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Abstract

Research on alibis has focused on how the presence of a relationship between an alibi corroborator and a defendant affects how jurors perceive the alibi itself. Some published studies have examined how the relationship between the alibi corroborator and the defendant affects evaluations of the alibi. The extant literature on alibis now warrants investigations of how differences among types of relationships between an alibi corroborator and the accused influence the evaluation of the alibi claim. The first study examined whether alibi evaluations are affected by the length of a romantic relationship between an alibi corroborator and a defendant and by the relationship status (e.g., wife) of the corroborator. Results from this study suggested that experimental manipulations of relationship length and relationship status do not affect mock juror perceptions of the motives of the alibi corroborator to provide false testimony or the believability of the alibi claim itself. The second study examined if major life events that occur during a romantic relationship affect an individual’s willingness to falsely corroborate an alibi for his or her partner. Results suggested that composite ratings of positive and negative stressful life events did not influence an individual’s willingness to provide false alibi corroboration across a variety of scenarios. Relationship satisfaction, investment, commitment, and quality of alternative partners similarly did not predict this fabrication composite score for one partner in a romantic relationship. In combination, the two studies suggest that characteristics of the relationship between an alibi corroborator and the defendant may be overwhelmed by the simple presence of a relationship between the pair.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The nature of romantic relationships changes over time (Impett, Beals, & Peplau, 2001; Rusbult, 1983). A husband and wife may wonder if recent financial turmoil has affected their union. A young couple may ponder if the new addition to the family has strengthened the couple’s relationship or if it has weakened the romantic bond. A teenager may worry that his recent encounter with the law may jeopardize his new relationship, but he is also optimistic that if his relationship survives this turmoil, he and his girlfriend would be closer together than they were before. Fluctuations within a relationship may have important legal implications if that romantic partner is asked to corroborate an alibi in a court of law. Past research demonstrated that jurors are skeptical of alibis corroborated by a girlfriend (Culhane & Hosch, 2004). Experiments have investigated the hypothesis that the skepticism that greets testimony by alibi corroborators with a known relationship to the accused may be due to the perception that the corroborator is motivated to protect the defendant from prosecution (Olson & Wells, 2004). It would follow that changes within the romantic relationship due to external events (e.g., financial difficulty, serious illness) and due to the simple progression of the relationship (e.g., the status given to the romantic relationship) may affect how the relationship between the alibi corroborator and the defendant is perceived and, as a result, how the alibi itself is evaluated. This dissertation investigated how these changes in romantic relationships affect the evaluation of alibis.

1.1 Theoretical Grounding

One social psychological model that attempts to explain how romantic relationships change over time is the Investment Model (Rusbult, 1980a; Rusbult, 1980b). The theoretical skeleton of the Investment Model (Rusbult, 1980a) is Interdependency theory (Kelley, 1979;
Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Interdependency theory maintains that dyadic relationships (e.g., platonic friendships, romantic relationships) are maintained if the individuals are satisfied with the relationship. Each interaction has associated costs ($C_X$) such as time that cannot be recovered for the individual; however, the interaction does produce rewards ($R_X$) such as friendship that help to offset these costs. Repeated interactions between the same individuals allow for each to coordinate his or her behavior in a manner to minimize costs and to maximize rewards similar to how individuals learn through trial and error what topics of conversation are appropriate with new acquaintances.

Satisfaction ($SAT_X$) in a relationship is the result if the ratio of rewards to costs exceeds “…the level of outcomes they believe they deserve from the relationship” (Kelley, 1979, pg. 58). The outcome to which an individual compares the current ratio of rewards to costs is known as the individual’s comparison level (CL). If the ratio of rewards to costs does not exceed an individual’s CL, the individual is considered unsatisfied in the relationship. A woman who was physically abused in past romantic relationships may have such a low comparison level for romantic partners that any nonviolent potential partner may be satisfactory. Conversely, a young man who has broken up with his high school sweetheart may find it unsatisfactory to date other women because few potential partners exceed the comparison level set by his ex-girlfriend.

The satisfaction that an individual derives from a relationship with another person is a function of the costs and rewards associated with their interactions. As a result, the behaviors of one individual in a relationship can profoundly influence the costs and rewards that the other person receives or anticipates receiving (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978). Thibaut and Kelley (1959) described several unique cases in which this happens.
Fate control occurs when the decision of one partner in a relationship provides the other partner with minimal control over the outcome (i.e., costs, rewards) of the interaction. If a girlfriend suddenly chooses to end a relationship with her boyfriend, it becomes extremely difficult for the boyfriend to extract any rewards from that interaction; he cannot avoid the negative costs associated with her decision. Behavioral control occurs when the outcome of an interaction is mutually beneficial to both parties because both parties choose a behavior that maximizes their rewards and minimizes their costs. The interactive effect of both parties choosing the behavior that optimizes individual outcomes is more beneficial to both than if one party had chosen an optimal behavior and the other did not. An employer and an employee both receive the greatest amount of rewards and the fewest costs if the employer’s praise of the employee is taken as genuine and not misinterpreted as sarcasm. An individual’s dependence level is defined as the degree to which one’s positive experiences with another is dependent upon the behavior of the other individual (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Regardless of whether or not two individuals who meet ultimately develop a romantic relationship, each member of the pair initially does not know how to interact with one another. Each person is unaware of which topics of conversation are inappropriate to discuss or which topics of conversation would be engaging for both. Over time, the two may learn how to coordinate their choices of conversation topics such that both can maximize the rewards and minimize the costs associated with engaging in that behavior. Indeed, Kelley noted that, “...[we] are uncomfortable about having our theory described as an ‘exchange’ theory. It is equally a ‘coordination’ theory” (Kelley, 1979). Interdependency theory maintains that a person is thought to be dependent upon another (e.g., a friend, a romantic partner) to the extent to which interacting with that other
person offers an improved opportunity to enhance rewards and limit costs relative to interacting with strangers.

Furthermore, to maximize their rewards and minimize their costs, individuals compare their current romantic relationship not only to the expectations that they have about that relationship, but also to alternative relationships available to them. The comparison level of alternatives (CL\textsubscript{ALT}) is the minimum level of outcomes that can be met in other romantic relationships if the current relationship is abandoned. Other potential relationship partners may offer a greater ratio of rewards to costs for the individual than his or her current partner. An individual may also perceive that being single is a more attractive than remaining in a romantic relationship. Thus, individuals who have a relatively poor quality of alternatives to their current romantic relationship will choose not to leave their present relationship. Those individuals who have a relatively excellent quality of alternatives to their current romantic relationship may consider terminating their present relationship and pursuing these alternatives.

Rusbult (1980a) interpreted interdependency theory to argue that partners in a romantic relationship would be committed to one another if each is satisfied with the relationship and if each has a poor quality of alternative relationship partners; however, Rusbult argued that romantic relationships persist between two individuals because each also invests in the relationship. An investment (I\textsubscript{X}) in a relationship is anything that a partner contributes to it that cannot be recovered if the relationship is terminated. Investments in a relationship may be quantifiable (e.g., gifts, debt), but this is not possible in many cases, such as when couples form precious memories of life events or when one partner emotionally supports the other during a period of hardship (Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008).
Interdependency theory and the theoretical extension offered by Rusbult (1980a) allow for commitment to a romantic relationship to be expressed as a formula. Commitment (COM<sub>X</sub>) to a relationship can be expressed as

\[ \text{COM}_X = ((\text{R}_X - \text{C}_X) - \text{CL}) + \text{I}_X - \text{CL}_{ALT} \]

or simplified to:

\[ \text{COM}_X = \text{SAT}_X + \text{I}_X - \text{CL}_{ALT} \]

where \( \text{COM}_X \) represents commitment to a relationship, \( \text{R}_X \) represents rewards obtained in the relationship, \( \text{C}_X \) represents costs incurred in the relationship, \( \text{CL} \) represents the individual’s comparison level for that person’s ratio of relationship rewards to costs, \( \text{I}_X \) represents investment levels in the relationship, and \( \text{CL}_{ALT} \) represents the comparison level for alternative relationships. Through conceptualizing romantic commitment as being a function of not only an individual’s satisfaction and quality of alternatives, but also of his or her investment in the relationship, Rusbult (1980a) formed the basis of the Investment Model. The Investment Model therefore predicts that commitment to a romantic relationship is maximized if a person is highly satisfied with the relationship and highly invested in it while concurrently lacking attractive alternatives to his or her current partner. Commitment to a romantic relationship is theorized to be least if the individual is neither satisfied with nor invested in his or her relationship while attractive alternatives to this current relationship partner are available.

Research on the Investment Model spans nearly three decades. A recent meta-analysis of the associations between the theoretical constructs of the model reported 39 publications on the topic in addition to 13 unpublished theses, dissertations, or data sets (Le & Agnew, 2003). Operational definitions of Investment Model constructs (Rusbult, 1980a) allow researchers to make specific predictions about the relationships between satisfaction, investment, quality of
alternatives, and commitment. Clear and consistent evidence of the utility of the Investment Model emerged in the meta-analysis. The meta-analysis revealed moderate, positive associations between both satisfaction and commitment and investment and commitment. Individuals who are pleased with a relationship and who continue to contribute to it find that they are more committed to this relationship. Conversely, those who find themselves with an increasing appealing quality of alternative relationship partners have lower commitment to their romantic relationship, as evidenced by the moderate, negative correlation between the two constructs. The authors noted that the Investment Model could be used to explain commitment outside of the domain of romantic relationships, although the strength of association between the constructs of the model is weakened in these domains (Le & Agnew, 2003). Koslowsky and Kluger (1986) altered Investment Model constructs with the goal of understanding why Israeli musicians remain committed to their hobby. Seeking answers to applied questions, researchers (Oliver, 1990; Rusbult & Farrell, 1983) reconceptualized Investment Model constructs in an effort to understand why employees remain committed to their job. Putnam et al. (1994) attempted to explain why individuals adhere (or fail to adhere) to medication. Given that the Investment Model can be applied to different domains and that it is most successful in explaining romantic relationships (Le & Agnew, 2003), it follows that the model may be appropriate to consider in investigating how jurors evaluated the relationship between a criminal defendant and his or her alibi corroborator.

1.2 Alibis

Black’s Law Dictionary (2004, pg. 79) defines an alibi as “[a] defense based on the physical impossibility of a defendant’s guilt by placing the defendant in a location other than the scene of the crime at the relevant time.” In layman’s terms, an alibi is a legal defense in which
the accused claims that he or she could not have committed a crime because it would be
temporally impossible for the person to be the perpetrator. If a murder occurred in Ciudad
Juarez, Chihuahua, and the suspect was able to prove that he was at work in El Paso at the time
of the murder, he would be able to eliminate himself from the police’s pool of criminal suspects.
While an alibi may remain a simple claim that the person was elsewhere (e.g., “I was asleep
when the murder was committed.”), independent corroboration of the alibi may be critical if the
individual is to avoid criminal prosecution.

