SurveyMonkey was set up only to receive 30 responses. After the required responses were achieved, the survey would become 'locked' and prevent other potential participants from accessing the survey. Thirty responses were received by December 2020, and the survey opened in July of 2020.

Using social media to contact participants while using snowball sampling allowed the researcher to reach more students than would have been feasible by entering classrooms or contacting professors through email. This manner of recruiting participants was helpful because they did not indicate whether they would take the survey. It was strongly suggested and emphasized that they should not tell the researcher if they were going to participate or if they were going to tell their friends about the project. Though the researcher did reach out to peers within her program, none of them indicated whether they would participate, nor did they tell

the researcher if they passed along the link to other individuals. They remained as anonymous as possible (Fujii, 2012; Palys, 2003). In addition to this, as mentioned previously, the names of the participants did not appear on the online survey, solidifying the anonymity of the participants (Palys, 2003). Even the consent form attached at the beginning of the online survey did not ask the participant to sign their names (Appendix 2). It only asked them for their consent to participate by checking a box (Fujii, 2012; Palys, 2003).

Twenty-five out of 30 participants checked the 'yes' box after the consent form, and 5 skipped the question. It should be noted that since these participants submitted their surveys, thus agreeing to participate, the researcher has decided to keep their answers as part of this study. It should be noted that the researcher had no way of knowing the identity of the students submitting the survey. The researcher only has access to the information provided by the participants, which are only the answers given for each question.

Most of the participants answered all the questions that were within the survey. However, some participants decided not to answer important questions needed to conduct the QCA. Three questions on the questionnaire were essential to this study, which some participants did not answer. Therefore, individuals who did not provide information regarding their results for the Implicit Association Test (IAT) or the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) were removed from the dataset. These two tests and their subsequent results are the main factors examined in this research. This research project concentrates on implicit and explicit gender bias towards women accused of murdering their spouses. Hence, the dataset introduced to the QCA must incorporate these two aspects. Due to this, 7 cases were removed from the dataset, leaving 23 cases used out of the original 30. This is because six people did not

submit their results for the IAT or the ASI. One person submitted the ASI twice, and could not be used since the IAT was missing.

Of the remaining 23 participants, 6 were male, and 17 were female. Five of the males were between the ages of 18-24, and one was between 25-34. As for the females, eleven were between 18-24 and six were between 25-34. All the participants answered the background questions about their age, gender, education, etc. With this being said, almost all of the participants answered the questionnaire, and it was not exclusively used in this study. It was found that the data collected from the background questionnaire did not help understand the fsQCA results. Instead, these results made it harder to analyze the results. With this being said, the age and gender of the participants were used to see whether or not a generalized understanding of the age of someone or their gender could have impacted how they perceived the women in the scenarios.

It was determined that their level of education, program, year of their current enrolment, time spent in university, political position, or socioeconomic status were not used to analyze the results. Furthermore, they were deemed less necessary to the analysis since they did not explicitly relate to the utilized theoretical framework.

To ensure that the consent form and the data collected were safe, they were kept in a locked cabinet. This cabinet was in a room within the researcher's apartment that could only be accessed with a digital passcode. The researcher was the only person who knew the passcode. This allowed the researcher to protect all hard copies of the empirical material. Furthermore, the electronic documents were password protected on the researcher's laptop. In addition, the data collected and the research materials were copied on a USB stick to ensure that the

information was not lost during the project. The USB stick was password protected and encrypted.

Data Analysis

Fuzzy Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis

Fuzzy Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fsQCA) was used to analyze the data collected. This data analysis strategy was helpful because it allowed the researcher to view patterns of interaction between variables or conditions (Goicolea, Chrisianson, Hurtig, Marchal, Sebastian & Wiklund, 2016; Kane, Lewis, Williams & Kahwati, 2014; Rihoux & Lobe, 2012). Most versions of the QCA, such as crisp sets, are based on dichotomies, where the elements either belong or do not belong to a given set. A set is defined by a set of parameters, to which each condition is either a full member [1] or not [0]. Therefore, each QCA membership means that the combination of conditions can result in an outcome. Whereas Fuzzy Set QCA does not have defined parameters, the numbers used to determine whether a condition is a member are based on a continuum. Therefore, the numbers used are continuous. These memberships can be multiple; there does not have to be only one set of combinations to achieve the desired outcome. There can be multiple, but some combinations can have a stronger correlation to an outcome than others.

fsQCA addresses the possibility that some sets can have partial membership, allowing for a more diverse set of results. Sets are the combinations of the conditions. Therefore, there can be infinite degrees of membership (Dusa, 2019; Kane et al., 2014; Ragin, 2012) due to the vast number of possible partial memberships. Therefore, a numerical degree was set to prevent an infinite number of results for this research, the inclusion score discussed later in this chapter.

Fuzzy set QCA is highly useful because it goes beyond solely using discreet variables such as [0], [1], [2], and so on. fsQCA allows researchers to use continuous variables, which is anything between [0] and [1] (Dusa, 2019; Ragin, 2012). This analysis method allowed the researcher to compare the IAT and ASI results. The numerical results obtained from the IAT and ASI are continuous numbers. Therefore, the fsQCA, the only one that does not use dichotomous variables, was the most useful QCA. It allowed the researcher to achieve accurate results that could be analyzed.

A significant benefit of this type of analysis is identifying multiple connections and pathways that can lead to outcomes (Goicolea et al., 2016; Kane et al., 2014). In other words, the variables are not just one or the other but can be placed on a continuum. This is because the data set being studied for this research is not discrete but rather an interval-level data set (Dusa, 2019). The variables used are not 'yes' or 'no' categories. These variables are a person's level of gender bias. Biases are not dichotomous; they are on a vast spectrum. One person can be highly biased in one situation and less in another. For this research, the level of bias was determined using two tests that place a person's bias on a spectrum, not into binary categories. The variables used are more than just a 'yes' or 'no' on whether or not the participant has gendered bias. It goes beyond that and delves into their level of bias because everyone has biases; it depends on where one falls on the spectrum.

All forms of QCA are helpful in analyzing small to a medium number of cases (Goicolea et al., 2016; Kane et al., 2014; Rihoux & Lobe, 2012). Sample sizes taken for research using QCA are from a larger population; therefore, the results are considered sample-specific (Dusa, 2019). QCA is designed for small to intermediate sample sizes because it was meant to use data that

can be both quantitative and qualitative (Kane et al., 2014). In addition, since QCA can be used in relation to quantitative methods, a small to medium sample size is necessary to obtain an in-depth final analysis of the QCA results (Kane et al., 2014). In other words, the researcher must be able to know the cases on a more intimate level to analyze the meaning of the QCA data and quantitative data. Therefore, the QCA allows the researcher to have a closer look at each case at an individual level and what it means at a group level. As seen in the results and discussion section, the QCA found both interesting results at the individual and group level.

Generally, fsQCA can utilize qualitative and quantitative data (Berg-Schlosser, DeMeur, Rihoux & Ragin, 2012; Blatter, 2017; Kane et al., 2014). For this research, the data used for the fsQCA was solely quantitative. The qualitative data collected from the participants, used anecdotal information to support the results of the fsQCA.

First, the data obtained from the IAT placed the participant in a particular gender bias category. This category was not useful for the fsQCA since it was not numerical. Therefore, the researcher had to transfer these categories into a numerical value in the fsQCA. Following this, the ASI gave the respondents two scores, indicating their benevolent sexism and hostile sexism level. Both the IAT and ASI scores were quantitative data. The qualitative data was obtained through open-ended questions where participants were allowed to describe their thought processes and understanding of the vignettes.

Typically, all forms of the QCA use a Truth Table. The fsQCA is not specifically suited for a Truth Table. However, in this case, it was still utilized to visually understand why some cases were deemed to have a sufficient inclusion/consistency score (Dusa, 2019; Ragin, 2012). A Truth Table is used to visualize and summarize the 'vector space,' a multidimensional space

where a multitude of possibilities between variables can occur (Rubinson, 2019). The researcher selects an 'outcome' in the case of this research, and it is either harsh or lenient judgements that the researcher wants to investigate. In addition, two or more conditions are also chosen that will either be necessary or sufficient for the outcome to occur (Kent, 2008). For this research, the conditions chosen were Implicit bias, benevolent bias and hostile bias. The rows within the Truth Table are used to demonstrate a possible combination within the vector space. The Truth Table is used to determine which combination of conditions or configurations "are sufficient to produce the outcome under investigation" (Rubinson, 2019:6). A configuration is the combination of conditions that explain the desired outcome. A Truth Table can be straightforward. It only shows one possible combination of conditions for the outcome, or it can be more complicated to show multiple possibilities to achieve a given outcome. It should also be noted that the observations within the Truth Table are mutually exclusive and can only be part of one row in the truth table (Rubinson, 2019). This means that the participants within this study will only be found once in the Truth Table associated with each vignette.

A truth table also incorporates all the required information about each configuration, such as consistency scores, which is critical in fsQCA. The consistency score measures the subset relationship between conditions leading to an outcome (Poveda & Martinez, 2013). Therefore, consistency scores will determine the degree of membership strength. This score will determine the cutoff value "for determining which causal combinations pass fuzzy set-theoretic consistency and which do not" (Ragin, 2012:20). A consistency score is a number between [0] and [1] (Poveda & Martinez, 2013). The closer to [1], the stronger the relationship.

This is for each value that is part of the QCA calculation. For this research, the consistency score determined for this project was 0.85.

An inclusion score is the cutoff point to which a configuration will be deemed a [1] or [0] outcome (Ragin, 2012). There are also times when the output may not be flagged with a [1] or [0] but rather a C. This occurs when the cases associated with a Particular configuration do not meet either cutoff for inclusion or exclusion into an outcome. That is to say that the fsQCA determined that there is not enough evidence to designate a [1] or a [0] (Dusa, 2019). Generally, this means that the C does not meet the inclusion score or the exclusion score. The inclusion score is 0.85, and the exclusion score is 0.75 unless otherwise specified by the researcher. For this research, the inclusion score was determined to be 0.85, and the exclusion score was determined as 0.75. Inclusion means that 80% of the cases in a specific configuration have the outcome of interest (Dusa, 2019). The exclusion means that less than 75% of the cases in a configuration have the desired outcome. Anything between the inclusion and exclusion scores is ambiguous because they do not have enough cases that meet either criterion. Looking at these configurations will be of interest in analyzing the other conclusive outcomes.

The outcomes can be positive, [1], or negative, [0]. The fsQCA does the same calculations for both the positive and negative outcomes to obtain the OUT score [0] or [1]. The OUT is given a C when the positive and negative outcomes are below 0.85 (Dusa, 2019). This means that the fsQCA has determined not enough evidence for either a positive or negative outcome. This research's positive and negative outcomes are for harsh and lenient judgements. When this happens, it is crucial to take a close look at the Truth Table to see if there are possibilities that some outcomes may have a necessary condition. These conditions are needed

for the searched outcome (Dusa, 2019; Ragin, 2012). These outputs did not have a [1] because they did not meet the desired consistency score but fell very close under it. There are quite a few of these that have been determined to be of interest. They are discussed in more detail in the Results section of this paper.

PRI stands for Proportional Reduction in Inconsistency and is only relevant to fsQCA (Dusa, 2019). When the fsQCA software determines simultaneous subset relations for an OUTPUT and is unsure whether the combination is sufficient [1], the PRI is used to determine the consistency score (Dusa, 2019). This means that the fsQCA software is unsure whether the outcome is closely related to the presence or absence of the desired outcome. This could be due to the Inclusion score being slightly below 0.75 or between 0.75 and 0.85. The PRI score will help decide whether the output will be a [0], C, or [1]. The PRI determines which subset relation, presence or absence of the outcome, has the highest consistency score. Sometimes, the scores are close enough that the PRI cannot determine which consistency score is more important, and therefore the output is determined as C (Dusa, 2019). The PRI value should be clearly above 0.50 and close to the desired Incl value for a stronger consistency between the conditions and the outcome. The lower the PRI score, the more inconsistency between the outcome values (Dusa, 2019). This requires the researcher to look at the Truth Table, and the theories used to explain this outcome.

Boolean algebra or logic is the mathematics used to determine the configurations that lead to the desired outcome. This is not a statistical type of logic. This logic assumes that there are multiple ways to achieve the desired outcome, different from standard quantitative methods that only look for the strongest association between the conditions and an outcome

(Dusa, 2019). Three types of Boolean algebra are used to determine whether a configuration meets the desired outcome. The first one is 'OR.' This means that any conditions can be present to arrive at the outcome (Dusa, 2019). For example, the desired audience for a presentation is people who like hockey, baseball, soccer, or football. This means that anyone who likes these sports will be part of the desired outcome. The second is 'AND,' which means that all conditions are necessary to arrive at the outcome (Dusa, 2019). This means that the desired audience, for example, are people who like hockey and baseball and soccer and football. This means that people who like all the sports are part of the outcome. Finally, 'NOT' means that one or more specific conditions are unnecessary for the outcome to occur (Dusa, 2019). This means, for example, that the targeted people for a rated R movie are people above the ages of 18 and not those 17 and below. This means that people who are 17 and under are not part of the outcome.

Following the Truth Table is the logical minimization process introduced for the fsQCA (Dusa, 2019). The goal of logical minimization is to find the simplest expression of an association between the chosen conditions explaining the output. The minimization process eliminates the configurations within the Truth Table that do not have the [1] outcome. In other words, minimization looks for a generalized statement that explains the outcome and is consistent with the data. An initial expression is the configuration of the conditions that have a [1] outcome, and there could be multiple expressions that lead to [1]. The final expression of the minimization process will consist of a causal configuration, which are the conditions needed for the outcome to occur. Therefore, to reiterate, the simplest expression starts from the initial configurations, in which the ones with a [0] or C outcome are removed until it is only the [1] that remains.

The minimization table has a similar criterion as the Truth Table, including the inclS, PRI, covS, and covU. The first criterion that appears on the minimization table is InclS. This is similar to the inclusion score found in the Truth Tables, as defined earlier in this section. The inclS is the inclusion score that is specific to the minimization table. If only one configuration has the desired outcome and all the conditions are required, then the InclS will be the same as the one in the Truth Table. If a condition is removed during the minimization process, the InclS will change to reflect the new solution. The same goes for the PRI in the minimization table. If multiple configurations lead to the outcome, the minimization process will generate the necessary inclS and PRI for each possible minimization.

The covS refers to the raw coverage, that is, the coverage for sufficiency. This measures the OUT that could be explained by the condition (the minimization) (Dusa, 2019). This means that the covS is sufficient to demonstrate how much the set can explain the outcome.

In contrast, covU is used to determine the unique coverage score. This score indicated demonstrates “how much of that explanation can be uniquely attributed to that set, and to no other” (Dusa, 2019:146). The sufficient coverage demonstrates the complete coverage of a given set, and the unique coverage will only indicate what is uniquely covered by that set. For example, covS can overlap with other sets and cover its portion for the outcome. CovU is used to eliminate the overlapping coverage between the chosen set and other sets.

Chapter Four - Results

Criteria for the QCA

The fuzzy set QCA (fsQCA) was utilized for this research paper. The inclusion [1] for the Truth Table cut-off was 0.85, and the exclusion [0] was 0.75. As explained in the previous section, these are the inclusion scores for the outcome of interest. Two desired outcomes were calculated with fsQCA. The inclusion and exclusion scores were based on gender bias, and the outcome is based on whether the participant gave a harsh or lenient sentence.' Combinations above 0.85 were assigned a [1], indicating that the configurations are associated with the desired outcome. The combinations below 0.75 were given a [0] because they were determined to be insufficient for the desired outcome. In contrast, cases that held values between 0.85 and 0.75 were considered "contradictory" (unclear/undetermined) and were labelled [C] in the OUT value. Finally, a minimization procedure was performed using the values from the Truth Table, which determined the most significant configurations for the outcomes in each scenario.

The first column indicates the eight combinations using the three conditions (Dusa, 2019). Unfortunately, not all possible configurations were found within the dataset and were not included in the Truth Tables, hence the missing configuration numbers. The second column is for the IAT score, the third is for the ASI Hostile Calibration score, and the fourth column is for the ASI Benevolent Calibration score. If these columns have a [1], this indicates that the participant obtained a high bias score on these measures. If the columns have a [0], they were determined not to score high enough to meet the inclusion criteria. This criterion is the same for the harsh and lenient gender bias sections below. The column with "n" indicates the number of cases found with each configuration. The final column titled "cases" displays the case numbers that have said combination.

The Truth Tables' harsh and lenient judgment differ in their Truth Tables in the fifth column, the OUT score. This is determined based on the inclusion, and PRI score, which is explained in detail in the previous Chapter under the Fuzzy Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis section.

Results for Harsh Judgement

Scenario 1

The following fsQCA results are associated with the first vignette described in the Methods section and found in Appendix 5.

Truth Table

OUT: output value

n: number of cases in configuration

incl: sufficiency inclusion score

PRI: proportional reduction in inconsistency

Table 1. Associations between Conditions and a Harsh Judgement for Scenario 1

	IAT	ASI.Host.Cal	ASI.Benev.Cal	OUT	n	incl	PRI	cases
5	1	0	0	C	6	0.721	0.482	1,3,7,13,17,21
6	1	0	1	C	2	0.778	0.430	4,11
7	1	1	0	C	1	0.719	0.167	23
8	1	1	1	1	1	0.866	0.681	15
1	0	0	0	0	3	0.687	0.425	6,10,14
2	0	0	1	0	6	0.676	0.489	2,8,9,12,16,18
4	0	1	1	0	4	0.625	0.356	5,19,20,22

Minimization:

M1: IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal -> What.degree.1

		inclS	PRI	covS	covU	cases
1	IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal	0.866	0.681	0.264	-	15
	M1	0.866	0.681	0.264		

As the results demonstrate, there is only one configuration, configuration 8, with a high level of bias on all conditions. The fsQCA minimization has determined that this configuration is the most associated with a more severe judgement for the offender and was given a [1] in the OUT column. In other words, a harsher judgement tends to be associated with a higher level of bias on all levels. Case 15 is the sole participant who has a high level of bias on all conditions and is, therefore, more likely to suggest a harsher sentence for the accused in this scenario. This is supported by the minimization, which has determined that the three conditions are necessary for more severe punishment, as indicated with IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal. If the inclusion score were above a 0.90, the conditions implied by the minimization would be 'necessary conditions.'

The minimization table is interesting because the raw coverage score (covS) is meagre. This means that this specific combination or set can only explain about 0.264 of the outcome, which is 26.4% of cases having the outcome. Therefore, just because an individual has a high score on all three conditions does not necessarily mean they will give a harsh sentence. It just means that they are more likely to do so.

Three configurations were determined to be ambiguous and were given a C in the OUT column. This means that the fsQCA decided that there was insufficient evidence to determine

whether these configurations could be assigned a [1] or [0]. However, if the [C] outcomes are compared to the configuration with a [1], it can be seen that they have a similarity. That is that they all have a high IAT score. This means that though having a high score in all three conditions can lead to a more severe judgement, the IAT appears to be a condition that may be needed for a stricter judgement. It should still be noted that configuration 8 has an inclusion score of about 0.87. It suggests that this configuration is almost necessary for a severe outcome, but not quite. This means that there is possible, but unlikely, that a harsh judgement may be associated with some other configuration, such as one of the C outcomes. This is where the similarity between the three C outcomes and configuration 8 is important. If a high IAT score is present in this scenario, it is more likely that a harsher sentence will follow.

Scenario 2

The following QCA results are derived from the participants' answers regarding vignette 2 (Appendix 6).

Truth Table:

OUT: output value

n: number of cases in configuration

incl: sufficiency inclusion score

PRI: proportional reduction in inconsistency

Table 2. Associations between Conditions and a Harsh Judgement for Scenario 2

	IAT	ASI.Host.Cal	ASI.Benev.Cal	OUT	n	incl	PRI	Cases
1	0	0	0	0	3	0.170	0.170	6,10,14
2	0	0	1	0	6	0.234	0.203	2,8,9,12,16,18
4	0	1	1	0	4	0.137	0.091	5,19,20,22
5	1	0	0	0	6	0.417	0.417	1,3,7,13,17,21
6	1	0	1	0	2	0.220	0.168	4,11
7	1	1	0	0	1	0.179	0.179	23
8	1	1	1	0	1	0.328	0.274	15

Minimization:

N/A

The truth table reveals that all outcome values have been coded to [0] for this scenario. The findings suggest that none of the configurations can account for more severe judgments

because the inclusion scores for each configuration are significantly low. In addition, there is no minimization table because the fsQCA could not determine what conditions were needed for the desired outcome. These results do not necessarily mean that these participants did not judge the accused severely; they suggest that the association between the chosen conditions and the desired outcome is characterized by ambiguity. No clear pattern of association can be discerned. These outcomes will be explained in the analysis section (Chapter Five).

Scenario 3

The results of scenario three are derived from the answers given to vignette 3 (Appendix 7).

Truth Table:

OUT: output value

n: number of cases in configuration

incl: sufficiency inclusion score

PRI: proportional reduction in inconsistency

Table 3. Associations between Conditions and a Harsh Judgement for Scenario 3

	IAT	ASI.Host.Cal	ASI.Benev.Cal	OUT	n	incl	PRI	Cases
1	0	0	0	0	3	0.127	0.027	6,10,14
2	0	0	1	0	6	0.097	0.020	2,8,9,12,16,18
4	0	1	1	0	4	0.156	0.059	5,19,20,22
5	1	0	0	0	6	0.044	0.000	1,3,7,16,17,21
6	1	0	1	0	2	0.242	0.135	4,11
7	1	1	0	0	1	0.000	0.000	23
8	1	1	1	0	1	0.155	0.007	15

Minimization:

N/A

All outcome values have been coded to [0]. Therefore, none of the configurations could account for the desired outcome of more severe judgements for this scenario. Consequently,

there is no minimization table to indicate what conditions may be needed for a harsher sentence. As mentioned above in scenario two, several reasons could explain this, which will be discussed in the next Chapter.

Scenario 4

The results for this QCA scenario are derived from the answers given for vignette 4 (Appendix 8).

Truth Table:

OUT: output value

n: number of cases in configuration

incl: sufficiency inclusion score

PRI: proportional reduction in inconsistency

Table 4. Associations between Conditions and a Harsh Judgement for Scenario 4

	IAT	ASI.Host.Cal	ASI.Benev.Cal	OUT	N	incl	PRI	Cases
2	0	0	1	C	6	0.660	0.508	2,8,9,12,16,18
4	0	1	1	C	4	0.721	0.475	5,19,20,22
5	1	0	0	C	6	0.671	0.541	1,3,7,16,17,21
6	1	0	1	C	2	0.723	0.541	4,11
8	1	1	1	1	1	0.797	0.590	15
1	0	0	0	0	3	0.591	0.413	6,10,14
7	1	1	0	0	1	0.302	0.143	23

Minimization:

M1: IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal -> What.degree.4

		inclS	PRI	covS	covU	cases
1	IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal	0.797	0.590	0.232	-	15
	M1	0.797	0.590	0.232		

This Truth Table and the minimization table are the same as the first scenario, in the sense that configuration 8 is determined to have sufficient evidence to be designated an [1] OUT. This combination has a high bias for all three conditions. This indicates a relatively high chance of an individual having a harsher judgement if they have a high bias score on all conditions.

Although the minimization's inclusion score is below the predetermined 0.85, the PRI determines that this combination is strong enough to warrant an [1] OUT score. The PRI is above 0.50 but still decently far from the inclusion score. The fsQCA determined the configuration to be significant enough to warrant a [1] output but is highly inconsistent. The inclusion score is about 0.80. This means that the combination of these conditions is more likely to lead to a more harsh judgment, but the inclusion score is not high enough. The PRI score is relatively low; therefore, this configuration cannot be considered necessary. The minimization table also indicates that this combination can explain 23.2% of severe judgment instances in this sample.

The combinations 2, 4, 5, and 6 are found not to have sufficient evidence to be included or excluded and labelled ambiguous. However, it should be noted that three of the [C] configurations have ASI.Benev.Cal, as does case 15. This seems to suggest that if the participant

has a high ASI.Benev.Cal score, they are more likely to have a harsher judgement. This can be further supported because the two [0] outcomes do not have a high ASI.Benev.Cal score. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that while a higher level of explicit benevolent bias increases the likelihood of harsher judgment in this scenario, it is a reasonably non-specific factor and is neither necessary nor sufficient to account for in this scenario.

Results for Lenient Judgement

Scenario 1

The results for this QCA scenario are derived from the answers given for vignette 1 (Appendix 5).

Truth Table:

OUT: output value

n: number of cases in configuration

incl: sufficiency inclusion score

PRI: proportional reduction in inconsistency

Table 5. Associations between Conditions and a Lenient Judgement for Scenario 1

	IAT	ASI.Host.Cal	ASI.Benev.Cal	OUT	n	incl	PRI	Cases
1	0	0	0	C	3	0.769	0.575	6,10,14
4	0	1	1	C	4	0.787	0.634	5,19,20,22
5	1	0	0	C	6	0.740	0.518	1,3,7,13,17,21
8	1	1	1	C	1	0.713	0.319	15
6	1	0	1	1	2	0.832	0.570	4,11
7	1	1	0	1	1	0.944	0.833	23
2	0	0	1	0	6	0.690	0.511	2,8,9,12,16,18

Minimization:

M1: ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal + IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal
-> ~What.degree.1

		inclS	PRI	covS	covU	cases
1	ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal	0.959	0.905	0.251	0.143	23
2	IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal	0.832	0.570	0.281	0.173	4,11
	M1	0.879	0.731	0.424		

According to the Truth Table, two combinations appear relevant in determining if participants would hold a more lenient judgment: configurations 6 and 7. Configuration 6 is of interest because its inclusion score is 0.832. It is slightly below the 0.85 cutoff value but still accounts for a quarter of the less severe judgment participants. The PRI for this configuration is 0.57, above the 0.50 threshold, but is still very far from the inclusion score, leading to a more inconsistent configuration. Configuration 7's inclusion score is 0.944, which is very high. This would indicate that this configuration is more specific, leading to a less severe judgment. The PRI score is also very high and close to the inclusion score. This means that it is very consistent. Configuration 7 appears to be necessary to reach the desired outcome of a lenient judgment. This means that if a person has all three conditions, there is a very high probability of giving a lenient judgment in this scenario. In addition, something the two combinations have in common is a high bias score on their IAT. This could indicate that having a high IAT could lead to a less harsh judgment but is not necessary.

The Truth Table indicates that the IAT is of interest but not necessary. Whereas, in the minimization table, it appears as though there are two forms of simplified configurations that have a possibility of leading to a lenient judgement. The first is configuration 7, with a high

inclusions core of 0.96. This is higher than the Truth Table, solidifying the idea that this simplified configuration is more likely necessary. Furthermore, this is increased with the PRI being above 0.90, meaning that there is little inconsistency in this simplified configuration. According to the minimization of configuration 7, the IAT would not be considered a necessary condition for a lenient outcome since it was removed entirely from the configuration in this scenario. Whereas configuration 6 has the same inclusion score and PRI, meaning that it is of interest because the minimization was unable to simplify the configuration.

Something of interest found within the minimization table is that when one of the explicit bias scores, either the hostile or benevolent bias, is high, the other is low. The minimization table indicates that the covS for both configurations accounts for 0.42 or 42% of the cases of less severe judgment cases. Higher IAT is present for both configurations but is not considered a necessary condition in explaining less severe judgement. Whereas having a high score on one of the explicit biases appears to be more associated with a less severe judgement.

Scenario 2

The results for this QCA scenario are derived from the answers given for vignette 2 (Appendix 6).

Truth Table:

OUT: output value

n: number of cases in configuration

incl: sufficiency inclusion score

PRI: proportional reduction in inconsistency

Table 6. Associations between Conditions and a Lenient Judgement for Scenario 2

	IAT	ASI.Host.Cal	ASI.Benev.Cal	OUT	n	incl	PRI	Cases
8	1	1	1	C	1	0.746	0.726	15
1	0	0	0	1	3	0.830	0.830	6,10,14
2	0	0	1	1	6	0.805	0.797	2,8,9,12,16,18
4	0	1	1	1	4	0.914	0.909	5,19,20,22
6	1	0	1	1	2	0.842	0.832	4,11
7	1	1	0	1	1	0.821	0.821	23
5	1	0	0	0	6	0.583	0.583	1,3,7,13,17,21