Physical evidence can be used to corroborate an individual’s alibi. If a suspect’s alibi
was that she was at an electronics store when the crime under investigation occurred, there may
be security camera footage of her shopping. Alternatively, she may have a receipt for the
electronics that she purchased. In order to substantiate the suspect’s alibi, the physical evidence
ought to be either time or date-stamped. Alibi corroboration may come from an individual who
was with the accused at the time of the crime (e.g., “We were playing a round of golf.”). The
fact-finder (e.g., police office, judge, jury) is responsible for evaluating the veracity of this claim
and any accompanying physical evidence. Having an alibi is not a failsafe protection against
the possibility of criminal prosecution; evidence may yet emerge that further implicates the
suspect in the crime.

Empirical investigations of alibis remain rare (Burke, 2003); indeed, base rate data does
not exist on the identity of the alibi corroborator and his or her relationship to the accused. Until
recently (Culhane & Hosch, 2004; Olson & Wells, 2004), alibis were not the primary focus of
experimental psychologists. Alibis first appeared in the detection of deception literature. In
their investigation of how individuals interpret nonverbal behavior, Hemsley and Doob (1978)
showed mock jurors a videotape in which an alibi witness either displayed gaze aversion or gaze
maintenance as he corroborated the defendant’s claim that the pair of them was watching a hockey game when a robbery took place. Other experiments required that participants either fabricate an alibi by themselves (Porter & Yuille, 1996) or in tandem with another participant (Granhang, Stromwell, & Jonsson, 2003). Porter and Yuille (1996) reported a prototypical deception detection experiment that incorporated alibis. Participants were randomly assigned to either retrieve a folder from a professor’s office or to ‘test’ the newly hired Psychology Department security guard by taking a $100 bill from the office. Upon completion of their task, all participants were informed that they would be interrogated about their mission and were given 15 minutes to prepare a mental account for their whereabouts. Participants were informed that they would receive a small incentive if they were able to convince the interrogator that their statement was honest. In the innocuous task condition (i.e., retrieval of the folder), participants were instructed to provide an honest account of their activity. In the mock crime condition, participants were instructed to either confess fully to the crime, be partially deceptive (i.e., explain that they were to retrieve a folder), or be fully deceptive (i.e., create an alibi for the time during which the mock crime occurred). All interviews were video and audiotaped (Porter & Yuille, 1996).

Porter and Yuille introduced three methodological innovations that would be featured in later alibi deception detection work. First, they created experimental conditions that required that some participants provide a partially or a completely false alibi. Second, the interrogations in which these alibis were provided were recorded. Third, the participant was provided with time in which to create the claim. Other deception detection researchers would expand upon these methodological advances. Granhang, Stromwell, and Jonsson (2003) randomly assigned pairs of participants to either receive a free lunch as a part of the experiment; remaining pairs did
not have this free lunch. If the pair received a free meal, each member of the pair was interrogated twice about their time together. If the pair did not receive a free meal, each was given 30 minutes in which to create a coherent claim about this lunch and then the pair was divided so that each member could be interrogated twice about their alibi. All interrogations were structured and videotaped. Independent observers coded all taped interrogations. Truthful alibis and fabricated alibis were both rated as being equally consistent across time; furthermore, there were no differences between truth-tellers and liars on the number of omissions or contradictions made by participants in their statements.

The spread of alibis within the deception detection literature and their occasional appearance in eyewitness identification studies (Greene & Loftus, 1984; Leippe, 1985) foreshadowed the first true experiments conducted on these claims of innocence. Olson and Wells (2004) constructed an alibi taxonomy to guide research on the topic. Alibis were theorized to vary on a continuum of ease with which they can be fabricated. A third-party may modify or concoct a claim that supports what has been told to law enforcement personnel.

Finer distinctions were drawn between potential alibi corroborators not only for the depth of motivation of the person to fabricate alibi testimony, but also on the ability of the individual to identify the suspect or defendant. If an individual is unable to identify the suspect or defendant as a person that he or she saw at a specified time and location, any subsequent testimony is moot. Thus, while there would little motivation for a stranger to fabricate an alibi for another person, the corroborator may nonetheless err in his or her identification. Motivated and non-motivated familiar others were thought to be able to identify the suspect or defendant. Motivated familiar others (e.g., mothers, romantic partners) were thought to be more willing to fabricate testimony to protect the family member or acquaintance while non-motivated familiar others (e.g.,
neighbors) would lack that inclination. The researchers proposed that an alibi is only effective in the degree to which others believe the claim. An alibi that is supported by a non-credible corroborator would not be an effective defense to a criminal charge.

Evidence supported the hypothesized structure of the alibi taxonomy (Olson & Wells, 2004). In the absence of physical evidence, alibis that were provided by non-motivated strangers were considered to be more believable than alibis that were provided by motivated familiar others or non-motivated familiar others. The testimony of any alibi corroborator, regardless of the identity of the individual, produced greater ratings of alibi believability in comparison to conditions in which there was no testimony. As predicted, ratings of alibi believability were greater in conditions in which there was difficult-to-fabricate physical evidence than in conditions in which there was no physical evidence. Contrary to the expectations of Olson and Wells, alibi believability did not vary if the relationship of the alibi corroborator to the accused was manipulated across conditions in which either easy or difficult-to-fabricate evidence was present.

Other researchers have reported evidence that supported the distinctions that were drawn between the different types of alibi corroborators by Olson and Wells (2004). One study examined how mock jurors interpret both incriminating and exculpatory eyewitness testimony (McAllister & Bregman, 1989). Participants read a trial summary in which an alibi witness either testified that he was with the defendant at the time in question, that he was not with the defendant at the time in question, or that his intoxication at the time at the time in question would not allow him to make an identification. Conviction rates were greater in conditions in which the alibi witness testified that he was not with the defendant and in conditions in which he was unable to provide any type of identification. A positive identification of the defendant by a
prosecution witness, coupled with testimony from the alibi corroborator that he and the
defendant were not together at the time in question, produced the greatest conviction rates
(McAllister & Bregman, 1989).

In another study, participants were asked to read a trial summary and to render a verdict
on the case; the relationship between the defendant and the alibi corroborator and the confidence
of the alibi witness in her testimony were manipulated between subjects. An interaction was
found between these two variables such that a positive identification of the suspect by either the
defendant’s girlfriend or his neighbor decreased conviction rates relative to conditions in which
the identification was ambiguous or non-existent (Culhane & Hosch, 2004). When mock jurors
have been asked to explain their verdicts, they have cited the legal ramifications for those who
falsify alibi testimony and have weighed the testimony of both pro-prosecution and pro-defense
eyewitnesses (Greene & Loftus, 1984). As Olson and Wells (2004) proposed, the ability of an
alibi witness to accurately identify whom he or she was with at a particular time is critical if the
alibi is to be believed. Both Culhane and Hosch (2004) and McAllister and Bregman (1989)
reported evidence to support this claim.

Furthermore, when a motivated familiar other (i.e., a girlfriend) provided alibi testimony,
verdict rates did not differ from verdict rates when there was no alibi corroboration (Culhane &
Hosch, 2004). This finding replicated the results of an earlier eyewitness identification study
(McAllister & Bregman, 1989). Lindsay and his colleagues found that conviction rates did not
differ between conditions in which a brother-in-law provided alibi testimony and when there was
no alibi testimony whatsoever (Lindsay, Lim, Marando, & Cully, 1986). Clearly, the relationship
of the alibi corroborator to the accused affects not only how the alibi is evaluated (Olson &
Recognizing the importance of the relationship between the alibi corroborator and the defendant, researchers have attempted to explain the skepticism of jurors towards alibis corroborated by relatives with kinship theory (Hosch, Culhane, Jolly, Chavez, & Shaw, in press). Hamilton (1963) argued that an individual would be willing to perform an altruistic act on behalf of a relative if the benefits of that act exceed the costs that the actor assumes in performing that behavior. The likelihood of an altruistic act increases as the genetic relatedness between two people increases. Thus, an actor is more likely to engage in an altruistic act to the extent that it increases the likelihood that his or her genes are passed on to future generations (Hamilton, 1964). The proportion of genes that two related people share is known, allowing for predictions about how a person will behave towards a relative. As the genetic distance between two people increases, the proportion of genes that the pair share decreases. Children share half of their genes with their father and half with their mother; siblings conceived from the same parents share 50% of their genes. Children share only 25% of their genes with a paternal grandparent, however. Kinship theory may be particularly salient in the study of alibis because if an individual puts him or herself at risk of criminal prosecution by choosing to concoct or substantiate an alibi that is not true, that person is engaging in an altruistic act. If the penalty for perjury is the same regardless of the identity of the recipient of the false testimony, kinship theory predicts that a person would attempt to maximize the likelihood that his or her genes are passed on by lying for close (e.g., children) rather than distant (e.g., cousins) relatives. Jurors may be wary of alibis provided by close relatives because the same altruistic act (i.e., fabricating
an alibi) could benefit the corroborator more by being offered to protect a more genetically similar relative.

Alibi research has featured corroboration from individuals with no genetic connection (i.e., brother-in-law, girlfriend) to the defendant (Culhane & Hosch, 2004; McAllister & Bregman, 1989). As it was originally formulated, kinship theory could only offer predictions on altruistic acts performed by relatives (Hamilton, 1963; Hamilton, 1964); Trivers (1971) would expand kinship theory by proposing that reciprocal altruism could explain why an individual would perform an altruistic act for an unrelated person; individuals who had received an act of altruism would be obligated to return the favor or face societal disapproval. Among the factors that were theorized to influence an individual’s decision on whether or not to behave altruistically towards non-kin was the length of the recipient’s remaining life, the likelihood that the two would encounter each other again, and the degree to which the pair are mutually dependent upon each other (Trivers, 1971).

A girlfriend may provide false testimony in court because she believes that her partner would live long enough or see her frequently enough to reimburse her for her risk. Indeed, some have argued that reciprocal altruism developed in part to satisfy an organism’s need to differentiate those that aided it in the past and those that did not (Axelrod & Hamilton, 1981). Alternatively, the girlfriend may recognize that she is dependent upon her partner in fulfilling day-to-day demands (e.g., paying the rent, raising the children) and would behave altruistically because the two are reliant upon each other for survival. Jurors may consider these hypothetical situations when evaluating the testimony of non-kin (Hosch et al., in press). Consequently, even though alibi corroborators are not genetically related to a defendant, their relationship to the accused may be sufficient to introduce skepticism to any testimony that they provide.
1.3 Changes in Close Relationships

The taxonomy of Olson and Wells (2004) was static and did not address the possibility that changes in the classification of an alibi corroborator could occur. A non-motivated stranger may become a non-motivated familiar other, who may in turn transform into a motivated familiar other. A newly hired barista may initially not be able to distinguish one customer from another at a coffee shop. Over time, he slowly becomes able to recognize regular customers and to anticipate their orders. The barista may develop relationships with some of the customers, platonic or otherwise. Romantic relationships may follow a similar developmental trajectory: a man will first introduce himself to a woman and then later form a friendship with her that may form the basis for a romantic relationship. Two questions that are left unanswered by the Olson and Wells (2004) taxonomy are these: Relationship length being equal, is an alibi that is corroborated by an individual’s girlfriend equal in its impact on jurors as that of an individual’s wife? Do the occurrence of particular major life events, many of which have implications for a couple’s romantic relationship, affect how a person will approach the possibility of falsely corroborating his or her partner’s alibi?