Minimization:

```
M1: ~IAT + ~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal + ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal
  -> ~What.degree.2
                                    inclS     PRI      covS      covU
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1                              ~IAT  0.808   0.804    0.618     0.282
2  ~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal       0.801   0.788    0.388     0.075
3  ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal       0.889   0.889    0.164     0.033
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                                M1    0.812   0.806    0.735

                                    cases
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1                              ~IAT  6,10,14; 2,8,9,12,16,18; 5,19,20,22
2  ~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal       2,8,9,12,16,18; 4,11
3  ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal       23
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

This is a much more complex solution, and several configurations appear to account for the outcome. According to the minimization table, it would appear that the absence of implicit bias (IAT) would lead to a less severe judgment. Thus, for this scenario, a low level or absence of implicit bias could be considered a near-sufficient condition to lead to a less severe judgement. An examination of the covU in the minimization table for row one of the absence of IAT suggests that it uniquely explains 28% of cases of less severe judgment. In addition, it has good specificity, the PRI and Inclusion values being almost equivalent.

According to the Truth Table, configuration 4 has the highest possibility of being a necessary configuration leading to the desired outcome. The inclusion score is 0.91, and the PRI score is 0.90. This means that if a person has a combination of these conditions, they are more likely to indicate a less severe judgement. In contrast, this configuration is simplified to just the

absence of the IAT in the minimization table, and the inclusion and PRI score is lowered. This indicates that the original configuration for number 4 is unnecessary as initially thought.

In the minimization table, it appears as though the configuration closest to being considered a necessary configuration is 7. The inclusion score is just under 0.90, sitting at 0.89. It has increased from its original 0.82 in the Truth Table. The PRI has also increased in the minimization table. Something of interest is that the inclusion score and the PRI score are the same. This means that there is little to no inconsistency in this configuration. It is not quite a necessary configuration, but if someone had this minimization configuration of a high and a low explicit bias, there is a high likelihood that they would have a less severe judgement in this scenario.

The other component of the retained model involves, as in the previous scenario, an antagonism between the two forms of explicit bias. When one of the explicit biases is high, and the other is low, the probability of having a lesser sentence tends to be higher, regardless of the value of the implicit bias. However, this discrepancy between types of explicit bias is relatively non-specific because it accounts for only a small percentage of cases with less severe sentences.

Scenario 3

The results for this QCA scenario are derived from the answers given for vignette 3 (Appendix 7).

Truth Table:

OUT: output value

n: number of cases in configuration

incl: sufficiency inclusion score

PRI: proportional reduction in inconsistency

Table 7. Associations between Conditions and a Lenient Judgement for Scenario 3

	IAT	ASI.Host.Cal	ASI.Benev.Cal	OUT	n	incl	PRI	Cases
1	0	0	0	1	3	0.975	0.973	6,10,14
2	0	0	1	1	6	0.981	0.980	2,8,9,12,16,18
4	0	1	1	1	4	0.947	0.941	5,19,20,22
5	1	0	0	1	6	1.000	1.000	1,3,7,13,17,21
6	1	0	1	1	2	0.881	0.865	4,11
7	1	1	0	1	1	1.000	1.000	23
8	1	1	1	1	1	0.993	0.993	15

Minimization:

M1: ~IAT + ASI.Host.Cal + ~ASI.Benev.Cal -> ~What.degree.3

		inclS	PRI	covS	covU	cases
1	~IAT	0.942	0.939	0.583	0.182	6,10,14; 2,8,9,12,16,18; 5,19,20,22
2	ASI.Host.Cal	0.950	0.944	0.359	0.067	5,19,20,22; 23; 15
3	~ASI.Benev.Cal	0.951	0.948	0.451	0.152	6,10,14; 1,3,7,13,17,21; 23
	M1	0.946	0.943	0.854		

Once again, this fsQCA offers a complex solution. It involves all three indicators. What is of note is that all three conditions are considered significant when they are found by themselves (not in combination). In fact, according to the minimization table, all indicators meet the sufficient inclusion score to lead to a less severe judgment. Therefore, this solution allows for a better view between cases with more and less harsh sentences. The first row of the minimization table indicates that the absence of implicit bias (IAT) can be a contributing factor to a lenient judgement. The inclusion score for this row is very high at 0.942, indicating that this condition is almost a necessary condition for the desired outcome. The raw coverage score (covS) is 0.583, and the unique coverage score (covU) is 0.182. This indicates that the absence of IAT explains 58.3% (covS) of the outcome, where 18.2% pertains uniquely to this configuration.

The second configuration, involving a high explicit bias (ASI.Host.Cal), has a high inclusion score of 0.950. This indicates that a high explicit hostile bias has a high potential to lead to a more lenient judgement. The raw coverage that can explain this outcome is 0.359. Out of this raw coverage, 0.067 is a unique explanation. This could be because only three of the

conditions featured in the Truth Table have a [1] for the ASI.Host.Cal condition, therefore leading to a decreased sensitivity for this configuration.

The final solution in the minimization table indicates that the absence of explicit benevolent bias (ASI.Benev.Cal) is related to a less severe judgement. The inclusion score, similar to the last two rows, is very high at 0.951. This indicates that a low explicit benevolent score is related to the participant's more lenient judgment. The raw coverage (covS) explains 0.451 of the less severe judgement. At the same time, 0.152 (covU) is the unique coverage of the absence of explicit benevolent bias.

Together, these configurations account for most (85%) of cases with a less severe sentence. Moreover, there is minimal overlap with cases showing harsher sentences, implying that these configurations strongly relate to milder and not harsher sentences.

Scenario 4

The results for this QCA scenario are derived from the answers given for vignette 4 (Appendix 8).

Truth Table:

OUT: output value

n: number of cases in configuration

incl: sufficiency inclusion score

PRI: proportional reduction in inconsistency

Table 8. Associations between Conditions and a Lenient Judgement for Scenario 4

	IAT	ASI.Host.Cal	ASI.Benev.Cal	OUT	n	Incl	PRI	Cases
1	0	0	0	C	3	0.712	0.587	6,10,14
4	0	1	1	C	4	0.742	0.514	5,19,20,22
8	1	1	1	C	1	0.707	0.410	15
7	1	1	0	1	1	0.934	0.857	23
2	0	0	1	0	6	0.649	0.492	2,8,9,12,16,18
5	1	0	0	0	6	0.613	0.459	1,3,7,13,17,21
6	1	0	1	0	2	0.674	0.459	4,11

Minimization:

M1: ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal -> ~What.degree.4

		inclS	PRI	covS	covU	cases
1	ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal	0.933	0.847	0.255	-	23
	M1	0.933	0.847	0.255		

The solution for this scenario only has one configuration, which is determined to relate to less severe judgement, and that is configuration 7. According to the minimization table, the IAT has not been considered a reliable factor concerning less severe judgements for this scenario, which is why it was removed from the final solution. However, the minimization solution has determined that high explicit hostile bias (ASI.Host.Cal) and low explicit benevolent bias (ASI.Benev.Cal) relate more to less severe judgements. The inclusion score is 0.933, which suggests a strong association with the outcome (less severe judgement). The raw coverage explains 0.255 of the outcome. There is no unique coverage score because only one configuration is determined to be of significance.

Three combinations were determined to be ambiguous and given a [C]. These configurations each have one of the two conditions determined to be significant for the less severe outcome. That is that configurations 4 and 8 both have the inclusion of the ASI.Host.Cal indicator, but do not have the absence of the ASI.Benev.Cal. Whereas configuration 1 has the absence of the ASI.Benev.Cal condition, as suggested by the minimization solution. However, it is missing the inclusion of the ASI.Host.Cal condition. These configurations were considered not to have enough evidence to determine a [1] or [0] outcome, unlike configurations 5 and 6, which have none of the required conditions to relate to a less severe outcome. Thus, the three

[C] combinations possess some, but not all, of the needed conditions to demonstrate a sufficiently strong and specific association with the outcome.

It should be noted that the reason the configurations are never the same in any of the 8 tables or the reason that they do not follow numerically is because they present the ambiguous (C) configurations first, followed by the [1] outcomes and finishing with the excluded outcomes [0]. This allows the researcher to compare the ambiguous and positive outcomes in the following analysis chapter.

Chapter Five - Analysis

Scenario 1 (Table 1)

This scenario refers to Appendix 5 regarding the mother accused of murdering one of her daughters and neglecting the second. Configuration 8 (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal) was the only one determined by the fsQCA to be the most clearly associated with a harsh judgement. It should be noted that configurations 5 (IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal), 6 (IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal), and 7 (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal) were deemed ambiguous but can also explain to an extent what may be necessary for a harsh judgement. As mentioned in Chapter Four, all four combinations have a high implicit gender bias score (IAT). Therefore, it was determined that a high IAT was not a 'necessary condition' to have a harsh judgment. However, a high IAT is needed to have a higher probability of the participant having a severe judgment. Therefore, the minimization for table 3 determined that all three conditions were needed to have a higher probability of a severe judgment.

Interestingly, out of the outcomes determined either to be significant or ambiguous, eight of these participants were female, and two were male. As will be explained later in this section, the males reserved harsher judgements towards the mother and were more lenient towards the father. This indicates, to some level, that the two identified male participants held harsher judgements towards the accused. Thus, for this scenario, it appears as though being male is more likely to be associated with a harsher judgement. Another interesting finding is that the two males determined to be of interest were placed in the same configuration: configuration 6 (IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal). This means that they both had the same combination of conditions, high implicit gender bias and a high level of benevolent gender bias. Hence, their explicit bias emphasizes stereotypical beliefs about women and men's roles in

society that are subjectively perceived as ‘positive’ (Bem, 1972; Fazio, 1990; Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 2011).

Something found within these two male participants' qualitative statements is that they both indicated that none of their “personal outside [experiences] impacted [their] decision.” Therefore, these two individuals believe that their perceptions of the woman in this situation are ‘normal’ and that their perceptions, understandings, or beliefs are common knowledge (Norris, 2015:124; Tversky & Kahneman, 1973; Kelman, 2013). In contrast, the eight female participants indicated that their education, religion, and childhood trauma were reasons for their understanding of the situation. In addition, they were more open about their biases regarding this scenario than the male participants.

Another interesting difference between the male and female participants was the fact that the males explained that the mother in this situation was “negligent toward her daughters” and “that [the mother] purposely favoured [the son],” but only indicated that the father was ‘somewhat responsible’ for the situation. In comparison, the female participants showed similar thoughts regarding the mother and blamed the father. They indicated that “he must have been aware of the neglect, which makes him complicit in the harm caused to the children,” and “he failed to take any action.” Thus, the females could evenly distribute the blame to both parents, whereas the male participants blamed the mother over the husband.

As previously mentioned, the two male participants in configuration 6 (IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal) have a high benevolent bias score. This means they are less direct with their gender biases towards women and men. Their statements are generally perceived as more ‘acceptable’ because they are not outright negative, such as hostile gender

bias (Glick & Fiske,1996; Glick & Fiske, 2011). Instead, it is more indirect, such as when they expressed that their personal experiences do not influence them and place less blame on the husband. In this sense, it appears that the mother in this situation is more responsible for the children than the father. This is a general representation of the socialized belief that women are associated more as caretakers and loving (Fazio, 1990; Foster, 1993). In contrast, fathers are generally associated with a secondary caretaker role and tend to have more lenience regarding the care of the children.

In contrast, the female participants deemed ambiguous by the fsQCA could identify what biases they may already hold when viewing this scenario. They could determine that they were coming into this with a particular lens that shaped how they perceived the parents in this situation. Based on their explanations regarding the mother and the father, it appears that they may facilitate implicit bias towards both genders. In other words, the mother and father were both viewed as having parental roles and as caregivers. Most of these female participants indicated that the father lived with children and knew what was occurring to the daughters. Participant 21, who was part of configuration 5 (IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal), took this argument a bit further and indicated that the father "is also their parent and has the same responsibilities to meet [the daughters] needs." These participants held stereotypical beliefs about being a 'good mother' (Fazio, 1990; Foster, 1993). Still, they also went as far as to brand the father as an 'accomplice' to these crimes and indicated that he too had a significant responsibility to take these children.

Case 15, under configuration 8 (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal), was a lot harsher than other participants towards the mother in this scenario. Case 15, who is female, indicated that

the mother “clearly committed a hate crime.” Based on the phrasing of this statement, the participant holds a lot of anger toward the mother for what occurred to the daughters in this situation. Instead of talking about responsibilities or neglect, as in the other ambiguous cases, she directly indicates that the mother purposefully committed a hate crime against her daughters. Though this participant does suggest that the father played his role in the event leading to the death, she is not as harsh in her wording towards the husband. Coupled with her high bias levels on all three conditions, this could indicate that this participant has a lot of internalized gender bias that she expresses in both benevolent and hostile comments about the mother (Kovera & Borgida, 2010:1343; Rudman & Ashmore, 2007:368).

The implicit bias is found because she has a high IAT score but is emphasized with the benevolent and hostile commentary. The participant used benevolent comments such as “responsibility to provide for her children, she had everything to do so, and she failed at it.” The participant used the term ‘responsibility’ about the accused being a mother. This was followed by emphasizing that this woman had all the ‘means’ necessary to take care of all her children and ‘failed.’ This description places the central portion of the blame on the mother for the death of one daughter and the second's neglect. This could be a gender bias based on a gender stereotype related to the traditional view of women being the primary caretakers of children in a heterosexual household (Foster, 1993; MacGillivray, 2014). This can be perceived as a general stereotype that society holds as common knowledge (Chryssides, 2008; Cohrs, Ulug, Stahel & Kishoglu, 2015; Morant & Edwards, 2011). This participant has utilized the ‘bad mother’ social representation to describe and account for a woman’s conduct towards her children (Dunham,

Baron & Banaji, 2016). In comparison, she did indicate that the father was responsible for the children, indicating a more benevolent stereotype associated with women.

In addition to this, the term 'failed' would indicate that the accused was unsuccessful at being a mother, where she did not live up to the gender stereotype of being a 'good mother.' In addition to this, the participant indicates that "she clearly knew what she was doing." Once again, this relates to gender stereotypes and norms. Ultimately, this leads to the participant separating herself from this woman (Riketta, 2005:97). This is a conflict between the participant's perception of how women are meant to behave and how the accused acted. Therefore, the participant relied on stereotypical social representations and removed the accused from her ingroup, creating an intergroup conflict (Cohrs, Ulug, Stahel & Kishogly, 2015:33). It appears as though she views this mother as an 'other' by describing her with undesirable traits and characteristics. Case 15 is describing the stereotypical depiction of a 'bad mother.' The participant does try to explain that "nothing impacted [her] decision" and that she "was neutral in [reviewing] this situation." Hence, she removes any blame associated with her personal bias and her biased-decision making.

For hostile comments toward the mother, she used the term 'hate crime' to describe the events. She only indicates that he was aware of what was happening and may have participated. There is no attack on him being a 'bad' father. This participant's use of 'hate crime' may exaggerate the events, but it is used to solidify that the mother is the main reason the daughter died. The participant does not use any highly negative terms for the father's role in this scenario. In addition, participant 15 explained that the mother in this vignette has 'intent' "to hurt them deliberately." This participant made it clear that the accused was aware

that what she was doing would hurt her daughters. This can relate to the 'bad mother' heuristic that this participant has been utilizing to severely judge the accused (Foster, 1993:135). How the participant constructs the mother relates to the participant's harsh judgement. The way the victims in this scenario are portrayed as young, innocent, and unable to take care of themselves heightens the participant's negative perception. Thus, the terms utilized in her explanations reflect her internal gender bias.

Overall, the stereotypical view of these participants could all lead to different levels of biased-decision making (Foster, 1993:137; Gabor, 2004:458), both implicit and explicit, that is discriminatory towards the mother in this situation. In this scenario, the two male participants appeared to be unaware of the implicit bias they have and are expressing. With the exception of case 15, the female participants seem to understand that they have gender biases developed from their life experiences and use this in their understanding of the scenario. Whereas case 15 tried to explain that her understanding of the scenario is 'neutral' because she does not consider her gender biases towards the accused. This situation has led her to make more negative comments and decisions regarding the accused (Alexander & Levin, 1998:361; Norris & Franklin, 1997:185; Orthwein, Packman, Jackson & Bongar, 2010:526), which could lead to discriminatory decisions in a trial. This demonstrates that women can hold implicit and explicit gender biases towards other women.

Scenario 1 (Table 5)

Two configurations, 6 (IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal) and 7 (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal), showed a significant association between the chosen conditions and the desired, lenient outcome. Interestingly, cases 4 and 11 fall within the same

configuration, and they are both males. Case 23 is female and is alone in her configuration. She also has a higher inclusion score than the men. More female participants than male participants fell within the ambiguous configurations, but that can be because there were fewer male participants in this study. Gender does not appear to be associated with a lenient outcome.

Both configurations 6 (IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal) and 7 (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal) indicated that the mother "obviously neglected the two daughters." These participants used the term 'neglected' rather than the 'hate crime' compared to case 15, mentioned in scenario 1 in the previous section. These three participants perceived that the daughters were "put at risk [due to] favouritism." They viewed that the mother showed more care towards her son than her daughters. The configurations differ because case 23 had a high explicit hostile score (ASI.Host.Cal), and cases 4 and 11 had a high explicit benevolent score (ASI.Benev.Cal). This could explain their lenient judgement towards the accused but in different ways.

Interestingly, cases 4 and 11 are both males between 18-24. These individuals scored high on the IAT and ASI for benevolent sexism. This means that their gender bias reveals more through subtle, unconscious perceptions than outward sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 2011). These cases indicated that the accused was "negligent toward her daughters" but not the son. Case 11 went so far as to suggest "favouritism" and its negative implications on the daughters.

Interestingly, and noted in the previous section analyzing scenario 1, both male participants place more blame on the mother and less on the father. It appears as though these two male participants perceived the accused in a negative light but negated these statements

by adding that she did not “deliberately planned to kill [her] daughters.” Whereas, when they mention the father in this case, they only indicate that he “also had responsibility over them” but did not explain further.

The dominant social representation of the concepts of motherhood and fatherhood could demonstrate their understanding of the scenario. These concepts are general social representations that benefit the dominant group (Cohrs, Ulug, Stahel & Kishoglu, 2015; Fazio, 1990; Kang, Bennett, Carbado & Casey, 2012; Schnierle, Christian-Brathwaite & Louisisas, 2019). This group is comprised of men who generally control society with social norms and characteristics (Dunham, Baron & Bnaji, 2016). These concepts can be hostile or benevolent towards women, creating the ‘good mother’ image and the associated norms and traits. In this case, the male participants have a high explicit benevolent score (ASI.Benev.Cal), explaining their biased decision-making. They place most of the blame on the mother in congruence with the social representation of the ‘bad mother’ and the internalized understanding of such as construction, but still do not outright state that she is a ‘bad mother.’ They are instead more controlled with their answers.

It is clear to the researcher that the two male participants, in configuration 6 (IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal), place less blame on the father since they solely say he has some ‘responsibility,’ without explicitly stating that he played a role in what is seen as the mother's actions. This demonstrates negative judgment towards the mother while removing some blame from the father. This could be due to the male participants connecting more with the father in this scenario than the mother. They were aware that the father is also to blame by indicating that he has ‘responsibilities’ but reduced his complicity by suggesting that the

mother is negligent towards the daughters. They never mentioned the father being neglectful. In other words, they ascribed the adverse actions to the mother (Riketta,2005) and removing the father from those actions, creating a divide between the parents (Riketta, 2005), which has led them to a more discriminatory explanation of the situation, while remaining overtly lenient with the mother.

In contrast, case 23 perceived the mother more severely in the sense that she said that she "obviously neglected the two daughters [and] it was done on purpose." She was more hostile with her comments about the accused, clearly pointing out how the accused is a 'bad mother' and expressing that she neglected her daughters on purpose. This participant had a high explicit hostile score (ASI.Host.Cal) related to outward gender bias comments (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 2011). Interestingly, though she was harsh towards the accused, she also understood that the father was also to blame for the situation. She indicated that the father "was obviously present […] and did not do anything" to help his daughters. She went beyond saying that the mother is 'bad' and evoked an understanding of a 'bad father.' This understanding allows the participant to place the father in the 'other' category. She goes beyond the existing gender hierarchy for primary caregivers in families (Alexander & Levin, 1998; Crisp, 2008) to include the father, leading to less blame on the mother.

In conclusion, the three cases deemed significant for less severe perception of the accused all invoked that the daughters were neglected, but the configurations explained this point differently and assigned different degrees of blame to different people. The male participants placed most of the blame on the mother, whereas the female participant (case 23) put a little more responsibility on the father in this situation. Even though case 23 was more

direct about the accusations toward the mother, she ultimately related to the mother's position and blamed both the mother and the father. These aspects lead to these cases having a more lenient judgement of the accused.

Scenario 2 (Table 2) and Scenario 3 (Table 3)

Scenario 2 is regarding the woman who took a contract on her husband's life because she felt backed into a corner (Appendix 6). In contrast, Scenario 3 refers to a woman who accidentally killed her husband trying to assault her sexually (Appendix 7). The fsQCA concluded that no configurations were significant, so that available configurations could not account for cases of more severe sentences. This could be due to a couple of reasons. However, since these results were similar, they will be analyzed together since they could have similar explanations for the outcome.

Firstly, the fsQCA potentially could not indicate an association between the conditions and the harsh judgment outcome because the conditions were too specific. This means that the categorization selected by the researcher could have been too precise and may need to be changed to be a broader and, therefore, more inclusive criterion (Dusa, 2019). This could have been done by segmenting the IAT score into two categories instead of one. For example, a category for bias towards men and another for bias towards women. This could have generated significant or near-significant associations more readily. This also would have provided more case material to analyze.

Secondly, the scenarios themselves could have impacted how people perceived the accused. For example, how the women in these scenarios were constructed could have affected how the participants perceived their actions as more acceptable. As a result, they could have

deemed their behaviours as being appropriate to their situations. For scenario 2, the woman was constructed as having an abusive, cheating husband whom she left. He also told her that he would kill her. The accused in this situation also had a child with her abuser. How the woman was perceived with certain social representations, such as a 'good mother' protecting herself and her child, could explain why the results were insignificant, especially since this is in stark contrast to the mother portrayed in the first scenario (Appendix 5). The representation of a 'good mother' protecting her child compared to a mother who did not could have influenced the participants to be more lenient towards the accused in this scenario.

Similarly, for scenario 3 (Appendix 7), the fsQCA determined that no significant configurations led to a more severe judgement of the accused. This could be due to how the woman was portrayed or how the participants perceived the woman in the scenario. In this instance, the participants most likely interpreted the woman as being helplessly stuck in an abusive marriage. It was described that her husband verbally, physically, and sexually assaulted her, and she no longer slept in the same room. The accused was so scared for her life that she kept a knife under her bed to defend herself, though she never used it. The night the husband died, he tried to assault the accused sexually, and he was killed accidentally (Appendix 7). The woman in this scenario was represented as a victim of intimate partner violence, whereas the husband was portrayed as an aggressive abuser. This could have impacted how the participants perceived the victim and the accused, influencing their results, mainly since the previous scenario already portrayed a woman who was scared for her life. This scenario added to this in a more extreme manner, potentially enhancing the understanding that the woman was in danger.

Thirdly, had the inclusion scores been very close to 0.85, but not quite meeting it and not being determined as [C], a concluding thought could have been that the inclusion score was too high (Dusa, 2019). But in both table 4 and table 5, the inclusions scores were close to 0. This means that the inclusion score was not the problem. The combinations simply did not demonstrate an association with a harsh judgement. This, in turn, suggests that greater severity in sentencing in such scenarios may be inherently too complex to account for using the indicators that were used (implicit and explicit bias). This could mean that other indicators were not explored in this research that could have changed the results of the fsQCA and indicated whether some of the participants held harsh judgments. Especially since the background information was not utilized within this research, one of those factors could have changed the results of the fsQCA. It is also interesting to explore the fact that harsh judgements were not found in both scenarios, that the scenarios were extremely different in the fact that the woman in scenario 2 had not faced abuse in months, but the woman in scenario 3 was actively being abused. The researcher would have thought that the participants would have portrayed the women in different lights, but based on the fsQCA results, they were viewed from a lenient perspective.

Scenario 2 (Table 8)

This fsQCA is the most interesting result because almost all of the configurations in this table were associated with a lenient outcome. Only configuration 8 (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal) was considered ambiguous, and configuration 5 (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal) was determined not to associate with the desired outcome.

Gender does not appear to have an association with a lenient outcome since there is a good mixture of male and female participants determined to be more tolerant towards the accused.

Quite a few participants to be of interest indicated that the accused was under duress or had “no other options” in her current situation. The participants were using these explanations as a way to defend the actions of the accused. Duress is also a defence used in court to minimize the gravity of the accused acts, which is what the participants were expressing. Some cases indicated in their statements that “the contract on her husband was the only measure left to assure her safety.” This is because vignette 2 (Appendix 6) mentions that the accused had previously contacted the police and refused to help. At times, when women call the police for help, the police believe that the women are either exaggerating or ‘making up stories’ (Harding & Helweg-Larsen, 2008; Perrin, 2017), which is a form of gender discrimination (Clarke, 2018; Gorman & Prestwich, 2007). Whether or not this occurred, the fact remains that because the police could not help the accused, the participants could have perceived the accused as stuck in a dangerous situation. She was out of options and needed to find another solution to her problem, hence a contract on her husband’s life. This perception of the accused could be related to a high level of explicit benevolent bias. The participants in configurations 2 (~IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal), 4 (~IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal), 6 (IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal), and 8 (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal) seemed to use a simplified understanding of what battered women are faced with in a relationship (Erwin, Gershon Tiburzi & Lin, 2005; Messing, Ward-Lasher, Thaller & Bagwell-Gray, 2015; Meyers, 2010). This is a form of heuristics, which is when a simplified thought process, such as associations with battered women, can be retrieved for a person to understand a situation

(Cervone & Peake, 1986; Saks & Kidd, 1980; Tversky & Kahneman, 1973). This can also be seen as self-preservation and social representations (Fazio, 1990; MacGillivray, 2014). They used the social representation of "battered woman" and related behaviours, such as "[she] was scared of her husband," "she felt trapped," and "she did try to call the police several times," as their explanations for her final solution to her problem. Accordingly, they used this constructed image of a battered woman to justify their lenient judgment of her actions.

In addition, some participants thought it necessary to mention that the accused faced "a history of violence." Using the term 'history of violence' brings forth general heuristics regarding women in those situations. In this case, they are primarily benevolent gender biases. In other words, the participants could view the accused in a positive light as the 'true victim' in this situation and not her husband. The heuristics here pertain to common or cultural knowledge regarding abuse victims (MacGillivray, 2014; Norris, 2015; Saks & Kidd, 1980; Tversky & Kahneman, 1973). This plays a part in social representation as well since this involves using socialized knowledge about a given group of people (Chryssides, 2008; Cohrs, Ulug, Stahel & Kishoglu, 2015; Morant & Edwards, 2011; Wagner, 2016), which in this case are victims of abuse. The cases that mention the history of abuse the accused has endured ultimately remove some of the blame she faces because the idea of her being a genuine victim is put forth.

With this being said, the majority of the participants did not consider that the husband in this situation was not actively seeking his estranged wife. The vignette also states that the separated couple sent a civil email to one another to communicate. The woman had her child, was employed, and lived apart from her husband. It was also stated that the last threat the husband uttered was a month prior. It would appear as though the husband was turly leaving

his wife alone and letting her leave for all intense purposes. This information would indicate that the female did not need to contract someone to kill her husband since he was not actively trying to harm or threaten her. It would appear as though the participants either did not pay attention to this information or concentrated on the abusive past relationship between the couple rather than what was occurring around the time the female chose to have her husband killed.

Following this, the cases who used the term "abuse" to emphasize the trauma the accused was faced with by mentioning that the husband "[put] a gun to the accused's head," "victim killed their dog," and "threatening the accused saying he would kill her if she tried to leave." The construction of the accused as someone who has experienced violence and abuse puts forth the social representation of a woman who set a contract on her husband for her safety because she was in danger. These participants read this vignette and automatically categorized (Ackermann & Mathier, 2015; Chryssides, 2008; Lansu, Cillesseen & Bukowski, 2013) the accused in a specific social representation/heuristic that leads them to identification with group characteristics. This influenced their attitudes and opinions of the accused.

In addition, the participants who had a low level of IAT tended to have a less severe implicit gender bias, leading to a less severe judgement regarding the woman. The biases that did appear tended to be more positive heuristics, helping them understand the overall situation the accused found herself. Such positive heuristics benefited the accused in this situation, casting her in a more appealing light. For example, some of these heuristics included "fear[ing] for her safety/life and that of their child," leading the participants to see the accused as a "good mother protecting her child." This also aligns with the fact that there was an overall lower score

on the hostile sexism scale. At the same time, there was a high score for benevolent sexism, which aligns with more "positively framed" stereotypes. What is meant by this is that sexism would be less easily perceived.

Scenario 3 (Table 7)

The fsQCA determined that all configurations were associated with a less severe outcome. Out of all the configurations, two were deemed entirely associated with a lenient outcome, configurations 7 (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal) and 5 (IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal) for Appendix 7.

The majority of the participants perceived the accused as engaging in "self-defense in the face of a very immediate threat" and was "physically, sexually, and verbally abused throughout their 35-year marriage." These participants used these descriptions of the accused to explain their lenient judgement. This explanation allowed them to perceive the accused as an abuse victim trapped within this relationship with no end in sight, an automatic implicit association (Ackermann & Mathier, 2015; Chryssides, 2008; Lansu, Cillesseen & Bukowski, 2013). The accused squarely fit into the social representation of an abuse victim, which influenced the attitudes and opinions of the participants (Fazio, 1990; MacGillivray, 2014; Norris, 2015; Saks & Kidd, 1980; Tversky & Kahneman, 1973). This ultimately constructed the accused as the victim in this scenario, leading to the participants sympathizing with her and giving her a lenient judgement.

In addition to this, some participants thought it essential to mention that the accused "tried to stop the bleeding before the ambulance got there." This seems to relate to the high implicit association (IAT) score for configurations 4 (~IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal), 7

(IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal), and 8 (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal). In other words, these participants appear to be using their implicit social representation of women in this situation to explain their lenient judgment of the accused. The stereotypes of women being caring and nurturing, even towards an abuser, is a social construction relating to how women are meant to behave (Chryssides, 2008; Cvencek, Greenwald & Meltzoff, 2011; Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 2011; Orthwein, Packman, Jackson & Bongar, 2010). In a sense, these participants took this general construction of women. They associated it with the accused to explain her selflessness in helping her abuser, even though she was in danger. These explanations of the accused actions by the participants relate to a high implicit and explicit association (high IAT) of gendered traits, such as caring and nurturing, with the more lenient outcome.

Scenario 4 (Table 4)