According to Interdependency Theory, the costs and rewards of being in a relationship vary over time; more attractive alternative relationship partners may or may not appear. The passage of time also allows for each relationship partner to invest more into the relationship. Thus, if the Investment Model adequately describes the fluctuating nature of romantic relationships, changes in the theoretical constructs of the model should be observed over time. In a longitudinal study, Rusbult (1983) recruited 30 heterosexuals who were currently in a dating relationship. Relationship questionnaires were sent to each participant approximately twice per month for six months. Each relationship questionnaire contained questions measuring
relationship costs, rewards, investment, and alternatives to the current relationship. At the end of the data collection period, 10 participant relationships had ended. As the Investment Model predicts, rewards, costs, satisfaction, investment, and commitment increased over the course of the study. The quality of alternative relationship partners decreased over the course of the study. While this pattern held for those remained in their relationship during the data collection period, it was different for those who chose to end the relationship and for those whose relationship was ended for them. Commitment was found to mediate the decision of staying in or leaving the relationship (Rusbult, 1983).

Impett, Beals, and Peplau (2001) added to the generalizability of Rusbult’s (1983) findings by studying how Investment Model constructs changed across time in a sample of married couples. The authors proposed that a married couple’s relationship stability could be predicted by the indirect effect of Investment Model constructs through commitment for both the husband and the wife. Over 3,600 husbands and wives independently completed 40 page questionnaires about their romantic relationship at the start of the study and at the termination of the study 18 months later. The results of the study supported the structure of the Investment Model. Satisfaction, investment, and quality of alternatives were found to predict commitment for both husbands and wives and that the commitment that each had to each other in their marriage predicted whether or not the couple remained together. As hypothesized, the model was an excellent fit of the data.

While some researchers (Impett, Beals, & Peplau, 2001; Rusbult, 1983) have analyzed the progression of all Investment Model constructs over time, Arriaga (2001) focused exclusively on how relationship satisfaction changes during a relationship. Conventional thought maintained that satisfaction follows a linear pattern as romantic relationships develop; no
research had examined whether satisfaction could be described as a linear function with sudden drops or if it could be characterized by repeated fluctuations above and below a set point. The author replicated the findings of Rusbult (1983) that ratings of satisfaction with a romantic relationship is associated with the outcome of the relationship and that those who break up with their partner and those who are broken up with display different ratings of satisfaction than those who persist in the relationship. Arriaga (2001) found evidence of a relationship between the number of fluctuations in romantic satisfaction across the 10 weeks of the longitudinal study and the outcome of the romantic relationship. The number of fluctuations in satisfaction influenced the outcome of the romantic relationship above and beyond the effects of satisfaction; however, this effect was most pronounced for those individuals whose ratings of satisfaction were greater or whose satisfaction trended upwards.

Unlike Arriaga (2001), Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) focused exclusively on the concept of investment in the romantic relationship. According to the pair of researchers, investment in a romantic relationship can be tangible, as when a boyfriend buys jewelry for his girlfriend, or intangible, as when a girlfriend reveals her fears to her boyfriend. A distinction also was drawn between past investment, or investment that has already taken place in a relationship and planned investment, or investment that will take place in the relationship in the future. Until this distinction was made, research on the Investment Model relied exclusively upon Rusbult’s (1980a) conception of the construct. Initially, Rusbult (1980a) proposed a conception of investment in a romantic relationship that was analogous to the psychological concept of sunk costs (Arkes & Blumer, 1985; Garland, 1990; Moon, 2001), or the tendency of people to increase their commitment to a behavior or a project given that resources have already been devoted to it. In contrast, planned investment is thought to force couples to become more
committed to their relationship because the termination of the relationship cancels future plans that the couple has made (e.g., home ownership). In an eight-month longitudinal study investigating the four different types of investment, Goodfriend and Agnew (2008) reported that planned intangible investments emerged as the strongest predictor of commitment to the relationship; this finding replicated the results of a cross-sectional study. As hypothesized, both past and planned investment predicted the ultimate outcome of the relationship.

The changes observed in Investment Model constructs over time (Arriaga, 2001; Rusbult, 1983; Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008) may be the result of significant events that occurred in the couple’s relationship (e.g., engagement). Consistent with Goodfriend and Agnew’s (2008) conception of investment, significant events may yet occur in a relationship and these events can spur tangible (e.g., purchasing gifts at Christmas) and intangible (e.g., disclosing romantic feelings on an anniversary) investment in the relationship. The Social Readjustment Rating Scale (SRRS) is one instrument that can be used to gauge the number of significant life events and also to ascertain the degree to which one must change to accommodate that event (Holmes & Rahe, 1967). The SRRS was originally designed to measure the intensity and duration of coping that were thought to be necessary for a person to adjust to the major life event. Holmes and Rahe (1967) provided 394 participants with a list of 43 major life events (e.g., death of a close friend, change in sleeping habits); one event, marriage, was assigned the arbitrary value of 500. Participants then assigned values to the remaining major life events on the basis of whether they felt that more or less adjustment was necessary relative to the anchor value provided for marriage. The values assigned to these major life events were then averaged and then divided by ten to arrive at a relative weight, or life change unit (LCU; Casey, Masuda, & Holmes, 1967) for the event. When ordered by weight, the events that required the greatest
amount of readjustment for a person were those associated with marriage (i.e., death of a spouse, divorce, marital separation); however, events common to all individuals (e.g., change in financial state, change in health of a family member) were found to require significant life adjustment (Holmes & Rahe, 1967). Further analysis of the calculated weights for the subjective reports of necessary adjustment revealed that the events fit a ratio scale; as a consequence, the use of parametric statistics on the SRRS was appropriate (Masuda & Holmes, 1967).

Hobson et al. (1998) reported that the SRRS (Holmes & Rahe, 1967) has become a staple in research on the effects of stress on illness. Some researchers (Hobson et al., 1998) have attempted to revise the SRRS by adding new life events (e.g., surviving a disaster) despite the large influence of the original measure. In the nearly 40 years of research that have followed the publication of the SRRS, attempts have been made to recalibrate the weights of the serious life events (Birnbaum & Sotoodeh, 1991) or to find alternative methods of scoring the SRRS (McGrath & Burkhart, 1983). Crandell (2006) demonstrated that the original weighting of life events was sufficient. A recent study questioned this assumption by presenting evidence that 14 of the 43 items in the original SRRS changed rank-order position from 1967 by at least five positions; however, the authors came to the conclusion that the SRRS remained a valuable measurement instruments (Scully, Tosi, & Banning, 2000).

1.4 The Current Studies

Encountering significant life events and coping with them in a romantic relationship may significantly alter the nature and trajectory of that relationship. A boyfriend who loses his job may not be able to support the lifestyle that he and his girlfriend share. As a result of his failure to provide, the girlfriend may be tempted to pursue alternative romantic partners than her current boyfriend; consequently, she may be less likely to falsely corroborate his alibi should that
situation ever arise. Alternatively, a boyfriend may express his commitment to his girlfriend by purchasing her a ring. By transitioning from ‘boyfriend’ to ‘fiancé’, the young man may find that jurors become more skeptical of alibi corroboration offered by his significant other as a result of marriage proposal. From these and other hypothetical examples, it is reasonable to suggest that significant life events that occur during a couple’s romantic relationship may ultimately shape how jurors evaluate an alibi that is corroborated by one of these individuals. 

The proposed studies investigate how major changes within a romantic relationship affect the evaluation of an alibi. The second study seeks to determine if and how the occurrence of major life events in the course of a romantic relationship affect an individual’s willingness to fabricate an alibi for his or her partner.
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No research has examined differences within the same romantic relationship. If the same romantic relationship is given a label that reflects a closer romantic bond, an alibi corroborator may be treated with greater skepticism. Similarly, an individual may be critical of an alibi that is offered by a corroborator who has a longer romantic history with a defendant. The first study is a between subjects study that seeks to determine if qualitative changes to the social status attached to a romantic couple and the length of their romantic relationship affect ratings of alibi believability and the likelihood that the alibi corroborator will falsely corroborate the claim. Increasing the depth and the length of the romantic relationship between the accused and the alibi corroborator may be indicative of escalating investment in the relationship; hence, evaluations of the alibi will differ across experimental conditions.

2.1 Hypotheses

Three primary hypotheses were advanced for the first study:

1. A main effect was hypothesized such that as the alibi corroborator’s relationship status increasingly reflects a closer romantic attachment to the accused, participants would provide higher ratings of the likelihood that she would falsely corroborate the alibi. Ratings of alibi believability would be low in these conditions.

2. A main effect was hypothesized such that as the alibi corroborator’s relationship is portrayed to be longer, participants would provide the highest ratings of the likelihood that she would falsely corroborate the alibi. Ratings of alibi believability would be lowest in these conditions.
3. It was hypothesized that the experimental condition in which the alibi corroborator was the accused’s wife and that their romantic relationship was two years old would be the condition in which participants would provide the greatest ratings of the likelihood of false testimony from the corroborator and the lowest ratings of the believability of the claim.
Chapter 3: Experiment 1 Methods

3.1 Participants

Power analysis revealed that a medium effect size ($\eta^2 = .06$) for both proposed main effects with an $\alpha = .05$ would require 28 participants per experimental cell to achieve a power of .80 (Cohen, 1988). Given that the experiment featured 8 experimental cells, participants would be 230 University of Texas at El Paso undergraduates in order to achieve that statistical power. A total of 419 participants enrolled in the study; however, the hypotheses that were proposed involved only data collected in the six experimental conditions in which an alibi corroborator had a known romantic relationship with the accused. Participant data was excluded from the analysis if he or she failed one or more experimental manipulation checks. To be included in the analysis, the participant must have provided the correct name of the defendant and the crime with which he was charged, indicated that the defendant had an alibi claim, identified the relationship of the alibi corroborator to the defendant, and reported that no physical evidence supported the alibi claim.

Thus, all subsequent analyses feature data collected from 273 participants. These participants were, on average, 21.40 years of age ($SD = 5.29$) and 78.0% self-identified as being Hispanic American. Most participants (67.0%) were female. All participants were jury-eligible. In the state of Texas, an individual is jury-eligible if he or she is above the age of 17 and possesses either a valid driver’s license or voter registration card. Every participant was at least 18 years of age. Almost every participant (97.1%) reported possessing a valid driver’s license and most (66.3%) indicated that he or she was a registered voter.
3.2 Design

The experiment featured a 3 (alibi corroborator romantic relationship status: dating, engaged, married) X 2 (length of alibi corroborator romantic relationship: two months, two years) between subjects design. Two additional experimental conditions served as comparison conditions. One experimental condition featured an unmotivated familiar other (e.g., a waitress at a restaurant) as an alibi corroborator (Olson & Wells, 2004). The other featured no alibi corroborator. Thus, the experiment consisted of a total of 8 experimental conditions to which a participant could be randomly assigned.