This scenario only determined that configuration 8 (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal) (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal) had enough evidence for a clear association between conditions and outcomes. There was a significant amount of ambiguous conditions specified. This means that these configurations did not have enough evidence to determine whether there was a clear association between the conditions and the outcome. Unlike in the first scenario in the harsh judgment section, including the ambiguous outcomes does not allow the researcher to determine clearly and unambiguously related conditions. In addition to this, the gender of the participant does not seem to be associated with the outcome. Both female and male participants were found with ambiguous outcomes and therefore appeared to impact the accused's perception in this scenario.

The vignette (Appendix 8) associated with scenario 4 indicates that both partners involved were abusive towards one another. Participant 15 reported that "[n]othing proved that she was a victim of abuse." The participant chose to ignore the facts stated within the vignette. It was clearly stated that the accused and the victim were both abusers. The participant can be understood as engaging in "victim-blaming" since she ignored the facts stated in this case (Perrin, 2017), which could in part be related to her high IAT. She removed all factors about abuse, which could explain the woman's violent reaction, and concentrated on the outcome. The victim-blaming is heavily emphasized when the participant says that the accused "didn't try to save herself." In addition to this, the participant stated that if the accused "[were] a victim of abuse, she would've been more emotional and somewhat disturbed from the events […] [instead] she remained calm." The participant chose not to consider the stated facts about both partners being abusive and having faded bruises and abrasions on their bodies. Hence, the participant appeared to rely on prescribed gender norms according to which abused women should leave their abusive partners (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 2011; Perrin, 2017), which, since she is explicitly stating these gender norms, relates to her high hostile and benevolent scores. This is a simplistic understanding of how abuse victims should behave when facing danger. The high explicit hostile and benevolent sexism score (ASI) and a high implicit bias score (IAT) may partly account for her explanations for her severe judgment of the accused.

In addition to this, participant 15 neglected to think of the dangers of leaving an abusive relationship. Instead, she believes it is straightforward to leave an abusive partner when it is one of the most dangerous things a survivor can do. The participant may have made this

statement about leaving or 'lack of proof' to put forth the idea that the accused was not a victim of abuse and that she is only dramatizing what took place in the relationship (DeSteno, Dasgupta, Bartlett & Cajdrie, 2004:319; Greenwald, Banaji, Rudman, Farnham, Nosel & Mellot, 2002:16; Perrin, 2017:168). Again, this relates to the high explicit hostile score mentioned above since the participant is accusing the woman of lying about the situation with her partner. If the accused were 'actually' being abused, she would leave the dangerous situation. This participant does not appear to realize that leaving an abusive relationship is difficult for many reasons, such as financial, emotional, or social.

As mentioned in the results section, the one thing that most of the ambiguous and included configurations have in common is the high score on the ASI.Benev.Cal condition. Configurations 2 (~IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal), 4 (~IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal), and 6 (IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal), excepting case 15 because it has already been analyzed, involve cases who share the fact that they are harsh on the accused but give some leeway. There are a few exceptions where the participants acquit the accused, but they all follow the same logic, and that is that the charged "did not plan out the murder; however, she did deliberately enter the room the victim was in on her accord and reached around her cousin to stab [the victim]." In other words, some of the participants described it as either "being in the heat of the moment" or "she was […] aware of the consequences." Though these participants understood that the accused was aware of the consequences of her actions, they still appeared to suggest a mitigating factor to her actions. This was usually described as her "being in danger" or suffering from "battered women syndrome." Interestingly, they perceive the accused as a victim of abuse but do not entirely acquit her actions. They appear to follow well within the

benevolent sexism scale, where they somewhat express understanding of the accused's situation but do not wholly believe she deserves to be set free (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 2011).

Given these points, case 15, in particular, demonstrates a very harsh judgement regarding the accused, which could be explained by a high level of bias on all the conditions. Participant 15 emphasized trying to debunk the 'victim of abuse' facts found in the description of this scenario (Appendix 8). This demonstrates a clear bias towards this particular woman. By contrast, configurations 2, 4, and 6 included a certain level of discrimination towards these women but are not as explicitly harsh as case 15. This appears to be due to having a high ASI.Benev.Cal score.

Scenario 4 (Table 8)

This fsQCA only generated one potential configuration associated with a more lenient outcome: configuration 7 (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal) observed specifically for case 23. Configurations 1 (~IAT*~ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal), 4 (~IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal), and 8 (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*ASI.Benev.Cal) were flagged as ambiguous, with insufficient evidence to indicate whether or not they could be reliably associated with a more lenient outcome. Interestingly enough, in case 23, the participant is female, but this is not enough to indicate whether gender is associated with a lenient outcome or not. There are two male participants within the ambiguous cases, but it is unclear if there is an association with the desired outcome.

Case 23 mentioned that the accused 'attacked' the victim "in the heat of the moment." This is used as a way to defend the actions of the accused. She also indicated "a history of

violence" with the accused's partner. The participant suggested that the accused may have had a reason to attack her partner. This is an interesting case because the participant had a less severe judgement of the accused but had a high implicit (IAT) and high explicit hostile (ASI.Host.Cal) bias. Theoretically, this should indicate that the participant would perceive the accused more negatively (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 2011).

In contrast, she defended the victim's actions. She constructed the woman as a victim of abuse who attacked her husband in the heat of the moment. This relates to a social representation of a female victim of intimate partner violence. She neglected that the male was also a victim of violence by the accused. She ignored these facts, potentially because males do not tend to fall within the prescribed definition of a victim of abuse (Chryssides, 2008; Rudman & Ashmor, 2007). The prototypical victim is not a man, and therefore this participant did not seem to view the murder victim as such in this scenario.

Comparing configuration 7 (IAT*ASI.Host.Cal*~ASI.Benev.Cal) with the other ambiguous combinations, most cases assigned [C] leaned towards a more severe judgement of the accused. They mostly identified the accused as "not act[ing] in self-defense" and "her intentions of killing the victim were clearly there." Even though these cases were deemed ambiguous, the qualitative nature of these participants' answers indicates a more severe judgement of the accused, unlike case 23.

Comparison and Synthesis of Data

Table 9. Synthesize the Results for each Configuration for each Scenario

	Scenario 1 Severe	Scenario 2 Severe	Scenario 3 Severe	Scenario 4 Severe	Scenario 1 Lenient	Scenario 2 Lenient	Scenario 3 Lenient	Scenario 4 Lenient
1	0	0	0	0	C	1	1	C
2	0	0	0	C	0	1	1	0
3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	0	0	0	C	C	1	1	C
5	C	0	0	C	C	0	1	0
6	C	0	0	C	1	1	1	0
7	C	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
8	1	0	0	1	C	C	1	C

Interestingly, case 15 appears to exemplify the link between implicit and explicit bias and more severe decision-making in both Scenario 1 and 4 Severe. With that being said, the ambiguous cases in both those scenarios demonstrate some gender bias and severe judgement.

In Scenario 1 Severe, obtaining a high IAT score was a necessary condition associated with severe judgement. Two male participants judged the accused severely, but most deemed significant or ambiguous were female. Therefore, it would appear that females held harsher judgements over the accused than the male participants. Whereas, in Scenario 4 Severe, gender is not associated with a harsh judgment since both females and males had some form of severe

judgment. Though no necessary condition was found, it appears to be a high ASI.Benev.Cal score could, in some cases be associated with a harsher sentence, as seen with the ambiguous outcomes.

Case 15 (configuration 8) is the only case where all three indicators in fsQCA are present and are strongly related to the desired outcome, specifically for severe judgment. If the case has a high bias in all three conditions, then the participant is very likely to have a harsher perspective of the accused. However, again, it is essential to note that a participant who obtained ambiguous outcomes does not necessarily relate to a lenient or harsh judgment in each scenario. This means that there was not enough evidence to determine whether or not a particular combination of conditions necessarily leads to the desired outcome—the fsQCA measures an association and not causation.

There is a possibility that the way the vignettes were constructed, specifically how the accused and the victim are constructed, may have impacted how the participants perceived guilt, responsibility and subsequent punishment. For the first and last vignette, the accused was portrayed as not abiding by gender stereotypes. For Scenario 1 Severe, the accused was perceived as a 'bad mother.' Whereas in Scenario 4 Severe, the accused was portrayed as stoic and non-emotional. In neither case did the accused follow the traditional perception of 'female.' In contrast, the victim in both instances was constructed as being 'innocent' and at the mercy of the accused. As a result, the children in the first vignette were represented as unable to protect themselves. The partner in the fourth vignette was attacked unexpectedly, whereas case 15 (configuration 8) heavily emphasized that the accused in that scenario fabricated false

claims of abuse and made the partner appear more appealing and innocent. Hence, bias is impacted by the social reaction/construction to the crime and the victim/accused.

In contrast to lenient judgements, the reactions to the crimes are consistent with how the participants perceived the vignettes. Based on the nature of the crime, the construction could be considered favourable in perceiving the women as more victims or less responsible for their actions. This is because the situation brings forth their implicit gender associations (Marder & Pina-Sanchez, 2018; Sunstein, 2005). Therefore, the way in which the vignettes were constructed may have impacted how the participants perceived the women in the scenarios and led to view them more favourably.

Scenarios 1 and 4 Lenient had fewer configurations relating to lenient perceptions of the accused, which may be due to how the accused is portrayed. This could explain why the fsQCA determined fewer significant inclusion scores. Whereas scenarios 2 and 3 included more participants because the situations and the accused were perceived as being less at fault for the situation's outcome. These women were viewed more as victims than as the 'bad character' in the situations. Therefore, the terms used by the participants to construct the accused as a victim resulted in their judgements being influenced by their automatic social representations.

Ultimately, it would appear that the fsQCA was more likely to account for cases that had less severe judgements. Therefore, the three indicators chosen were more beneficial in helping identify less severe sanctions than harsher ones.

Comparing Severe and Less Severe Judgements

How the accused and the victim are constructed could impact the nature of the social representations called upon to account for the events. The impact of bias is affected by the

social reaction to specific crimes or the construction of the victim/accused. This could explain the difference between vignettes 1 and 4, and 2 and 3. In the first and last vignette, the accused is constructed as being more autonomous and directly related to the victim's death. In contrast, in vignettes 2 and 3, the accused is constructed as more of a victim than the person who almost died or did die. They were viewed as having little to no choice in their actions since the police, in both cases, neglected to help the women who were suffering from abuse. This could also be why vignettes 1 and 4 had one participant, case 15 (configuration 8), perceive the accused more severely based on social representations of women and how they should react in those situations. By contrast, vignettes 2 and 3 had more participants with more lenient sentences because they fit the mould of women in distress and emotional (social representation, intergroup conflict).

Overall, the three selected indicators are more helpful in determining less severe judgment towards women accused of murdering their partners. However, the retained configurations depend on how the participant perceives the accused and victim. For example, if the social representation is more in line with stereotypical behaviours or characteristics, then the perception is less severe.

The more the participants perceive the accused as either a victim or fragile, their biases move towards the benevolent use of explicit gender bias. If the accused's situation is inescapable, the participants are less harsh towards the accused and their actions. By comparison, in vignettes 1 and 4, the women were deemed responsible for their situations because they both participated in the death of the accused. They were perceived as changing the outcome, which tended to relate more with a higher score on IAT and hostile sexism.

Chapter Six - Discussion

This research project focused on understanding and determining if the IAT and ASI could help determine whether implicit and explicit biases influence the perception of women accused of murder. In this context, psychological and criminological theories were meant to enhance the data and open new avenues for this type of research.

The methods utilized for this research are unique because fsQCA is not generally used in criminology. Adding both the IAT and the ASI enhances the findings. This is because not many studies utilize both forms of information on the concept of bias. In addition to this, using a survey that incorporates both qualitative data and quantitative data allows for a more in-depth understanding of how people perceive women. Having both forms of raw data is essential. The fsQCA assigns weight to cases that were deemed more important than others.

It was essential to have a moderate sample size. Having too small a dataset would have weakened the results and analysis of the data (Dusa, 2019; Ragin, 2012). This would mainly be because the researcher would not see a general trend in the data. The research could only look at the cases separately. In contrast, a larger data pool would only allow the researcher to look at the patterns that appear in the cases (Dusa, 2019; Ragin, 2012). Though the fsQCA can explore a more extensive data set, utilizing anecdotal evidence becomes more difficult. Therefore, having a data pool of 30 students was deemed ideal. Though it should be noted that the number of cases was reduced from 30 to 23 because of specific questions that the participants skipped, the fsQCA could still be utilized because of its ability to conduct a configurational analysis based on available cases.

Ultimately, the three indicators that were chosen, the IAT, ASI hostile, and ASI benevolent, are primarily associated with less severe outcomes. In other words, these indicators allow for the researcher to understand the factors underlying less severe judgments made by individuals dealing with complex, ambiguous cases involving women offenders. This could be due to the people found within the sample, which are university students. The outcome could have been different if the sample had been high school students. For example, these cases often involved utilizing words and phrases that painted the accused in a 'nicer light.' This is more easily seen in scenarios 2 and 3. Again, though, it should be mentioned that not all three indicators had to be present for the cases to be deemed significant. The results indicate that having low implicit bias with a high explicit bias and a low explicit bias, whether benevolent or hostile sexism, is most associated with lenient judgements.

The researcher understands that a potential reason why most participants viewed the cases in a lenient manner may be due to the order in which the vignettes were presented. For example, the first vignette started in a way that portrayed a 'bad mother' with little to no blame on the father. This was followed by three vignettes where women were part of abusive relationships, which got worse as the vignettes progressed. Though some participants did interpret the women in a harsh light, the majority did not. Therefore, it could be assumed that the order in which the researcher chose to present the vignettes could have impacted how the participants perceived and interpreted the women in each scenario.

In cases that viewed the accused more severely, only case 15 fit the criteria. All three indicators had to be present for the fsQCA to find a significant case. Case 15 mainly viewed the

accused as more severe in the first and last scenarios. Therefore, a high negative bias in the IAT appeared to be a moderately reliable indicator for a severe sentence.

Overall, it would appear that the three indicators are important in different manners and situations. Firstly, the results indicated that an absence of implicit bias could be an important indicator for less severe judgements. This was demonstrated in scenarios 2 and 3. Secondly, there were a few scenarios in the lenient judgment, scenarios 1 and 2, where a discrepancy between the two forms of explicit bias was linked to the outcome. This could be important because such a discrepancy could be associated with more psychologically rigid, naïve, or one-sided heuristics and social representations, influencing perceptions. This was different from the severe judgments where scenarios 2 and 3 did not find enough evidence in cases where the outcome was more likely. Whereas in scenarios 1 and 4, all three indicators were needed for the participant to be more likely to have a more severe perception of the accused. Though none of the conditions were determined to be necessary.

Limitations

A few limitations are relevant when considering the findings from the current study. When this study was created, the original method was to do short interviews with the participants. This had to be changed due to the Covid-19 pandemic. The technique to gather data then changed to having the participants answer a survey and submit their answers. This was all done online without direct oversight from the researcher. This could have had some potential consequences because the researcher was not there to help the participant if they had any questions or could not ensure that the participant was taking the survey alone.

Therefore, the participant's information must be taken at face value with no way to make sure that they answered honestly or by themselves.

Secondly, the sampling procedure causes limitations in generalizing the data obtained and the analysis. Since the group was limited to the University of Ottawa students, the results cannot be generalized to other universities or colleges. This is because each school can be associated with differences in culture, content and method of teaching. For example, the criminology department at the University of Ottawa is much more critical of “mainstream” research and open to qualitative forms of research. Many other universities involve little qualitative study and tend to be much more mainstream in their research. In addition to this, since the survey was meant to be shared between participants to have better access to potential subjects, the researcher could not ensure that all of the participants were from the University of Ottawa.

Thirdly, this research did not consider the emotions or the impression management the participants had or used regarding their answers to the vignettes. It would have been an interesting component that was impossible to incorporate due to the researcher's inability to ask the additional participant questions “in real-time” due to the pandemic. This could have been useful had the research been in the room to observe the participants' language, tone, body language and other non-verbal behaviours.

Lastly, it should be noted that the way the vignettes were written and built could have impacted how the participants came to interpret the scenarios. It may have also impacted how the participant came to perceive the people described in these scenarios. How the researcher constructed the vignettes may have had the undesired effect of influencing the participants to

perceive the people in the scenarios more or less severely. Therefore, the researcher's choices to include or exclude certain information may have affected the participants and accidentally led them to reflect on the people within the scenarios differently than they would have had the researcher made different choices. Some of these choices involved removing the names, locations and cultures of those described in the scenarios. This was mainly done to limit the possibility of other implicit/explicit biases from the participants. Regardless, the researcher's choices in incorporating or removing certain information may have impacted how the participants perceived and understood the vignettes.

Future Research

An idea for future research would be to use the IAT and the ASI with jurors. It would be fascinating to analyze how jurors were selected for a trial based on their scores on the IAT and ASI with the outcome of said trial. Since this is probably impossible, future researchers could precisely set up a mock trial like an actual trial. This could help researchers understand how certain biases affect a mock trial and potentially relate it to actual trials.

It was determined that their age, level of education, program, year of their current enrolment, the amount of time spent in university, their political position, or their socioeconomic status were not used to analyze the results. They were deemed less necessary to the analysis since they did not relate to the utilized theoretical framework. It would be interesting for future research if it is conducted using students at the college or university level to see if their program impacts their perception of women accused of murdering their spouses. There could be some interesting information to be gleaned from this. Each department focuses on traits or elements that need to be learned to succeed in that field. For example, at the

University of Ottawa, in the Criminology department, the teaching staff intends to teach the students to be more critical of several aspects of the criminal justice system. As a result, students are introduced to more critical theories and more mainstream ones. By contrast, other departments will adopt very different philosophies, for instance, focusing on training students to become actors within the criminal justice system, police, corrections, etc., specifically to meet the needs of these institutions. This will lead to a different learning experience for students and differences in teaching philosophies.

References

Ackermann, C-C. & Mathieu, J-P. (2015). Implicit attitudes and their measurement: Theoretical foundations and use in consumer behavior research. *Recherche et applications en marketing. 30*(2), 55-77.

Alexander, M. G. & Levin, s. (1998). Theoretical, empirical and practical approaches to intergroup conflict. *Journal of social issues, 54*(4), 629-639.

American Psychology Association. (2020). APA dictionary of psychology. https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_formatting_and_style_guide/reference_list_electronic_sources.html

Avery, J. J., Stark, J., Zhong, Y., Avery J D. & Cooper, J. (2020). Is your own team against you? Implicit bias and interpersonal regard in criminal defense. *Journal of social psychology. 136*(1), 1-17.

Baker, N. L., Buick, J. D., Kim, S. R., Moniz, S. & Nava, K. L. (2013). Lessons from Examining Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence. *Sex Roles, 69*(3), 182-192.

Barter, C. & Renold, E. (1999). The use of vignettes in qualitative research. *Sociology at Surrey, 25*, 1-6.

Bem, D. J. (1972). Self-Preservation theory. *Advances in experimental social psychology. 6*, 1-62.

Berg-Schlosser, D., De Meur, G., Rihoux, B. & Ragin, C. C. (2012). Qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) as an approach. Pp. 1-18. In *Configurational comparative methods: Qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) and related techniques*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Bilotta, I., Corrington, A., Mendoza, S. A., Watson, I. & King, E. (2019). How subtle bias infects the law. *Annual review of law and social science. 15*(1), 227-245.

Blatter, J. (2017). Truth seeking and sense making: Towards configurational designs of qualitative methods. *Qualitative & multi-method research.* 2-14.

Bodenhausen, G. V. (1990). Stereotypes as judgmental heuristics: Evidence of circadian variations in discrimination. *Association for psychological science. 1*(5), 319-322.

Bodenhausen, G. V. & Morales, J. R. (2012). Social cognition and perception. In *Handbook of psychology: Personality and social psychology*. (pp.225-246). New York: Wiley.

Brauer, M., Wasel, W., & Niedenthal, P. (2000). Implicit and Explicit Components of Prejudice. *Review of General Psychology, 4*(1), 79-101.

Brewer, M. B. & Garsher, W. (1996). Who is this "we"? Levels of collective identity and self representation. *Journal of personality and social psychology. 71(*1), 83-93.

Carlson, R. & Agerstrom, J. (2016). A closer look at the discrimination outcomes in the IAT literature. *Scandinavian journal of psychology. 57*(4), 278-287.

Carmo, R., Grams, A. & Magalhaes, T. (2011). Men as Victims of Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine, 18*(8), 355-359.

Cervone, D. & Peake, P. K. (1986). Anchoring, Efficacy, and Action: The influence of judgmental heuristics on self-efficacy judgments and behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology. 50*(3), 492-501.

Cho, H. (2012). Examining Gender Differences in the Nature and Context of Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(13), 2665-2684.

Chryssides, A. (2008). Conditions for dialogue and illuminating inequality in multicultural societies. *Journal of community & applied social psychology. 18*(4), 375-381.

Clarke, A. J. (2018). Explicit Bias. *Northwestern university law review. 113*(3), 505-586.

Cohrs, J. C., Ulug, O. M., Stahel, L. & Kishoglu, R. (2015). Ethos of conflict and beyond: Differentiating social representation of conflict. In *The social psychology of intractable conflict*. (pp.33-45). Switzerland: Springer International.

Collinson, J. A. (2009). A Marked Man: Female-Perpetrated Intimate Partner Abuse. *International Journal of Men's Health, 8*(1), 22-40.

Conrey, F. R., Sherman, J. W., Gawronski, B., Hugenberg, K. & Groom, C. J. (2005). Separating multiple processes in implicit social cognition: The quad model of implicit task performance. *Journal of personality and social psychology. 89*(4), 469487.

Crisp, R. (2008). Recognising complexity in intergroup conflict. *Psychologist. 21*(3), 206-209.

Cvencek, D., Greenwald, A., & Meltzoff, A. (2011). Measuring Implicit Attitudes of 4-year-olds: The Preschool Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 109*(2), 187-200.

De Rosa, A. s. (1993). Social representations and attitudes: Problems of coherence between the theoretical definition and procedure of research. *Papers on social representation. 2*(3), 1-15.

DeSteno, D., Dasgupta, N., Bartlett, M. Y. & Cajdrie, A. (2004). Prejudice from thin air: The effect of emotion on automatic intergroup attitudes. *American psychological society. 15*(5), 319-324.

Douglas, E. M. & Hines, D. A., (2011). The Helpseeking Experiences of Men who Sustain Intimate Partner Violence: An Overlooked Population and Implications for Practice. *Journal of Family Violence, 26*(6), 473-485.

Dunham, Y., Baron, A. S., & Banaji, M. R. (2016). The Development of Implicit Gender Attitudes. *Developmental Science, 19*(5), 781-789.

Dusa, A. (2019). *QCA with R: A comprehensive resource*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

Emiliani, F. & Passini, S. (2016). Everyday life in social psychology. *Journal for the theory of social behaviour. 47*(1), 83-97.

Erwin, M. J., Gershon, R. R. M., Tiburzi, M. & Lin, S. (2005). Reports of Intimate Partner Violence Made Against Police Officers. *Journal of Family Violence, 20*(1), 13-19.

Fazio, R. H. (1990). Multiple processes by which attitudes guide bahavior: The mode model as an integrative framework. *Advances of experimental social psychology. 23*, 75-109.

Fazio, R. H. & Olson, M. A. (2003). Implicit measures in social cognition research: their meaning and use. *Annual review psychology. 54*, 297-327.

Finneran, C. & Stephenson, R. (2013). Gay and Bisexual Men's Perceptions of Police Helpfulness in Response to Male-Male Intimate Partner Violence. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine, 14*(4), 354-362.

Foster, T. E. (1993). But is it law? Using literature to penetrate societal representations of women. *Journal of legal education, 43*(1), 133-148.

Fujii, L. A. (2012). Research ethics 101: Dilemmas and responsibilities. *Political science & politics. 45*(4), 717-723.

Gabor, T (2004). Inflammatory rhetoric on racial profiling can undermine police services. *Revue Canadienne de criminologie et de justice pénale. 46*(4), 458-466.

Garaigordobil, M. & Aliri, J. (2013). Ambivalent sexism inventory: standardization and normative data in a sample of the Basque country. *Psicologia conductual. 21*(1), 173-186.

Girvan, E. J., Deason, G. & Borgida, E. (2015). The generalizability of gender bias: Testing the effects of contextual, explicit, and implicit sexism on labor arbitration decisions. *Law and human behavior. 39*(5), 525-537.

Giustina, J-A. D. (2008). Violence against Women in Intimate Partner Relationships: Community Responsibility, Community Justice. Contemporary Justice Review, *11*(4), 351-361

Glick, P. & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 491-512.

Glick, R. & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American psychologist. 56*(2), 109-118.

Glick, P. & Fiske, S. T. (2011). Ambivalent Sexism Revisited. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*(3), 530-535.

Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J., L., Abrams, D. et al. (2000). Beyond Prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of personality and social psychology. 79*(5), 763-775.

Goicolea, I., Chrisianson, M., Hurtig, A-K., Marchal, B., Sebastian, M. S. & Wiklund, M. (2016). Searching for best practices of youth friendly services – a study protocol using qualitative comparative analysis in Sweden. *Health services research. 16*, 1-10.

Greenwald, A G. & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem and stereotypes. *Psychological review. 102*(1), 4-27.

Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. (1998). Measuring Individual Differences in Implicit Cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(6), 1464-1480.

Greenwald, A. G., Banaji, M. R., Rudman, L. A., Farnham, S. D., Nosek, B. A. & Mellot, D. S. (2002). A unified theory of implicit attitudes, stereotypes, self-esteem, and self-concept. *Psychological Review, 109(*1), 3-25.

Greenwald, A., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. (2003). Understanding and Using the Implicit Association Test: I. An Improved Scoring Algorithm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*(2), 197-216.

Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, T. A., Uhlman, E. L. & Banaji, M. R. (2009). Understanding and using the implicit association test: III. Meta-Analysis of Predictive validity. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. *97*(1), 17-41.

Greenwald, A. G. & Pettigrew, T. F. (2014). When malice toward none and charity for some: ingroup favoritism enables discrimination. *American psychology. 69*(7), 669-684.

Harding, H. G. & Helweg-Larsen, M. (2008). Perceived Risk for Future Intimate Partner Violence Among Women in a Domestic Violence Shelter. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*(2), 75-85.

Hines, D. A. & Malley-Morrison, K. (2001). Psychological Effects of Partner Abuse Against Men: A Neglected Research Area. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 2*(2), 75-85.

Hines, D. A., Brown, J & Dunning, E. (2007). Characteristics of Callers to the Domestic Abuse Helpline for Men. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*(2), 63-72.

Hofman, W., Gawronski, B., Gschwendner, T., Le, H. & Schmitt, M. (2005). A meta-analysis on the correlation between the implicit association test and explicit self-report measures. *Personality & social psychology bulletin. 31*(10), 1369-1385.

Ibabe, I., Arnoso, A. & Elgorriaga, E. (2016). Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Adaptation to Basque Population and Sexism as a Risk Factor of Dating Violence. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 19*, 1-9.

Kane, H., Lewis, M. A., Williams, P. A. & Kahwati, L. C. (2014). Using qualitative comparative analysis to understand and quantify translation and implementation. *Translational behavioral medicine. 4*(2), 201-208.

Kang, J., Bennett. M., Carbado, C., & Casey P. (2012). Implicit Bias in the Courtroom. *UCLA Law Review, 59*(5), 1124-1187.

Kelman, M. (2013). Moral realism and the heuristics debate. *The journal of legal analysis. 5*(2), 339-397.

Kovera, M. B. & Borgida, E. (2010) Social psychology and law. In *Handbook of social psychology*. (pp. 1343-1385). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Krieger, N., Carney, D., Lancaster, K., Waterman, P. D., Kosheleva, A. & Banaji, M. (2010). Combining explicit and implicit measures of racial discrimination in health research. *American journal of public health. 100*(8), 1485-1492.

Lansu, T., Cillessen, A., & Bukowski, W. M. (2013). Implicit and explicit peer evaluation: associations with early adolescents' prosociality, aggression, and bullying. *Journal of research on adolescence, 23*(4), 762-771.

Levinson, J., Cai, H. & Young, D. (2010). Guilty by implicit bias: The guilty/not guilty implicit association test. *Journal of criminal law. 8*(1), 1-21.

Lundy, M. & Grossmen, S. F. (2009). Domestic violence service users: A comparison of older and younger women victims. *Journal of family violence, 24*(5), 297-309.

MacGillivray, B. H. (2014). Heuristics structure and pervade formal risk assessment. *Risk analysis. 34*(4), 771-787.

Major, B., & O'Brien, L. T. (2005). The Social Psychology of Stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 393-421.

Mannel, J. & Dadswell, A. (2017). Preventing Intimate Partner Violence: Towards a Framework for Supporting Effective Community Mobilisation. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 27*(3), 196-211.

Marder, I. D. & Pina-Sanchez, J. (2018). Nudge the judge? Theorizing the interaction between heuristics, sentencing guidelines and sentence clustering. *Criminology & criminal justice. 00*(0), 1-17.

McKeig, A. K. & Madden, A. (2019). Family Court Enhancement Project: Improving Access to Justice. *Family Court Review, 57*(1), 107-117.

Messing, J. T., Wrd-Lasher, A., Thaller, J. & Bagwell-Gray, M. E. (2015). The State of Intimate Partner Violence Intervention: Progress and Continuing Challenges. *Social Work, 60*(4), 305-313.

Meyers, S. (2010). Seeking Help to Protect the Children?: The Influence of Children on Women's Decisions to Seek Help When Experiencing Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 25*(8), 713-725.

Morant, N. & Edwards, E. (2011). Police responses to diversity: A social representation study of rural British policing in a changing representational context. *Journal of community & applied social psychology. 21*(4), 281-296.

Murray, C. E., Mobley, A. K., Budford, A. P. & Seaman-DeJohn, M. M. (2006). Same-Sex Intimate Partner Violence: Dynamics, Social Context, and Counseling Implications. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling, 1*(4), 7-30.

Norris, P. & Franklin, M. (1997). Social representation. *European journal of political research, 32,* 185-210.

Norris, G. (2015). Judgment heuristics and bias in evidence interpretation: The effects of computer generated exhibits. *International journal of law and psychiatry. 42-43*. 121-127.

Nunes, K. L. (2005). Implicitly measured cognitions of child molesters. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa. Advisor: Dr. Philip Firestone.

Orthwein, J., Packman, W., Jackson, R. & Bongar, B. (2010) Filicide: Gender bias in California defense attorneys' perception of motive and defense strategies. *Psychiatry, psychology and law. 17*(4), 523-537.

Outlaw, M. (2009). No One Type f Intimate Partner Abuse: Exploring Physical and Non-Physical Abuse Among Intimate Partners. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*(4), 263-272.

Palys, T. (2003). Ethics in social research. Pp. 80-120. In *Research decisions.* Toronto: Thomson-Nelson.

Perrin, R. L. (2017). Overcoming Biased Views of Gender and Victimhood in Custody Evaluations when Domestic Violence is Alleged. *American University Journal of Gender, Social Policy, and The Law, 25*(2), 155-177.

Perugini, M. O., Gorman, R. & Prestwich, A. (2007), An ontological test of the IAT: Self-activation can increase predictive validity. *Experimental psychology. 54*(2), 134-147.

Poveda, A. C. & Martinez, C. I. P. (2013). Qualitative comparative analysis (QCA): an application for the industry. *Qualitative quantitative. 47*, 1315-1321.

Ragin, C. C. (2012). Qualitative comparative analysis using fuzzy sets (fsQCA). Pp.1-30. In *Configurational comparative methods: qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) and related techniques.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Richeson, J. A., & Ambady, N. (2001). Who's in Charge? Effects of Situational Roles on Automatic Gender Bias. *Sex Roles, 44*(9/10), 493-512.

Rihoux, B. & Lobe, B. (2012). The case for qualitative comparative analysis (QCA): Adding leverage for thick cross-case comparison. Pp.222-242. In *The SAGE handbook of case-based methods.* London: SAGE Publications.

Riketta, M. (2005). Cognitive differentiation between self, ingroup, and outgroup: The roles of identification and perceived intergroup conflict. *European journal of social psychology. 35*(1), 97-106.

Rolle, L., Giardina, G., Caldarera, A. M., Gerino, E. & Brustia, P. (2018). When Intimate Partner Violence Meets Same Sex Couples: A Review of Same Sex Intimate Partner Violence. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 1-13.

Rothbart, M., Fulero, S., Jensen, C., Howard, J & Birrell, P. (1978). *Journal of experimental social psychology. 14*, 237-255.

Rudman, L., Ashmore R. D., & Gary, M. L. (2001). "Unlearning" Automatic Biases: The Malleability of Implicit Prejudice and Stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(5), 856-868.

Rudman, L., & Ashmore R. D. (2007). Discrimination and the Implicit Association Test. *Group Process & Intergroup Relations, 10*(3), 359-372.

Saks, M. J. & Kidd, R. F. (1980). Human information processing and adjudication: Trial by heuristics. *Law and society association. 15*(1), 123-160.

Sammut, G. & Howart, C. (2013). Social Representations. In *Encyclopedia of critical psychology*. (pp.1799-1802). New York, NY: Springer.

Sarine, L. E. (2012). Regulating the social pollution of systemic discrimination caused by implicit bias. *California law review. 100*(5), 1359-1399.

Schnierle, J., Christian-Brathwaite, N., & Louisias, M. (2019). Implicit Bias: What Every Pediatrician Should Know about the Effect of Bias on Health and Future Directions. *Current Problems in Pediatrics and Adolescent Health, 49*(2), 34-44.