The status that described the romantic relationship between the defendant and the alibi corroborator was manipulated between subjects. Each trial summary featured the personal testimony of an alibi corroborator who is the romantic partner of the defendant. The content of the trial summary did not vary across experimental conditions; however, the status that described the relationship of the alibi corroborator to the defendant did systematically vary. The alibi corroborator described herself either as dating the accused, engaged to the accused, or married to the accused. Other participants in the trial scenario (e.g., the accused, the prosecutor) referred to the alibi corroborator by the label with which she described herself. This status was used to identify the alibi corroborator multiple times in the trial summary.

The length of the romantic relationship between defendant and the alibi corroborator was manipulated between subjects. The relationship between the defendant and the accused was either described as being two-months-old or two-years-old.

3.3 Materials

After the administration of the informed consent document (see Appendix A), the first experimental form (see Appendix B) that participants encountered was a sheet that listed the
instructions for the experiment. The instructions contained on the sheet were the same information that the researcher explained to the participants at the start of the experiment. Additionally, contact information for the University Counseling Center was listed should participants report psychological discomfort during the experiment.

Each participant completed a voir dire form (see Appendix C). The voir dire form contained questions designed to elicit demographic information from the participant. Some of these questions were designed to determine if the participant was eligible to serve on a jury in the State of Texas (i.e., possession of a valid driver’s license). Other questions were used to determine the extent to which the participant has had contact with the legal community (i.e., if he or she has ever been the victim of a crime).

Each participant viewed a four-and-a-half page trial summary that had been constructed for the proposed experiment. The trial summary contained a depiction of an aggravated assault at an El Paso gas station and the subsequent criminal investigation. A suspect who matched the description of the perpetrator by the victim is apprehended and questioned by the police. The suspect provided an alibi that he was with his current romantic partner at the time at which the crime was alleged to have occurred. When physical evidence linking the defendant to the crime emerges and a positive identification of the suspect is made from a simultaneous lineup, the suspect is arrested and charged. During the trial, the defendant and the victim provided testimony; the experimental manipulation of relationship status and relationship length was manipulated in the appropriate conditions in which an alibi corroborator testified that she and the defendant were together at the time of the crime. As an example, the trial summary that featured the testimony of an alibi corroborator engaged to the accused for two months is provided (see Appendix D). Throughout the trial, the prosecution stressed the importance of the
positive identification of the defendant, the physical evidence tying the defendant to the crime scene, and the nature of the romantic relationship between the accused and the alibi corroborator necessitating her fabricating her testimony. The defense downplayed the physical evidence tying the accused to the crime scene and introduced concerns about the reliability of the identification made by the victim; the testimony of the alibi corroborator was argued to demonstrate that the defendant could not have been the person responsible for the aggravated assault. The trial summary of the comparison condition in which the alibi corroborator was an unmotivated familiar (see Appendix E) other featured the testimony of a waitress at a bar who has no romantic relationship to the accused; thus, there was no mention of relationship length. Having an alibi corroborator who was an unmotivated familiar other also necessitated minor changes to the content of the defendant’s alibi (i.e., the waitress saw the defendant leave by himself).

To ensure that any findings that emerged between the condition in which the alibi corroborator is the waitress and the conditions in which the alibi corroborator has a known relationship to the accused are not due to the ability to positively identify the accused, the waitress was described as having gone to high school with the accused. The trial summary of the comparison condition in which no alibi corroboration was available (see Appendix F) matches the trial summary of the other experimental conditions; however, there was no alibi corroborator and thus no mention of the length of the relationship between the alibi corroborator and the defendant. Having no alibi corroborator also necessitated minor changes to the content of the defendant’s alibi (i.e., he went to the bar alone). The trial summary was successfully piloted tested to ensure that there was an approximately 50% conviction rate.
The dependent measures form (see Appendix G) that was featured in all conditions in which there is an alibi corroborator contained a series of questions about the trial summary that participants read. A set of multiple-choice questions focused on the content of the criminal trial (e.g., “What was the crime that took place?”, “Who corroborated the defendant’s alibi?”). The failure to correctly answer these questions resulted in the participant’s data being excluded from statistical analyses on the grounds that the participant did not sufficiently read or understand the trial summary. The remaining self-report and Likert-type questions focused on the perceptions of the defendant, the alibi corroborator, and the alibi itself. The primary dependent variables in the research were the likelihood that the defendant’s romantic partner provided false alibi testimony and the believability of the alibi claim. The first dependent variable was measured with the question, “In your opinion, how likely was it that the alibi witness provided false testimony to protect the defendant?” Participants indicated a percentage from 0 to 100 to indicate the likelihood with which they believed the alibi corroborator concocted false testimony on behalf of the defendant. The second dependent variable measured alibi believability with the question, “How believable was the defendant’s claim that he was at a bar at the time during which the crime occurred?” This dependent variable was measured on a 9-point Likert-type scale with 0 corresponding to “Completely unbelievable” and 8 corresponding to “Completely believable.”

Participants in the experimental condition that did not feature an alibi corroborator completed a dependent measures form (see Appendix H) that was modeled after the one used in all other experimental conditions (see Appendix G). The first twelve items on both forms are identical; however, the question that measures the likelihood that the alibi witness would provide false testimony on behalf of the defendant was omitted because this experimental condition did not feature an alibi corroborator. All Likert-type scale questions that measured perceptions of
the testimony of the alibi corroborator were also dropped. The form asked participants to imagine that certain individuals (e.g., a waitress, the defendant’s girlfriend) provided alibi testimony for the accused; subsequent questions gauged how the participant would view the motives of each alibi corroborator. When the participant was asked to assume that the alibi corroborator is in a romantic relationship with the accused, each question was answered under the assumption that that relationship is either two months or two years old.

Each participant viewed a form (see Appendix I) that contained the criteria that must be established beyond a reasonable doubt in order for the defendant to be found guilty. These criteria have been established in the Texas Penal Code. A verdict form (see Appendix J) followed, allowing the participant to render a verdict on the preceding case and to recommend a punishment commensurate with the felony level of the criminal offense, if appropriate; the boundaries on the number of years in jail and the optional fine with which the participant can sentence a guilty defendant are consistent with Texas Penal Law.

Finally, each participant completed the Social Readjustment Rating Scale (SRRS; Holmes & Rahe, 1967). The Social Readjustment Rating Scale was developed to quantify the impact of particular life events on individuals. The participant followed the instructions for completing the form that were reported by Holmes and Rahe (1967). The SRRS form listed 43 major life events and participants were provided with an arbitrary value of 500 for the first major life event, marriage. Values were assigned for the events to the degree to which the participant believed that the event required more or less readjustment relative to the value assigned to marriage. Life events listed on the Social Readjustment Rating Scale are not uniformly negative (e.g., death of a close friend) and as such reflect the need for the individual to make adjustments in his or her life to accommodate that event. Thus, life events include noteworthy
accomplishments (e.g., outstanding personal achievement) and lifestyle changes (e.g., change in responsibilities at work) (Holmes & Rahe, 1967). Weights are assigned to each life event by averaging the values for each event and dividing by 10. Events that are given higher weights are thought to require more readjustment by an individual to cope with the event. These derived weights are also known as life change units, or LCU (Casey, Masuda, & Holmes, 1967). The magnitudes of the weights of life events listed in the scale have been demonstrated to be temporally stable across two year time periods for psychologically healthy adults (Gerst et al., 1978).

The form (see Appendix K) that participants completed was an exact duplicate of that used by Holmes and Rahe (1967); however, minor changes to the experimental form were necessary due to changes in the economy and the demographics of the workplace that have occurred since the publication of the instrument. Scully, Tosi, and Banning (2000) changed the wording on two life events to convert monetary values of $10,000 in 1967 to $51,000, or the equivalent monetary value for when the study took place. One life event was reworded so that a “wife beginning or ceasing work outside the home” read, “spouse beginning or ceasing work outside the home,” to reflect changing demographics in the workforce. These changes were featured on the form that participants completed.

### 3.4 Procedure

All data collection occurred online using Survey Monkey™ software. Upon registering for the experiment, participants were provided with a link to the Survey Monkey™ website containing all experimental material. Prior to this registration, the description for the experiment informed participants that they would be serving as mock jurors. The first experimental form that each participant viewed upon accessing the experiment was the informed...
consent document. Each participant completed the informed consent document if they were willing to participate in the experiment.

Participants first read an information sheet containing experimental instructions and an acknowledgement that the case they were about to read featured a crime that occurred in Van Horn, Texas. The participants then read the trial summary. After reading the trial summary, the participant completed the dependent measures form. Following the completion of the dependent measures form, participants read a form that contained the criteria that must be established beyond a reasonable doubt in order for the defendant to be found guilty. The participants then rendered individual verdicts on the trial summary and provided sentences if the defendant was found guilty.

Having completed all the dependent measures forms for Study 1, participants were instructed to complete the modified SRRS form. When all experimental forms have been completed, the participant was fully debriefed and thanked for his or her participation.

Data collected on the modified SRRS form was not analyzed in connection with any of the hypotheses proposed in Study 1. Weights were derived from these data because previous research has relied upon samples that are not representative of a predominantly Hispanic community. Only 124, or 4%, of the 3122 participants in Hobson et al.’s (1998) revision of the SRRS self-identified as Hispanic-American. Indeed, no Hispanic-American respondents were included in the development of the original SRRS life event weights (Holmes & Rahe, 1967). To ensure that SRRS life events are weighted appropriately for the predominantly Hispanic-American sample that participated in Study 2, data obtained from the modified SRRS form in Study 1 were used to derive life event weights for the sample participants in Study 2. These data will be described in Study 2.
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4.1 Verdict Rates

Approximately half (51.4%) of all participants rendered a guilty verdict against the defendant. Across experimental conditions featuring the testimony of an alibi corroborator with a known relationship to the accused, there was no statistically significant main effect of alibi corroborator relationship type upon verdict rate, $F(2, 231) = .10, p = .909, \eta^2 = .00$, and there was no statistically significant main effect of relationship length upon verdict rate, $F(1, 226) = .29, p = .588, \eta^2 = .01$. There was no statistically significant interaction between relationship type and relationship length upon verdict rate, $F(2, 231) = .13, p = .875, \eta^2 = .00$. When the romantic relationship manipulations were collapsed across conditions and compared against the condition in which there was an alibi corroborator with no romantic ties to the accused and the condition in which there was no alibi corroborator, no statistically significant differences emerged, $F(2, 269) = 1.00, p = .371, \eta^2 = .01$.

4.2 Sentencing

Across all experimental conditions, guilty defendants were sentenced to an average of 6.74 ($SD = 4.23$) years in prison. There were no statistically significant main effects of alibi corroborator relationship, $F(2, 124) = .89, p = .414, \eta^2 = .01$, or relationship length, $F(1, 124) = .35, p = .345, \eta^2 = .01$, on this variable. There was no statistically significant interaction between the two variables, $F(2, 124) = .93, p = .396, \eta^2 = .02$. When the romantic relationship manipulations were collapsed across conditions and were compared against the condition in which there was an alibi corroborator with no romantic ties to the accused and the condition in
which there was no alibi corroborator, no statistically significant differences were observed on
the average jail length recommended for a guilty party, $F(2,142) = .54, p = .536, \eta^2 = .01$.

Across all experimental conditions, an average optional fine of $\$5351.77$ ($SD = 
$4157.46) was imposed on guilty defendants. No statistically significant main effects of alibi
corroborator relationship, $F(2, 124) = .46, p = .635, \eta^2 = .01$, or romantic relationship length,
$F(1, 124) = .02, p = .885, \eta^2 = .00$, were observed. No statistically significant interaction was
observed between the two variables, $F(2, 124) = .35, p = .703, \eta^2 = .01$. Once the romantic
relationship manipulations were collapsed across conditions and were compared against the
condition in which there was an alibi corroborator with no romantic ties to the accused and the
condition in which there was no alibi corroborator, there were no statistically significant
differences across conditions on the average optional fine recommended for a guilty defendant,
$F(2,142) = .32, p = .724$.

4.3 Hypotheses

To test the proposed hypotheses, a statistically significant bivariate correlation needed to
have been observed between the two dependent measures in order to proceed to the MANOVA. The use of a MANOVA for the three proposed hypotheses was justified by the statistically
significant negative bivariate correlation observed between ratings of the likelihood of the alibi
corroborator to provide false testimony to protect the accused and the believability of the
defendant’s claim that he was at a bar at the time during which the crime occurred, $r(232) = -.45,$
$p < .001$. If the MANOVA revealed statistically significant multivariate main effects and
interactions of the experimental manipulations for each hypothesis, follow-up univariate
ANOVAs would be warranted. In all between subjects multivariate and univariate tests,
romantic relationship status and romantic relationship length served as the between subjects
variables. All data analysis was conducted using SPSS 17.0. Figure 1 and Figure 2 display mean ratings of the two dependent measures as a function of experimental condition.

### 4.4 Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis proposed a multivariate main effect of alibi corroborator relationship status upon the two dependent measures such that differences on the variables will be observed across experimental conditions that featured the alibi testimony of a wife, fiancé, or girlfriend. Ratings of alibi believability were hypothesized to be least in the condition in which a wife testified and ratings of the willingness of the corroborator to provide false testimony were hypothesized to be greatest in this condition. A multivariate main effect of alibi corroborator relationship was not obtained, Pillai’s Trace = .014, $F(4, 452) = .79$, $p = .533$, $\eta^2 = .01$. No follow-up univariate ANOVA was justified from the results of the MANOVA. Thus, there was no support for the first hypothesis.

### 4.5 Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis proposed a multivariate main effect of alibi corroborator romantic relationship length upon the two dependent measures such that differences on the variables will be observed across experimental conditions that featured alibi corroboration coming from a romantic partner of either two months or two years. Ratings of alibi believability were hypothesized to be least in the condition in which a romantic partner of two years testified. Ratings of the willingness of the corroborator to provide false testimony were hypothesized to be greatest in this condition. A multivariate main effect of alibi corroborator romantic relationship length was not obtained, Pillai’s Trace = .008, $F(2, 225) = .87$, $p = .420$, $\eta^2 = .01$. The results of
the MANOVA did not provide justification for follow-up ANOVA analysis. Thus, there was no support for the second hypothesis.

4.6 Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis proposed a multivariate interactive effect of alibi corroborator romantic relationship status and alibi corroborator romantic relationship length upon the two dependent measures such that the greatest ratings of the likelihood of false testimony would be observed in the experimental condition featuring testimony provided by a wife of years. This experimental condition would also feature the lowest ratings of alibi believability. A multivariate interactive effect of alibi corroborator romantic relationship status and romantic relationship length was not obtained, Pillai’s Trace = .007, $F(4, 452) = .37$, $p = .830$, $\eta^2 = .00$. There was no statistical justification for follow-up univariate ANOVA tests. In sum, there was no support for the third hypothesis.

4.7 Additional Univariate Analyses

Additional multivariate analyses were conducted in order to explore why the experimental hypotheses were not empirically supported. The failure to observe support for the experimental hypotheses may have been the result of an incongruity between the two dependent measures. Having one dependent measure focus on the alibi corroborator while the second dependent measure focused on the criminal defendant may have produced this discrepancy. Specifically, one dependant measure sought to quantify the likelihood that the *alibi corroborator* produced false testimony while the second dependent measure sought to examine the belief in the alibi offered by the *criminal defendant*. If the primary hypotheses concern the nature and length of a romantic relationship between an alibi corroborator and a criminal defendant, the
dependent measures should be restricted to the perceptions of the alibi corroborator and the corroboration that she provides. Figure 1 and Figure 2 present the dependent measures chosen for additional analysis as a function of experimental condition.

The first of the additional multivariate analyses explored the believability of the testimony that the alibi corroborator provided and the motivation of that alibi corroborator to provide false testimony. If an alibi corroborator is thought to be more likely to provide false testimony, she should be considered to be motivated to lie on behalf of the accused. Hence, for the following analysis, ratings of alibi corroborator motivation to lie were measured on a 9-point Likert-type scale where 0 corresponded to “completely unmotivated” and 8 corresponded to “completely motivated” on the item, “How motivated to lie to protect the defendant would this alibi witness be?” Ratings of the believability of the alibi witnesses’ testimony were measured on a 9-point Likert-type scale where 0 corresponded to “completely unbelievable” and 8 corresponded to “completely believable” on the item, “How believable was the testimony of the alibi witness in this case?”

If the proposed hypotheses were consistent in addressing the perceptions of the alibi corroborator and the perceptions of that alibi testimony, the pattern of anticipated results for this post-hoc multivariate test would be identical to the pattern of results that were initially hypothesized. Specifically, multivariate main effects of romantic relationship type and romantic relationship length would be observed for both the motivation of the alibi corroborator to lie and the believability of the alibi corroborator’s testimony. Ratings on both variables would be expected to vary across experimental conditions such that the greatest ratings of an alibi corroborator’s motivation to lie would be observed in the conditions in which the alibi corroborator and the defendant are described as being married; the believability of the alibi
corroborator’s testimony would be least in those conditions. Ratings of an alibi corroborator’s motivation to lie would be greatest in conditions in which the romantic relationship was described as being two years old; the believability of the alibi witnesses’ testimony would be least in those conditions. A multivariate interaction would also be anticipated such that the alibi corroborator’s motivation to lie would be greatest and the believability of her testimony would be least in the condition in which the alibi corroborator and the criminal defendant are described as being in a two year-old marriage.

Analyses revealed that a statistically significant correlation did exist between the two dependent variables, $r(233) = -.127, p = .026$. A MANOVA revealed that no multivariate main effect of romantic relationship type, Pillai’s Trace = .030, $F(4, 454) = 1.72, p = .145, \eta^2 = .02$, or multivariate main effect of romantic relationship length, Pillai’s Trace = .009, $F(2, 226) = .43, p = .348, \eta^2 = .01$, existed. No significant multivariate interaction between romantic relationship type and romantic relationship length was obtained, Pillai’s Trace = .024, $F(4, 454) = 1.35, p = .246, \eta^2 = .01$. No follow-up ANOVAs were necessary based on the MANOVA results.

The second multivariate analysis concerned the motivation of the alibi corroborator to lie for the defendant and the likelihood that she would provide false testimony on behalf of the accused. Consistent with this notion, main effects of romantic relationship status and romantic relationship length would be expected on both dependent measures. Ratings of the likelihood of an alibi corroborator to produce false testimony and ratings of the motivation of the alibi corroborator to lie in order to protect the defendant would be expected to differ across experimental conditions such that the greatest values on these variables would be observed in the conditions in which the alibi corroborator is the defendant’s wife. Ratings of the likelihood of an alibi corroborator to produce false testimony and ratings of the motivation of the alibi
corroborator to lie to protect the defendant would also be anticipated to differ across experimental groups such that the greatest values for both variables should be obtained in the experimental conditions in which the alibi corroborator and the defendant were described as being together for 2 years. A significant interaction would also be anticipated for these two dependent measures such that the greatest ratings of the likelihood of the alibi corroborator to produce false testimony and the greatest ratings of the motivation of this corroborator to lie would be produced in the experimental condition in which the alibi corroborator and the defendant were described as having been married for two years.

Analyses revealed that a statistically significant association existed between ratings of an alibi corroborator’s motivation to lie and the likelihood that she would provide false testimony, $r(232) = .29, p < .001$. No statistically significant multivariate main effect of romantic relationship type, Pillai’s Trace $= .034, F(4, 452) = 1.96, p = .099, \eta^2 = .017$, and a multivariate main effect of romantic relationship length, Pillai’s Trace $= .008, F(2, 225) = .428, p = .428, \eta^2 = .01$, were obtained for ratings of the alibi corroborator’s motivation to lie and likelihood of providing false testimony and, thus, no follow-up univariate analyses were conducted. A marginally significant multivariate interaction between romantic relationship status and romantic relationship length was obtained, Pillai’s Trace $= .036, F(4, 452) = 2.08, p = .082, \eta^2 = .018$. A univariate ANOVA was conducted and a marginally significant interaction was obtained on the ratings of alibi corroborator motivation to lie on behalf of the criminal defendant, $F(2, 226) = 2.85, p = .060, \eta^2 = .03$. Subsequent pairwise comparisons using Tukey’s HSD revealed a marginally statistically significant ($p = .07$) difference on ratings of an alibi corroborator’s motivation to lie such that wives of two months were considered to be more motivated to lie for
their husbands \((M = 6.25, SD = 1.60)\) than girlfriends of two months \((M = 7.07, SD = 1.16)\) were for their boyfriends.

Additional multivariate analyses were conducted in order to explore why the experimental hypotheses were not empirically supported. The failure to observe support for the experimental hypotheses may have been the result of an incongruity between the two dependent measures. Having one dependent measure focus on the alibi corroborator while the second dependent measure focused on the criminal defendant may have produced this discrepancy. Specifically, one dependant measure sought to quantify the likelihood that the alibi corroborator produced false testimony while the second dependent measure sought to examine the belief in the alibi offered by the criminal defendant. If the primary hypotheses concern the nature and length of a romantic relationship between an alibi corroborator and a criminal defendant, the dependent measures should be restricted to the perceptions of the alibi corroborator and the corroboration that she provides. Figure 1 and Figure 2 present the dependent measures chosen for additional analysis as a function of experimental condition.

The first of the additional multivariate analyses explored the believability of the testimony that the alibi corroborator provided and the motivation of that alibi corroborator to provide false testimony. If an alibi corroborator is thought to be more likely to provide false testimony, she should be considered to be motivated to lie on behalf of the accused. Hence, for the following analysis, ratings of alibi corroborator motivation to lie were measured on a 9-point Likert-type scale where 0 corresponded to “completely unmotivated” and 8 corresponded to “completely motivated” on the item, “How motivated to lie to protect the defendant would this alibi witness be?” Ratings of the believability of the alibi witnesses’ testimony were measured on a 9-point Likert-type scale where 0 corresponded to “completely unbelievable” and 8
corresponded to “completely believable” on the item, “How believable was the testimony of the alibi witness in this case?”