Seelau, E. P., Seelau, S. M. & Porrman, P. B. (2003). Gender and Role-Based Perceptions of Domestic Abuse: Does Sexual Orientation Matter?. *Behavioral Sciences ad the Law, 21*(2), 199-214.

Seelau, S. M. & Seelau, E. P. (2005). Gender-Role Stereotypes and Perceptions of Heterosexual, Gay and Lesbian Domestic Violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 20*(6), 363-371.

Simmons, C. A., Lehmann, P. & Collier-Tension, S. (2008a). From Victim to Offender: The Effects of Male Initiated Violence on Women Arrested for Using Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*(6), 463-472.

Simmons, C. A., Lehmann, P. & Collier-Tension, S. (2008b). Men's Use of Controlling Behaviors: A Comparison of Reports by Women in a Domestic Violence Shelter and Women in a Domestic Violence Offender Program. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*(6), 387-394.

Simon, B. (2020). A new perspective on intergroup conflict: The social psychology of politicized struggles for recognition. *Theory & psychology. 30*(2), 147-163.

Sunstein, C. R. (2005). Moral heuristics. *Behavioral and brain sciences. 28*, 531-573.

Straus, M. A. & Gozjolko, K. L. (2014). Intimate Terrorism and Gender Differences in injury of Dating Partners by Male and Female University Students. *Journal of Family Violence, 29*(1), 51-65.

Taskale, N. & Soygut, G. (2017). Risk Factors for Women's Intimate Partner Violence Victimization: An Examination from the Perspective of the Schema Therapy Model. *Journal of Family Violence, 32*(1), 3-12.

Tsiko, R. G. (2016). A Spatial Latent Gaussian Model for Intimate Partner Violence Against Men in Africa. *Journal of Family Violence, 31*(4), 443-459.

Tversky, A & Kahneman, D. (1973). Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability. *Cognitive psychology. 5*, 207-232.

Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1983). Extensional versus intuitive reasoning: The conjunction fallacy in probability judgment. *Psychology review. 90*(4), 293-315.

Vatnar, S. K. B. & Bjorkly, S. (2009). Interactional Aspects of Intimate Partner Violence Result in Different Help-Seeking Behaviors in a Representative Sample of Women. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*(4), 231-241.

Wagner, W, (2016). Embodied social representation. *Journal for the theory of social behavior. 47*(1), 25-31.

West, J. & Merritt-Gray, M. (2008). A Theoretical Understanding of Abusive Intimate Partner Relationships that Become Non-Violent: Shifting the Pattern of Abusive Control. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*(4), 281-293.

Wittenbrink, B., Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (1997). Evidence for Racial Prejudice at the Implicit Level and Its Relationship with Questionnaire Measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(2), 262-274.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Email that will be sent to the people who run the university Facebook page, University Twitter page and the Criminology blog:

Hello,

My name is Tiffany Haineault. I am a master's student at the University of Ottawa. I am currently looking for students to participate in my short experiment. The experiment can be done from the comfort of the participants place of residence. I ask that you post the below script on your page. This will allow students to see my research and potentially decide to participate. The information about my study can be found in the below script. If you have any questions, please do not be afraid to contact. The information regarding my thesis project is in the attached script.

Thank you,

Tiffany H.

Recruitment script that will be asked to be posted on the online sites:

Hi, my name is Tiffany Haineault and I am the principal investigator for my thesis research project. I am looking for participants to take part in a short online questionnaire that will last about 30 to 60 minutes. This will consist of two short online tests and a short questionnaire where you will be given four vignettes to read that pertain to court judgements. I will ask you to screenshot your results from the two online questionnaires and attach them to the online survey, which will be done using a program called SurveyMonkey. For the final task, I ask that you read four short vignettes and answer a few questions. I am researching Implicit Gender Bias in association with women who are accused of murder. The potential participants need to be

registered at the University of Ottawa in any program at any level of education. I ask that you do not indicate your full name anywhere on the online survey. This will make sure that you remain anonymous.

Link:_____

Thank you and have a great day,

Tiffany H.

Script for when I contact people through Facebook:

Hello, my name is Tiffany Haineault. I am doing research on implicit gender bias as it pertains to women who are accused of murder. I am looking for some people to participate in my online study. The survey takes about 30 to 60 minutes to complete, depending on how long or short your answers to the questions are. The online survey has two short online tests followed by four vignettes with questions regarding them. If you would like to participate in my study, here is the link: _____. If you do not want to participate, that is fine. I do ask, if it is not much trouble and only if you want to, that you let other students know about my research project. You can send them this here script or place them in contact with me. Thank you for your time and have a nice day.

Appendix 2

The online questionnaire that could be found on SurveyMonkey

Consent Form

Name of Professor: David Joubert, Ph.D.

Affiliation: Department of Criminology, Faculty of Social sciences

Work Number:

Email:

Student Name: Tiffany Haineault

Student Email:

Invitation to Participate: I am invited to participate in the research study entitled Implicit Gender Bias: Associations with Trial Outcomes for Women Accused of Murder conducted by Tiffany Haineault for her Thesis at the Criminology Master's level. The project will be under the supervision of Professor Joubert.

Purpose of the Study: I understand that the purpose of the study is to gain a better understanding of implicit and explicit associations students may have regarding female murderers.

Participation: My participation will consist of taking part in one gender Implicit Association Test (IAT), a self-report (Ambivalent Sexism Inventory), and a short online questionnaire regarding four vignettes about females supposedly committing criminal offences, during which the participant will be asked to discuss their views on the topic of research. The online experiment

will take place at the participants house on their computer. The experiment will last about approximately 30 to 60 minutes.

Risks: I understand that since my participation in this study entails that I share my personal views, it may cause me to feel emotional discomfort. I have received assurance from the researcher that every effort will be made to minimize these risks, namely the possibility to take pauses whenever I desire or stop my participation at any time, without consequences. Should I experience anxiety or distress, I am encouraged to contact the supervisor for the study, David Joubert, who is a licensed mental health professional.

Benefits: My participation in this study will help me learn about implicit gender bias and how it may affect my everyday life and the lives of people around me. My participation will also help inform future researchers to form and construct solutions to Implicit Gender Bias in trials.

Confidentiality and Anonymity: I have received assurance from the researcher that the information I will share will remain strictly confidential. No one will be informed of my participation. The contents will be used only for this Thesis. Anonymity will be protected using a pseudonym to identify the IAT, self-report results and the answers to the questions regarding the four vignettes. All identifying information will be omitted from the final thesis paper.

Conservation of Data: The data collected (IAT, self-report results, vignette questionnaire) will be kept by the researcher in a secure location for 5 years.

Voluntary Participation: I am under no obligation to participate and if I choose to participate, I may withdraw from the study at any time and/or refuse to answer any questions for reasons that I do not have to justify. If I choose to withdraw, all data gathered until the time of withdrawal will be destroyed.

Acceptance: I agree to participate in the above research study conducted by Tiffany Haineault of the Department of Criminology, Faculty of Social Science, which research is under the supervision of David Joubert. I understand that by accepting to participate I am in no way waiving my right to withdraw from the study.

If I have any questions about the study, I may contact the student and/or their supervisor with the contact information above.

If I have any ethical concerns regarding my participation in this study, I may contact the Protocol Office for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, 550 Cumberland Street, Room 154, (613) 562-5387 or ethics@uottawa.ca.

1. I agree to participate in this study by clicking “Yes, I have read the consent form and agree to participate in this study”.

a. Yes, I have read the consent form and agree to participate in this study

Hello,

For this short experiment, I ask that you first answer the IAT that can be found at this link:

https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/user/agg/blindspot/indexgc.htm

I ask that you take a screenshot of your result and send it to me along with this questionnaire.

Secondly, I then ask that you answer this online questionnaire that can be found at this link:

https://secure.understandingprejudice.org/asi/

I ask that you take a screenshot of your results and send them to me.

Thirdly, I ask that you read the four attached vignettes and answer the questions that follow with as much detail as you deem fit. Below are a few definitions that you may find helpful in answering the questions.

Finally, I ask that you fill out a short questionnaire about yourself at the end of this experiment.

ATTENTION: I ask that you do not put your name anywhere on this document to remain anonymous.

Thank you for participating in my experiment.

2. What was the results of your Implicit Association Test?

Please screenshot your results and upload them here

Choose file to attach

3. What was the results of your Ambivalent Sexism Inventory?

Please screenshot your results and upload them here

Choose file to attach

Legal Context for the Study

Murder is part of first- and second-degree murder

First- and second-degree murder are to be sentenced to life imprisonment

- no possibility of parole for 25 years for first degree murder
- no possibility for parole for 10 years for second degree murder

First degree murder is planned and deliberate. The induvial who committed the crime took time to plan their actions and the person had the intent to kill.

Any other murder that is not first-degree murder is second-degree murder. These people did not plan the crime but were aware of the consequences of their actions, knowing that it can lead to death, and chose to keep going.

- Usually, because the prosecution cannot prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the person planned and deliberately committed the murder

Murder can be reduced to manslaughter if the homicide was not planned or deliberate and happened due to:

- The accused being in the heat of the moment
- reckless behaviour
- negligence
- it being an accident

Aggravating factors are factors that make the crime worse. This can include a previous criminal record, facts of the offence, the impact of the crime on the victims, if a weapon was used, damage to property, vulnerability of the victim, hate crimes and more.

Mitigating factors are any information r evidence regarding the defendant that might result in reduced charges. This can include no prior criminal record, admitting or showing remorse, mental illness, pleading guilty or admitting to the offence, provocation, young age and more.

R. vs. M.B.

The female is accused of aggravated assault, criminal negligence causing bodily harm and failing to provide the necessaries of life to her two biological twin daughters. The children are 27 months old (2 years and 3 months). She also has a 4-year-old son. The accused immigrated to Canada with her husband. The three children were born in Canada. She was a stay at home mother, while her husband worked. The accused does not have any prior criminal record. The paramedics were called to the accused house after she called her husband at work informing him that one of their daughters was in trouble. When the paramedics arrived, they called the police after determining that the infant was not breathing. They found both daughters in a car seat in the living room. The paramedics worked on one twin for over an hour and were unable to resuscitate her. She was brought to the hospital and remains in a vegetative state. Medical personnel have gone on record saying that there is no hope in her regaining consciousness. The paramedics indicated that when they arrived, the girls were in an advanced stage of starvation. They were extremely thin and had no fat and were losing muscle mass. In contrast, the male child was very alert and active when the paramedics arrived on scene. He was jumping on a sofa in a playful mood. He was physically healthy and well-nourished. The police checked the kitchen and found there to be enough food to feed a family of 5. It was found that the daughters slept in a room on a bare mattress that smelt of urine while the son slept in his parents' room on his own clean bed. The son had toys, but the two girls did not. There were injuries found on both girls and the mother indicated that they must have fallen down the stairs. She said that she normally uses the couch to block the stairs, but on this occasion, the two 2-year-old girls must have moved the sofa to gain access to the stairs. The

medical professionals expressed that the injuries are inconsistent with her statement. The daughter who was found unconscious was bleeding from her brain due to trauma, which meant that medical intervention was impossible. The second daughter had an incorrectly healed fracture of her upper arm and had bruising on her head and face. She was also unable to hold herself in a standing position.

Questions for R. vs. M.B. If the question requires a longer answer, please give as much detail as you believe necessary for your answer.

4. Would you charge or acquit the accused in this scenario?

- Charge
- Acquit

If you answered no to the previous question, you may skip questions 5 and 6 and go directly to question 7.

5. If you would charge the accused, would it be first-degree murder, second-degree murder or manslaughter?

- First-degree murder
- Second degree murder
- Manslaughter

6. Can you tell me about your rationale for charging the accused?

Answer:

If you did not acquit the accused, you may skip question 7 and go directly to question 8.

7. Why do you believe the accused should be acquitted?

Answer:

8. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with the actual charge of the case? In this case, the woman was charged with manslaughter and negligence.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

9. How much do you think outside factors, whether your education, religion, the way you were raised, or anything may have impacted your decision to charge or acquit the accused?

Answer:

10. What aggravating factors, mitigating factors or other factors of the case influenced your decision and why?

Answer:

11. Do you strongly agree or disagree with the husband being on trial with the wife?

Strongly Agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree disagree strongly disagree

12. Explain your answer to question 11.

Answer:

R vs. R

The accused, Mrs. R, attempted to take out a contract on her husbands' life in 2008. She approached an individual, who was an undercover cop, to discuss the possibility of killing the victim. The accused was then arrested and charged with counselling to commit murder. She admitted that she did as the Crown prosecution said but raised the defence of duress. She said that she had undergone years of abuse at the hands of her husband and was afraid that he was going to kill her. She revealed that the victim threatened to kill her and their child if she ever attempted to leave him. The accused believed that he was not bluffing and did not think that the police would help her because they would be unable to prevent his actions. She believed this to be true because she has contacted the police several times previously and nothing was done. The accused stated that she thought that she had no other reasonable option except to take a contract on his life.

There were concerns about her statement that she had no other rational choice but to hire a man to murder her husband since, at the time of the incident, they were no longer living together. The emails that the separated couple sent to one another were civil. The accused also had a good job to support herself (she was a teacher), had custody of their child and support from family and friends. The last threat from her husband was a few months before this incident. She says that when they started living together in the summer of 1993, the victim made it clear that he was to be in control of their relationship and that she should be subservient to him. During their relationship, her husband was transferred temporarily to many locations because he was part of the Canadian Armed Forces. During these occasions, she never left. She says that it was because she had a traditional view on marriage, that no matter what,

her vows would come first. The accused also stated that she tried to change her husband by showing him love; love that she thought he was denied as a child. Her husband drank daily and would come home demanding sex. She said that sometimes it was against her will, but she never told him no because she thought that it would be too risky. The accused said that after their daughter was born, the victims' outburst increased and that he had put a gun to her head once. She says that he killed their family dog. The accused also indicated that the victim was cheating on her with a 19-year-old girl. She left him and sought a peace bond, but people told her that it would be useless and at this point she felt as though she had no escape.

Questions for R. vs. R. If the question requires a longer answer, please give as much detail as you believe necessary for your answer.

13. Would you charge or acquit the accused in this scenario?

- Charge
- Acquit

If you acquit the accused, you may skip questions 14 and 15 and go directly to question 16.

14. If you would charge the accused, would it be first-degree murder, second-degree murder or manslaughter?

- First-degree murder
- Second-degree murder
- Manslaughter

15. Can you tell me about your rationale for charging the accused?

Answer:

If you did not acquit the accused, you may skip question 16 and go directly to question 17.

16. Why do you believe the accused should be acquitted?

Answer:

17. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with the actual charge of the case? In this case, the woman was acquitted.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

18. How much do you think outside factors, whether your education, religion, the way you were raised, or anything may have impacted your decision to charge or acquit the accused?

Answer:

19. What aggravating factors, mitigating factors or other factors of the case influenced your decision and why?

Answer:

R vs. H

Mrs. H is charged with the murder of her husband, to whom she has been married to for over 35 years and had four children. They got married in Ottawa in 1969 and immigrated to Canada in 1977. The deceased had been physically, verbally and sexually abusing the accused for 35 years. Mrs. H did not sleep in the same room as her husband and always took to sleeping with a knife under her pillow. The husband would sometimes enter her room at night to sexually assault her. During the several years they slept in different rooms, the deceased was deterred only twice. The battered women syndrome defence was used to explain why the accused decided to stay with her abusive and controlling husband. She does not have any prior criminal record.