If the proposed hypotheses were consistent in addressing the perceptions of the alibi corroborator and the perceptions of that alibi testimony, the pattern of anticipated results for this post-hoc multivariate test would be identical to the pattern of results that were initially hypothesized. Specifically, multivariate main effects of romantic relationship type and romantic relationship length would be observed for both the motivation of the alibi corroborator to lie and the believability of the alibi corroborator’s testimony. Ratings on both variables would be expected to vary across experimental conditions such that the greatest ratings of an alibi corroborator’s motivation to lie would be observed in the conditions in which the alibi corroborator and the defendant are described as being married; the believability of the alibi corroborator’s testimony would be least in those conditions. Ratings of an alibi corroborator’s motivation to lie would be greatest in conditions in which the romantic relationship was described as being two years old; the believability of the alibi witnesses’ testimony would be least in those conditions. A multivariate interaction would also be anticipated such that the alibi corroborator’s motivation to lie would be greatest and the believability of her testimony would be least in the condition in which the alibi corroborator and the criminal defendant are described as being in a two year-old marriage.

Analyses revealed that a statistically significant correlation did exist between the two dependent variables, $r(233) = -.127$, $p = .026$. A MANOVA revealed that no multivariate main effect of romantic relationship type, Pillai’s Trace $= .030$, $F(4, 454) = 1.72$, $p = .145$, $\eta^2 = .02$, or multivariate main effect of romantic relationship length, Pillai’s Trace $= .009$, $F(2, 226) = .43$, $p = .348$, $\eta^2 = .01$, existed. No significant multivariate interaction between romantic relationship
type and romantic relationship length was obtained, Pillai’s Trace = .024, $F(4, 454) = 1.35, p = .246, \eta^2 = .01$. No follow-up ANOVAs were necessary based on the MANOVA results.

The second multivariate analysis concerned the motivation of the alibi corroborator to lie for the defendant and the likelihood that she would provide false testimony on behalf of the accused. Consistent with this notion, main effects of romantic relationship status and romantic relationship length would be expected on both dependent measures. Ratings of the likelihood of an alibi corroborator to produce false testimony and ratings of the motivation of the alibi corroborator to lie in order to protect the defendant would be expected to differ across experimental conditions such that the greatest values on these variables would be observed in the conditions in which the alibi corroborator is the defendant’s wife. Ratings of the likelihood of an alibi corroborator to produce false testimony and ratings of the motivation of the alibi corroborator to lie to protect the defendant would also be anticipated to differ across experimental groups such that the greatest values for both variables should be obtained in the experimental conditions in which the alibi corroborator and the defendant were described as being together for 2 years. A significant interaction would also be anticipated for these two dependent measures such that the greatest ratings of the likelihood of the alibi corroborator to produce false testimony and the greatest ratings of the motivation of this corroborator to lie would be produced in the experimental condition in which the alibi corroborator and the defendant were described as having been married for two years.

Analyses revealed that a statistically significant association existed between ratings of an alibi corroborator’s motivation to lie and the likelihood that she would provide false testimony, $r(232) = .29, p < .001$. No statistically significant multivariate main effect of romantic relationship type, Pillai’s Trace = .034, $F(4, 452) = 1.96, p = .099, \eta^2 = .017$, and a multivariate
main effect of romantic relationship length, Pillai’s Trace = .008, \( F(2, 225) = .428, p = .428, \eta^2 = .01 \), were obtained for ratings of the alibi corroborator’s motivation to lie and likelihood of providing false testimony and, thus, no follow-up univariate analyses were conducted. A marginally significant multivariate interaction between romantic relationship status and romantic relationship length was obtained, Pillai’s Trace = .036, \( F(4, 452) = 2.08, p = .082, \eta^2 = .018 \). A univariate ANOVA was conducted and a marginally significant interaction was obtained on the ratings of alibi corroborator motivation to lie on behalf of the criminal defendant, \( F(2, 226) = 2.85, p = .060, \eta^2 = .03 \). Subsequent pairwise comparisons using Tukey’s HSD revealed a marginally statistically significant \((p = .07)\) difference on ratings of an alibi corroborator’s motivation to lie such that wives of two months were considered to be more motivated to lie for their husbands \((M = 6.25, SD = 1.60)\) than girlfriends of two months \((M = 7.07, SD = 1.16)\) were for their boyfriends.

### 4.8 Principal Components Analysis

A post-hoc principal components analysis was conducted to determine if the data that were obtained on the dependent measures forms for the experimental conditions featuring the testimony of an alibi corroborator (e.g., a waitress) could be reduced to distinct factors that would allow for comparisons on these factor scores. All non-manipulation check questions on the dependent measures forms were entered into the principal components analysis. Cases were excluded on a listwise basis. The principal components analysis was analyzed using a correlation matrix and factors were extracted if their eigenvalues exceeded 1.00. Varimax rotation ensured that any factors obtained in the principal components analysis would be orthogonal. Item loadings that did not exceed .30 were suppressed.
Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity, $\chi^2 (1, N = 136) = 719.113, p < .001$, revealed that a principal components analysis could be performed on the data. An examination of the screen plot revealed the presence of two factors that accounted for a total of 40.95% of the variance within the data. Six items loaded upon the first factor ($\lambda = 3.769$), named Alibi Believability, and seven items loaded upon the second factor ($\lambda = 3.191$), labeled Witness Motivation. Items loadings are reported in Table 1.

While there was no statistically significant main effect of romantic relationship length upon Alibi Believability factor scores, $F(1, 215) = .898, p = .344, \eta^2 = .01$, a marginally statistically significant main effect of romantic relationship status was obtained, $F(2, 215) = 2.73, p = .067, \eta^2 = .02$. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons using Tukey’s HSD revealed a statistically significant ($p = .02$) difference on the factor score such that fiancés ($M = 1.78, SD = .94$) scores higher on the Alibi Believability factor than girlfriends ($M = -.23, SD = .99$). No statistically significant interaction between the two independent variables on scores for the first factor was observed, $F(2, 215) = .38, p = .683, \eta^2 = .00$. Alibi Believability factor scores did not differ between experimental conditions featuring corroboration by an alibi corroborator with a known relationship to the accused and the experimental condition featuring the testimony of a waitress, $F(1, 240) = 1.50, p = .223, \eta^2 = .01$.

No main effects of romantic relationship status, $F(2, 215) = 1.25, p = .289, \eta^2 = .01$, or romantic relationship length, $F(1, 215) = 2.74, p = .10, \eta^2 = .01$, were observed on Witness Motivation factor scores. A marginally statistically significant interaction between romantic relationship status and romantic relationship length was obtained, $F(2, 215) = 2.88, p = .06, \eta^2 = .03$. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons using Tukey’s HSD failed to reveal any statistically significant differences on Witness Motivation factor scores across conditions featuring testimony.
provided by an alibi corroborator who had a romantic relationship to the accused. Witness Motivation factor scores were significantly higher in conditions in which an alibi witness had a romantic relationship with the accused ($M = .17, SD = .78$) than in the condition in which the alibi witness was a waitress ($M = -1.81, SD = .17$), $F(1, 240) = 109.73, p < .001, \eta^2 = .31$. 
Chapter 5: Discussion

The first study was designed to determine how experimental manipulations to the status given to a couple’s romantic relationship and the length of that romantic relationship could affect how mock jurors evaluate the likelihood with which the alibi corroborator would provide false testimony and the believability of the alibi provided by the defendant. Until this study, alibi research was restricted to comparisons involving the presence or absence of a known relationship between an alibi corroborator and a criminal defendant (Culhane & Hosch, 2004; Olson & Wells, 2004). The hypotheses for this study were predicated on the belief that jurors would attend to the terms that were used to characterize the nature of the romantic relationship between a man accused of committing aggravated assault and the woman with whom he was in a romantic relationship. A wife, a fiancé, and a girlfriend may all be described as having a romantic relationship with another person; however, the research literature has not examined whether these qualitatively different labels have any implications for alibi research.

In a similar manner, published research is silent as to whether an alibi corroborator who has been romantically linked to a defendant for different periods of time affects how jurors consider the corroborator’s motives or the alibi corroboration itself. By manipulating the term (i.e., girlfriend, fiancé, wife) that was used to describe how an alibi corroborator was romantically linked to a defendant and the length of the pair’s relationship (i.e., two months, two years), it was hypothesized that alibi researchers would gain a finer understanding of how claims of innocence were evaluated across qualitative differences in romantic relationships.

A statistically significant negative correlation was observed between the two dependent measures, suggesting that increases in the likelihood that an alibi corroborator offers false testimony are associated with decreases in the believability of the alibi claim offered by
defendant. Despite this, no statistical evidence emerged to suggest that the direct manipulation of the wording used to describe the depth of the romantic relationship or the length of that romantic relationship produced differences on the dependent measures. Identifying the alibi corroborator as the girlfriend, fiancé, or wife of the accused affected neither the likelihood that the corroborator would provide false testimony nor the believability of the defendant’s claim that he was at a bar at the time of the aggravated assault. The presentation of the romantic relationship as being either two months in length or two years in length also did not produce any change on ratings of the two dependant measures. The Investment Model (Rusbult, 1980a) would predict that, all else being held constant, the experimental condition that featured a marriage of two years would be the condition of the most theoretical interest to those who investigate alibis. The failure to obtain a statistically significant interaction makes this condition indistinguishable from the other experimental conditions on the dependent measures of interest.

Additional analyses were conducted on the basis that the two dependent measures were incongruent. In retrospect, multivariate hypotheses regarding alibis should focus on the individual providing or corroborating the alibi and the claim itself as it relates to that person. The believability of a claim provided by a suspect should be evaluated in connection with the credibility with the alibi witness, for example; rather, it should be evaluated alongside the credibility of the suspect. Exploratory analyses revealed that while participants believed all corroborators featured in this study were perceived to be motivated to lie on behalf of their romantic partner, wives of two months were more motivated to do so than were girlfriends of two months. This may suggest that mock jurors believe that wives have more to lose from their husbands going to jail than do girlfriends whose boyfriends go to jail.
Across the three proposed hypotheses, statistical power was low due to smaller-than-anticipated effect sizes. The proposed effect sizes for this study were obtained from alibi research conducted at the University of Texas at El Paso (Hosch et al., in press); as previously mentioned, alibi research is in its infancy and there is no published alibi research has examined differences among levels of the same type of alibi corroborator relationship. These small effect sizes were exacerbated by a sample of participants that was significantly reduced by self-imposed manipulation checks. Ninety one participants from experimental conditions were excluded from data analysis due to their failing of one or more manipulation checks (e.g., incorrect identification of the relationship between the accused and the alibi corroborator). Less stringent criteria for inclusion in data analysis would have improved statistical power at the expense of data quality.
Chapter 6: Experiment 2

No research has examined how discreet life events may influence the willingness of a person to falsely corroborate. Particular life events or the accumulation of many life events may make strengthen or weaken the romantic bond between them. This may affect the willingness of the individual to falsely testify on behalf of his or her partner. The second study seeks to determine if and how the occurrence of major life events in the course of a romantic relationship affect an individual’s willingness to fabricate an alibi for his or her significant other.

6.1 Hypotheses

Three primary hypotheses were advanced for the second study:

1. Data would be indicative of good model fit for both revised proposed latent variable models (see Figures 3 and 4). The addition of the SRRS composite scores for both positive and negative life events in the second path model would produce a significant improvement in model fit.

2. The SRRS composite scores of both positive and negative major life events that occur during one academic semester would indirectly affect the composite scores of the likelihood that an individual will falsely corroborate the alibi of a significant other.

3. Consistent with the findings of Rusbult (1983), Investment Model construct scores during the first data collection period would significantly predict Investment Model construct scores during the second data collection period.
Chapter 7: Experiment 2 Methods

7.1 Participants

A total of 209 participants enrolled in the experiment during the initial data collection period that ran from February 12th, 2010 to March 12th, 2010. A total of 190 participants completed the experiment by providing data during the second data collection period that ran from April 23rd, 2010 to May 11th, 2010. Five participants (2%) were excluded due to the inability of the researcher to match participant data. Forty-one participants (21.6%) of those who completed the experiment were excluded from data analysis due to the termination of the romantic relationship that they described during the first data collection period. Twenty-five participants (13.1%) were excluded on a pair-wise basis for missing any data on any variable that was featured in the path models. The final dataset that was used to test the two proposed path models included data collected from 119 participants. A majority of participants (74.8%) were female and almost every participant (97.5%) indicated that he or she was in a dating relationship during the first data collection period. Participants were, on average, 19.27 years of age ($SD = 1.56$) at the time they first provided data.

7.2 Design

The second study adopted a longitudinal design in which data collection occurred at two points. The first period of data collection occurred from February 12th, 2010 to March 12th, 2010; all participants completed the first set of experimental forms during this month. The second period of data collection occurred from April 23rd, 2010 to May 11th, 2010; all participants completed the second set of experimental forms during this time period. All data collection occurred online using Survey Monkey™ software. The appearance of the materials
described below changed slightly as they were converted into questions that Survey Monkey™ could display.

### 7.3 Materials

Having completed the informed consent document (see Appendix L), all participants viewed an instruction form that explained the general procedure of the experiment and the contact information for the investigator and the University Counseling Center. The instruction form that was presented in the first data collection period (see Appendix M) varied from the instruction form that was presented in the second data collection period (see Appendix N) only in informing participants that they would be asked to think about major life events that they experienced in the past academic semester and that they are to think about the romantic relationship that they described earlier when answering all questions if that romantic relationship dissolved between the two periods of data collection. In the first data collection period, each participant completed a demographic form (see Appendix O). The demographic form contained questions about the participant (e.g., age) and about the participant’s current romantic relationship (e.g., length of current romantic relationship). In order to ensure that participant data collected in the second study period matches data collected in the first study period, data that was collected included the participant’s date of birth, make and model of his or her first car, and mother’s maiden name. The demographic form contained the participant’s mailing address and UTEP e-mail address.

Each participant completed an Investment Model Scale (IMS; Rusbult et al., 1998) (see Appendix Q) during the initial observation period and at the final observation period. The Investment Model Scale was developed to measure each theoretical construct of the Investment Model. The three subscales of the IMS each contained six questions focused on the perceived
degree of satisfaction and investment in that romantic relationship and alternatives to that relationship. The first question is considered a facet question while the remaining five questions are considered global questions. The facet item for each subscale lists five statements on which participants indicate their level of agreement regarding their current relationship by circling one of five choices ranging from “Don’t Agree At All” to “Agree Completely.” The responses to facet items are not included in formal analyses of the IMS; rather, facet items function to orient respondents towards what concepts are measured for each theoretical construct.

Lay understanding of satisfaction in a relationship may not require facet items to explicate that construct, but the conceptualization of investment in a relationship or alternatives to the current romantic relationship necessitate their inclusion. The remaining five global items were created to measure the theoretical construct and thus are included in Investment Model analyses. Respondents indicate their agreement with each global item statement on 9-point Likert-type scales with 0 corresponding to “Do Not Agree At All,” 4 corresponding to “Agree Somewhat,” and 8 corresponding to “Agree Completely.” The final subscale of the IMS measures commitment. There are no facet items on this subscale. Respondent commitment is typically measured by agreement with seven statements utilizing 9-point Likert-type scales with 0 corresponding to “Do Not Agree At All,” 4 corresponding to “Agree Somewhat,” and 8 corresponding to “Agree Completely.” Experimenter error was introduced into the commitment subscale during both data collection periods. Rather than responding to the seven statements using a 9-point Likert type scale, participants were asked to respond to the statements as if the statements were facet items. Specifically, participants were asked if they “Don’t Agree at All,” “Agree Slightly,” “Agree Moderately,” or “Agree Completely.” Numerical values of 1, 2, 3, and 4 were assigned to those response options to correspond to the increasing levels of
agreement with each statement. Comparisons between the two data collection periods can be made because the error was consistent across both data collection periods.

The psychometric properties of the Investment Model Scale have been empirically assessed among college-aged dating couples. High levels of internal consistency have been reported for each of the theoretical constructs of the IMS across three reported studies with Cronbach alphas observed ranging in magnitude from .91 to .95 and .92 to .95 for the commitment and satisfaction scales, respectively. Cronbach alphas for the alternatives and investment scales ranged from .82 to .88 and .82 to .84, respectively.

During the second data collection period, each participant completed a modified SRRS form (see Appendix R). On the form, participants saw a list of the life events originally proposed by Holmes and Rahe (1967), as modified by Scully, Tosi, and Banning (2000). Participants indicated if they experienced that event in the past academic semester. Critically, as Holmes and Rahe (1967) noted in the development of the SRRS and later elaborated upon by Vinokur and Selzer (1975), no distinction is made between positive and negative change. Any major life event is believed to be stressful to the extent that it forced a person to change to adapt to it. To gauge how the participant perceived the major life event, each event be evaluated upon a scale adopted from the Life Experiences Survey (LES; Sarason, Johnson, & Siegel, 1978). For each event experienced, the participant selected an integer ranging from -3 (extremely negative) to +3 (extremely positive) to correspond with how he or she perceived the event; zero corresponds to the event having ‘no impact.’ To control for the possibility that a major life event occurred multiple times in the past 6 months, participants were instructed to respond only to the latest occurrence of that event.
During both data collection periods, each participant completed a dependent measures form (see Appendices R and S). The dependent measures form contained questions concerning the likelihood that the participant would fabricate an alibi for his or her romantic partner should the partner have been arrested for certain crimes. Participants were instructed to imagine that their romantic partner had been accused of various crimes (e.g., homicide, burglary). For each hypothetical crime, participants were asked to answer the question, “How likely is it that you would provide false alibi testimony to protect your romantic partner if he or she was accused of this crime?” Participants indicated a percentage from 0 to 100 was indicative of the likelihood of which they believe they would provide false alibi testimony on behalf of their romantic partner. The dependent measures form that was used in the second data collection period (see Appendix S) only differed from the dependent measures used during the first data collection period (see Appendix R) in that it contained questions asking the participant about his or her date of birth, make and model of his or her first car, and his or her mother’s maiden name. This information was used to match collected data.

To minimize attrition during the course of the study, each participant was sent three pieces of mail and one email. The first piece of mail was a friendly Valentine’s Day card (see Appendix T) featured a generic romantic item on the cover. This card thanked the participant for taking part in the study and wished the participant well in his or her relationship. The second piece of mail (see Appendix U) was a reminder letter sent in late April reminding the participant that they agreed to complete the study when they registered for the experiment. The web address for the study and contact information for the researcher was provided. At the same time that the reminder letter is mailed, an email (see Appendix V) was sent to all participants. The content of the email was identical in content in the reminder letter. The third piece of mail
was a birthday card wishing the participant a happy birthday (see Appendix W) if he or she was born between the two data collection time periods.

Funding was obtained for this study and was used to purchase the Valentine’s Day cards, birthday cards, stationary, and all postage associated with the efforts to maintain contact with participants. The reminder letter and the email informed the participant that he or she could receive a $10 gift certificate by completing the experiment. These gift certificates could be redeemed at a local ice cream store. The amount of the gift certificate was such that it could allow the participant to take his or her romantic partner out on a date.

7.4 Procedure

During the initial data collection period, when the participant logged onto the website for the experiment, the first form that he or she saw was the informed consent document. Following the administration of informed consent, each participant read the initial instructional form. The participant the completed the demographic form, the Investment Model Scale (Rusbult et al., 1998) and the dependent measures form.

The website displayed a message to the participant that he or she would need to log into the website again later in the semester to complete the study. The message informed the participant that he or she would be contacted via letter and e-mail to ensure that the study is completed. The participant was thanked and debriefed.

On Valentine’s Day, all participants received a card from the researcher wishing them the best in their romantic relationship. At the end of April, all participants received a reminder letter and e-mail informing them that they are to log into the experimental website to complete the study. During the second data collection period, the participant again completed the informed consent document. The website then displayed a message telling the participant that
the reason why he or she has been asked to return to the experimental site was to determine how romantic relationships change over time. The participant then completed the Investment Model Scale (Rusbult et al., 1998), the modified SRRS form, and the dependent measures form, in that order. At the conclusion of the experiment, the website displayed a message telling the participant how to collect a gift certificate for completing the study. The participant was then thanked and debriefed.
Chapter 8: Experiment 2 Results

8.1 Life Event Weights (LCU)

Composite scores were calculated for both positive and negative life events that occurred in the past academic semester. Life event weights, or LCU, were derived from the modified SRRS form featured in Study 1 and the calculation of LCU for the second study was consistent with past research (Casey, Masuda, & Holmes, 1967; Holmes & Rahe, 1967). A random sample of 300 participants across all experimental conditions in Study 1 was obtained using SPSS. The average value of the social readjustment necessary to cope with each life event was calculated. When a participant provided a value that exceeded the value representing three standard deviations above the average social readjustment for an event, the three standard deviation value was substituted for the outlier. Summing a participant’s responses about positive and negative life events that he or she has experienced has been used to create composite positive and negative change scores (Sarason, Johnson, & Siegel, 1978). Thus, if a participant indicated that a particular life event occurred in between the data collection points, the LCU of that event was multiplied by the value circled that indicates the events’ positive or negative emotional impact. The absolute value of these products was obtained. Derived values associated with positive life events (i.e., a +1, +2, or +3) were summed to obtain a composite score for positive life events. Derived values associated with negative life events (i.e., a -1, -2, or -3) were summed to obtain a composite score for negative life events. LCU data are described in Table 2.

8.2 Willingness to Falsely Corroborate an Alibi Composite

A composite score was calculated at both data collection time periods for the willingness of the individual to falsely corroborate an alibi for his or her relationship partner given that the
partner committed the crime. This composite was formed by summing all the responses that the participant gave to the likelihood that he or she would corroborate an alibi for their partner across a range of hypothetical crimes. Willingness to fabricate composite data for both data collection periods are presented in depth in Table 3 and Table 4. Table 5 and Table 6 provide more detailed data regarding the items that formed the fabrication composite score.