On the night of the murder, Mr., and Mrs. H were having dinner at Mr. H's sister's place. During the dinner, the accused and her husband fought with sending money to his sister in the BC. She told him that they did not have enough money to send to his cancer-stricken sister, because her bank account was frozen. This upset the victim, which was made worse by the alcohol consumed at the dinner. As the arguing got progressively worse, him stating that he was going to kill her multiple times, the accused decided to return home alone. Once home, she went upstairs to her bedroom, planning on going to sleep. The victim returned home, walked up the stairs and entered the accused's bedroom. Normally, to prevent him from touching her, all she had to do was remove the knife from under her pillows and wave it around. On this night, the deceased was not deterred and decided to continue with the assault. He went to her bed, grabbed and pulled her hair, forcing her to get off the bed. He proceeded to punch her. Mrs., H tried to fight him off. During the struggle, the knife entered the husbands' body. He went to lie

down on the couch as the accused was applying pressure on the wound to reduce the bleeding. She then called for an ambulance. The stab wound ended up killing the victim. An expert testified that the stab wound was consistent with that of a struggle.

Questions for R. vs. H. If the question requires a longer answer, please give as much detail as you believe necessary for your answer.

20. Would you charge or acquit the accused in this scenario?

- Charge
- Acquit

If you acquit the accused, you may skip questions 21 and 22 and go directly to question 23.

21. If you would charge the accused, would it be first-degree murder, second-degree murder or manslaughter?

- First-degree murder
- Second-degree murder
- Manslaughter

22. Can you tell me about your rationale for charging the accused?

Answer:

If you did not acquit the accused, you may skip question 23 and go directly to question 24.

23. Why do you believe the accused should be acquitted?

Answer:

24. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with the actual charge of the case and why? In this case, the woman was acquitted.

Strongly Agree Agree Neither agree not disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

25. How much do you think outside factors, whether your education, religion, the way you were raised, or anything may have impacted your decision to charge or acquit the accused?

Answer:

26. What aggravating factors, mitigating factors or other factors of the case influenced your decision and why?

Answer:

R vs. P

The accused is Miss P, who is standing trial for the murder of her common-law husband. She does not have any prior criminal record. On the day of the victim's murder, the couple got into an argument in their own home. P's cousin was present at the time of the incident. Both the accused and the victim were drinking heavily and had consumed marijuana. P was yelling demeaning insults to the victim. The altercation turned physical when the victim grabbed the accused by the neck. The cousin stepped in and told P to go into the kitchen and the husband to go into the bedroom. After some time, the victim came out telling the cousin that P was being mean and unreasonable. Meanwhile, P was listening in on the conversation form the kitchen. She decided to grab a knife that was on the counter. She walked back in the hallway, reached around her cousin and stabbed the victim once in the chest, which ultimately leads to his death. The accused called 911 and remained calm throughout the 45-minute conversation. The victim was pronounced dead at the scene and the accused was arrested.

At the trial, the accused tried to argue that she stabbed her partner in self-defence. She said that she was scared for her life. She claimed that she was a victim of battered women syndrome and that she felt in imminent danger. It should be noted that the victim had many bruises, scars and cuts on his body before his death. The cause of his death was determined to be the stab wound to the chest. The accused also had bruises and cuts on her body. According to friends and family, the couple were abusive to one another. It was a relationship that revolved around mutual verbal and physical abuse, which usually occurred during their frequent arguments. Most of their disputes were about how the victim was still legally married, that he had a sexual relationship with a woman while the victim and accused were separated

(taking a break), and about his jealousy and possessiveness. On the night of the murder, the accused and victim were arguing about a past relationship the victim had with a woman. It was also found that the accused made accusations of what took place that night, that could not be supported. She indicated that the victim threw a mug at her and it hit the wall. No fragments of a mug were found on the ground. She also said that her partner was chasing her and that she feared for her life. Her cousin testified that the victim did not chase her.

Questions for R. vs. P. If the question requires a longer answer, please give as much detail as you believe necessary for your answer.

27. Would you charge or acquit the accused in this scenario?

- Charge
- Acquit

If you acquit the accused, you may skip questions 28 and 29 and go directly to question 30.

28. If you would charge the accused, would it be first-degree murder, second-degree murder or manslaughter?

- First-degree murder
- Second-degree murder
- Manslaughter

29. Can you tell me about your rationale for charging the accused?

Answer:

If you did not acquit the accused, you may skip question 30 and go directly to question 31.

30. Why do you believe the accused should be acquitted?

Answer:

31. Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with the actual charge of the case and why? In this case, the woman was manslaughter.

Strongly Agree Agree Neitehr agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

32. How much do you think outside factors, whether your education, religion, the way you were raised, or anything may have impacted your decision to charge or acquit the accused?

Answer:

33. What aggravating factors, mitigating factors or other factors of the case influenced your decision and why?

Answer:

Information on the participant

34. What is your age?

- Under 18
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65 +

35. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
- Other (Please specify)

36. What program are you in (Major, Honors, Minor, Bachelor, Masters, Ph.D)?

Answer:

37. Year of current enrollment (ex. Second year bachelor student)

Answer:

38. How many years have you been attending University?

Answer:

39. What is your political stance?

- Liberal Conservative
- NDP
- Green Part
- Other (Please Specify)

40. What socioeconomic level best describes your background?

- Lower Class (below 25 000 a year)
- Middle Class (between 25 000 to 75 000 a year)
- Upper Middle Class (between 75 000 to 150 000 a year)
- Upper Class (Above 150 000 a year)

Gender of the participant:

What program is the participant in (major, honours, minor):

On a scale, 1 to 5, is your family more progressive or conservative?

What socioeconomic level best describes your background?

Lower, middle or upper

Level of education of the participant:

A. Undergraduate or Graduate?

B. Year of current enrolment:

C. How many years has the participant attended University?

Appendix 3

IAT Questionnaire

IAT test that will be used: https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/user/agg/blindspot/indexgc.htm

This test is randomly generated every time it is activated. The questions and words that appear on the screen remain the same.

The words used:

Family: garden, kitchen, marriage, laundry, home, children, relatives

Career: office, manager, salary, job, briefcase, profession, employees

Male: man, he, men, him, boy, his, gent

Female: woman, she, women, her, girl, hers, lady

Speed for this test is important. The participant must answer the questions in a timely manner. The accuracy of the tests relies on the speed of the participant. Every time the participant makes a mistake a red x will appear on the screen. The participant will be using the keyboard to relate words to the categories.

There are seven blocks. Each block will have the participant relate words with each other.

The first two blocks are practice runs. They are presently required to have the participant become used to using the keyboard.

The first asks the participants to relate family and career words to each category. Therefore, the program places the words Family and Career in the top corner of the screen and a word will appear at the bottom. The individual must relate the word to the 'correct' category. For example, if the word 'she' appeared, it would be associated with family. If the participant places it with career, that would be considered an error.

The second block asks the participants to relate male and female words to each category. An example would be if the word salary appeared, it should be associated to male.

The third and fourth blocks ask the participants to relate family and female together and male and career together.

The fifth block asks the participants to relate words for career and separate words for family.

The sixth and seventh blocks ask the participants to relate the words for career and female together and to relate the words for family and male together.

Appendix 4

Ambivalent Sexism inventory: https://secure.understandingprejudice.org/asi/

The statements on this page concern women, men, and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement by clicking on the numbered buttons below.

(1) No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(2) Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(3) In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(4) Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(5) Women are too easily offended.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(6) People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(7) Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(8) Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(9) Women should be cherished and protected by men.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(10) Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(11) Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(12) Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(13) Men are complete without women.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(14) Women exaggerate problems they have at work.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(15) Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(16) When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(17) A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(18) There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(19) Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(20) Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(21) Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

(22) Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

Disagree strongly

0

1

2

3

4

5

Agree strongly

Appendix 5

R. vs. M.B.

The female is accused of aggravated assault, criminal negligence causing bodily harm and failing to provide the necessaries of life to her two biological twin daughters. The children are 27 months old (2 years and 3 months). She also has a 4-year-old son. The accused immigrated to Canada with her husband. The three children were born in Canada. She was a stay at home mother, while her husband worked. The accused does not have any prior criminal record. The paramedics were called to the accused house after she called her husband at work informing him that one of their daughters was in trouble. When the paramedics arrived, they called the police after determining that the infant was not breathing. They found both daughters in a car seat in the living room. The paramedics worked on one twin for over an hour and were unable to resuscitate her. She was brought to the hospital and remains in a vegetative state. Medical personnel have gone on record saying that there is no hope in her regaining consciousness. The paramedics indicated that when they arrived, the girls were in an advanced stage of starvation. They were extremely thin and had no fat and were losing muscle mass. In contrast, the male child was very alert and active when the paramedics arrived on scene. He was jumping on a sofa in a playful mood. He was physically healthy and well-nourished. The police checked the kitchen and found there to be enough food to feed a family of 5. It was found that the daughters slept in a room on a bare mattress that smelt of urine while the son slept in his parents' room on his own clean bed. The son had toys, but the two girls did not. There were injuries found on both girls and the mother indicated that they must have fallen down the stairs. She said that she normally uses the couch to block the stairs, but on this occasion, the two 2-year-old girls must have moved the sofa to gain access to the stairs. The

medical professionals expressed that the injuries are inconsistent with her statement. The daughter who was found unconscious was bleeding from her brain due to trauma, which meant that medical intervention was impossible. The second daughter had an incorrectly healed fracture of her upper arm and had bruising on her head and face. She was also unable to hold herself in a standing position.

Appendix 6

R vs. R

The accused, Mrs. R, attempted to take out a contract on her husbands' life in 2008. She approached an individual, who was an undercover cop, to discuss the possibility of killing the victim. The accused was then arrested and charged with counselling to commit murder. She admitted that she did as the Crown prosecution said but raised the defence of duress. She said that she had undergone years of abuse at the hands of her husband and was afraid that he was going to kill her. She revealed that the victim threatened to kill her and their child if she ever attempted to leave him. The accused believed that he was not bluffing and did not think that the police would help her because they would be unable to prevent his actions. She believed this to be true because she has contacted the police several times previously and nothing was done. The accused stated that she thought that she had no other reasonable option except to take a contract on his life.

There were concerns about her statement that she had no other rational choice but to hire a man to murder her husband since, at the time of the incident, they were no longer living together. The emails that the separated couple sent to one another were civil. The accused also had a good job to support herself (she was a teacher), had custody of their child and support from family and friends. The last threat from her husband was a few months before this incident. She says that when they started living together in the summer of 1993, the victim made it clear that he was to be in control of their relationship and that she should be subservient to him. During their relationship, her husband was transferred temporarily to many locations because he was part of the Canadian Armed Forces. During these occasions, she never left. She says that it was because she had a traditional view on marriage, that no matter what,

her vows would come first. The accused also stated that she tried to change her husband by showing him love; love that she thought he was denied as a child. Her husband drank daily and would come home demanding sex. She said that sometimes it was against her will, but she never told him no because she thought that it would be too risky. The accused said that after their daughter was born, the victims' outburst increased and that he had put a gun to her head once. She says that he killed their family dog. The accused also indicated that the victim was cheating on her with a 19-year-old girl. She left him and sought a peace bond, but people told her that it would be useless and at this point she felt as though she had no escape.

Appendix 7

R vs. H

Mrs. H is charged with the murder of her husband, to whom she has been married to for over 35 years and had four children. They got married in Ottawa in 1969 and immigrated to Canada in 1977. The deceased had been physically, verbally and sexually abusing the accused for 35 years. Mrs. H did not sleep in the same room as her husband and always took to sleeping with a knife under her pillow. The husband would sometimes enter her room at night to sexually assault her. During the several years they slept in different rooms, the deceased was deterred only twice. The battered women syndrome defence was used to explain why the accused decided to stay with her abusive and controlling husband. She does not have any prior criminal record.

On the night of the murder, Mr., and Mrs. H were having dinner at Mr. H's sister's place. During the dinner, the accused and her husband fought with sending money to his sister in the BC. She told him that they did not have enough money to send to his cancer-stricken sister, because her bank account was frozen. This upset the victim, which was made worse by the alcohol consumed at the dinner. As the arguing got progressively worse, him stating that he was going to kill her multiple times, the accused decided to return home alone. Once home, she went upstairs to her bedroom, planning on going to sleep. The victim returned home, walked up the stairs and entered the accused's bedroom. Normally, to prevent him from touching her, all she had to do was remove the knife from under her pillows and wave it around. On this night, the deceased was not deterred and decided to continue with the assault. He went to her bed, grabbed and pulled her hair, forcing her to get off the bed. He proceeded to punch her. Mrs., H tried to fight him off. During the struggle, the knife entered the husbands' body. He

went to lie down on the couch as the accused was applying pressure on the wound to reduce the bleeding. She then called for an ambulance. The stab wound ended up killing the victim. An expert testified that the stab wound was consistent with that of a struggle.

Appendix 8

R vs. P

The accused is Miss P, who is standing trial for the murder of her common-law husband. She does not have any prior criminal record. On the day of the victim's murder, the couple got into an argument in their own home. P's cousin was present at the time of the incident. Both the accused and the victim were drinking heavily and had consumed marijuana. P was yelling demeaning insults to the victim. The altercation turned physical when the victim grabbed the accused by the neck. The cousin stepped in and told P to go into the kitchen and the husband to go into the bedroom. After some time, the victim came out telling the cousin that P was being mean and unreasonable. Meanwhile, P was listening in on the conversation form the kitchen. She decided to grab a knife that was on the counter. She walked back in the hallway, reached around her cousin and stabbed the victim once in the chest, which ultimately leads to his death. The accused called 911 and remained calm throughout the 45-minute conversation. The victim was pronounced dead at the scene and the accused was arrested.

At the trial, the accused tried to argue that she stabbed her partner in self-defence. She said that she was scared for her life. She claimed that she was a victim of battered women syndrome and that she felt in imminent danger. It should be noted that the victim had many bruises, scars and cuts on his body before his death. The cause of his death was determined to be the stab wound to the chest. The accused also had bruises and cuts on her body. According to friends and family, the couple were abusive to one another. It was a relationship that revolved around mutual verbal and physical abuse, which usually occurred during their frequent arguments. Most of their disputes were about how the victim was still legally married, that he had a sexual relationship with a woman while the victim and accused were separated

(taking a break), and about his jealousy and possessiveness. On the night of the murder, the accused and victim were arguing about a past relationship the victim had with a woman. It was also found that the accused made accusations of what took place that night, that could not be supported. She indicated that the victim threw a mug at her and it hit the wall. No fragments of a mug were found on the ground. She also said that her partner was chasing her and that she feared for her life. Her cousin testified that the victim did not chase her.