### 8.3 Investment Model Scale Reliability

Investment Model subscale scores were uniformly excellent. The satisfaction subscale had excellent internal reliability during both the first data collection period (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .95$) and the second data collection period (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .97$). The investment subscale had very good internal reliability during the first data collection period (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .87$) and the second data collection period (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .86$). Like the investment subscale, the quality of alternatives subscale had very good internal reliability both during the first data collection period (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .88$) and the second data collection period (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .86$). The internal reliability of the subscale was excellent during the first data collection period (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .91$) and during the second (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .93$). Descriptive statistics on all subscales of the Investment Model Scale are provided in Table 3 and Table 4. Bivariate correlations between Investment Model subscale scores, willingness to fabricate an alibi composite scores, and SRRS positive and negative life event composite scores are found in Table 7.

### 8.4 Hypotheses

The originally hypothesized baseline latent variable model (see Figure 5) and full latent variable model (see Figure 6) each had 48 variables. Both latent variable path models were over-identified at the latent variable model level and did not feature feedback loops or correlated
disturbance terms that are indicative of a recursive model (Rigdon, 1995). Both latent variable
path models were over-identified at the measurement model level and it was anticipated that all
Investment Model Scale (Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998) subscale items would significantly
load onto their respective constructs (e.g., satisfaction) at both data collection time periods. The
first latent variable model (see Figure 5) proposed that Investment Model construct scores in the
first data collection period would predict Investment Model construct scores at the second point
of data collection. The composite score for a significant other’s willingness to falsely
corroborate an alibi for his or her partner in the first period of data collection would predict that
variable’s score in the second data collection period. Commitment subscale scores would
predict the willingness to fabricate composite scores at both times; satisfaction, investment, and
quality of alternative scores would indirectly predict willingness to fabricate composites at both
times. The second latent variable model (see Figure 6) was nested within the first model. It
differed from the first model only in that it proposed that composites formed by summing both
positive and negative SRRS weights would have a direct effect on satisfaction, investment, and
quality of alternative scores in January. A participant’s commitment to his or her relationship
during the first data collection period would predict both positive and negative SRRS composite
scores that reflect life events that occur between the two periods of experimental participation.
These SRRS composite scores would then exert an indirect effect upon the participant’s final
willingness to fabricate composite scores by affecting satisfaction, investment, and quality of
alternatives scores during that time period.

Despite satisfying Rigdon’s (1995) criteria for model identification, LISREL 8.80 would
not run these latent variable models as originally hypothesized. Thus, slight modifications had
to be made to the proposed models in order for both models to become identified. To resolve this
discrepancy, 6 parameters were added to each of the hypothesized models. Three new parameters represented the direct effect of satisfaction, investment, and quality of alternatives scores during the first data collection period upon the composite score of the willingness of the alibi corroborator to provide false testimony on behalf of his or her romantic partner during the initial time period. To remain consistent, three new parameters represented the direct effect of satisfaction, investment, and quality of alternatives scores during the second data collection period upon the composite score of the willingness of the alibi corroborator to provide false testimony on behalf of his or her romantic partner during that second time period.

The parameters that were added to make the baseline and full models identified are defensible on theoretical grounds. The originally hypothesized models proposed that commitment subscale scores at both time periods would predict a participant’s respective willingness to falsely corroborate composite scores. Commitment to a romantic relationship alone may not predict these composite scores. An individual’s satisfaction and level of investment in a relationship could predict an overall willingness to provide false testimony for his or her partner. If a person is pleased with his or her relationship and feels that significant investment has been made in the relationship, this individual may be willing to commit perjury by providing false alibi testimony on the partner’s behalf. Perceptions of the quality of a person’s potential alternative romantic partners may also predict how willing that person is to falsely corroborate an alibi over a wide variety of circumstance. If a person feels that he or she cannot find an alternative romantic partner better than his or her current significant other, this individual may be willing to falsely corroborate the partner’s alibi in an effort to prevent the person from serving time in jail.
The identified latent variable models analyzed in this study are referred to as the modified baseline model (see Figure 3) and the modified full model (see Figure 4). According to Preacher and Coffman (2006), a power analysis performed on the modified baseline model revealed a power of 1.00 could be obtained with 119 participants under the assumptions that $\alpha = .05$, $\text{RMSEA}_0 = .08$, $\text{RMSEA}_A = .05$, and $df = 1060$ to test the hypothesis that models were poor fits of the data. MacCallum, Browne, and Sugawara (1996) report that values of 1.00 for statistical power can be obtained for tests of model fit despite small sample sizes if the degrees of freedom within the model are large; thus, the statistical power observed in this study is not unusual given the number of degrees of freedom observed.

All data obtained were submitted to the two latent variable models as correlation matrices using LISREL 8.80 software (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2005). For purposes of statistical interpretation, the first item in each Investment Model subscale was constrained to equality. The statistically significant item loadings for the baseline and full model are presented in Table 8 and Table 9, respectively. The statistically significant unstandardized paths within the modified baseline model and the modified full model are presented in Figure 7 and Figure 8, respectively.

8.5 Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis proposed that the data that were collected would be indicative of good model fit for the two proposed models and that the inclusion of the SRRS composite scores for both positive and negative life events would produce a significant improvement in model fit. Hu and Bentler (1999) have argued that combinational rules should be adopted for the evaluation of model fit. The evaluation of model fit should include both absolute fit indices (e.g., standardized root mean square residual [SRMR]), or statistics that reflect the degree to which the hypothesized variance-covariance matrix structure matches the observed variance-covariance
matrix structure, and incremental fit indices (e.g., comparative fit index [CFI]), or statistics that reflect the improvement of the hypothesized model over baseline or null models. Parsimonious fit indices (e.g., root mean square error of approximation [RMSEA]) are similar to absolute fit indices except that these statistics penalize models that add parameters that do not improve model fit; these indices may also be used in assessing model fit. Hu and Bentler (1999) suggested a combinational rule of absolute, parsimonious, and incremental fit indices to indicate that a model is an acceptable fit for the data. This combinational rule requires that CFI ≥ .95, SRMR ≤ .08, and RMSEA ≤ .06. While evidence for acceptable model fit would be obtained if RMSEA values approximate .06, values ≤ .05 are indicative of excellent model fit. SRMR values ≤ .08 are indicative of acceptable model fit. CFI values ≥ .95 are indicative of excellent model fit; CFI values of .90 are indicative of acceptable model fit if paired with acceptable or excellent values of SRMR and RMSEA. While the modified baseline model demonstrated a CFI ≥ .95 (CFI = .953), other model fit indices did not meet the threshold values that Hu and Bentler (1999) recommended for a combinational rule of acceptable model fit. The observed SRMR exceeded the threshold value of .08 (SRMR = .0919), and the RMSEA value that was obtained exceeded .06 (RMSEA = .0695). Taken together, the fit indices were indicative of a modest model fit that was close to the threshold values recommended by Hu and Bentler (1999). Like the modified baseline model, the modified full model produced an acceptable CFI value (CFI = .953). The RMSEA value (RMSEA = .0694) and the SRMR value (SRMR = .0880) remained above threshold values recommended by Hu and Bentler (1999). In conclusion, the model fit indices for the modified full model were not far from the arbitrary threshold values indicative of good model fit. Model fit indices are reported in Table 10.
The addition of the SRRS composite scores for positive and negative life events and the
direct and indirect effects associated with them represented an attempt to improve the fit of the
modified baseline model. Cheung and Rensvold (2002) have proposed that change in the
comparative fit index (CFI) $\geq .01$ is indicative of a significant improvement in model fit; Chen
(2007) has proposed that a change in RMSEA that $\geq .015$ is indicative of a significant
improvement in model fit. Adopting the recommendations of both Cheung and Rensvold
(2002) and Chen (2007), evidence for an improvement in model fit from the first to the second
model would be obtained if $\Delta$CFI $\geq .01$ and $\Delta$RMSEA $\geq .015$. The change in CFI values
observed between the two modified models ($\Delta$CFI = .000) and the change in RMSEA values
($\Delta$RMSEA = .0001) did not provide evidence of improved model fit.

The modified baseline model was retained to test the third hypothesis because it
demonstrated that it fit the data as well as the full model while simultaneously requiring fewer
parameters to be estimated. Despite both models displaying adequate fit indices, the parsimony
of the baseline model made it superior to the full model. Modification indices obtained from
LISREL indicated that the fit of the baseline model could be improved by correlating
disturbances among Investment Model constructs of satisfaction, investment, and quality of
alternatives during the second data collection period. The model that incorporated these
correlated disturbance terms (see Figure 9), like the baseline model and full model, was an
adequate fit of the data. This model reported an acceptable CFI value (CFI = .955) and an
acceptable SRMR value (SRMR = .0734); like the other models, the RMSEA value (RMSEA = .0684)
approached the threshold value of .06 that indicates acceptable model fit. While these
indices indicate that the baseline model that featured correlated disturbance terms was an
adequate fit of the data (Hu & Bentler, 1999), the improvement in CFI ($\Delta$CFI = .002) and the
improvement in RMSEA values ($\Delta$RMSEA = .0015) did not indicate that this revised baseline model was an improvement over the modified baseline model (Chen, 2007; Cheung & Rensvold, 2002). Thus, the modified baseline model without the correlated disturbance terms remained the preferred model for evaluating the final hypothesis.

In sum, there was some support for the first hypothesis. Both modified models failed to display evidence of good or excellent model fit but the fit indices were close to the accepted threshold values indicative of acceptable model fit. The data were conclusive regarding the lack of improvement in model fit of the modified full model over the modified baseline model and thus the modified baseline, or more parsimonious model was retained for testing the third hypothesis.

8.6 Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis proposed that the SRRS composite scores for both positive and negative major life events would indirectly affect the composite scores of the likelihood that the participant would fabricate an alibi for his or her partner across a range of scenarios during the second period of data collection. Despite the superiority of the more parsimonious baseline model, the second hypothesis could only be tested in the full model. Only one of the hypothesized paths between an SRRS composite score and an Investment Model construct score was statistically significant. Specifically, the negative SRRS composite score predicted a participant’s satisfaction level during the final experimental session, $\beta = -.002$, $t(118) = -2.475$, $p < .05$; there was no indirect effect of negative SRRS composite scores upon the second composite score of the likelihood of alibi fabrication, $\beta = -.081$, $t(118) = -1.885$, $p > .05$, however.
The positive SRRS composite variable did not predict satisfaction, $\beta = .001$, $t(118) = 1.185, p > .05$, investment, $\beta = .000$, $t(118) = .706, p > .05$, quality of alternatives, $\beta = 10.497$, $t(118) = .195, p > .05$, or commitment, $\beta = .000$, $t(118) = -1.382, p > .05$, during the second experimental session. Consistent with these lack of findings, there was no indirect effect of positive SRRS composite scores upon the second composite score of the likelihood to fabricate an alibi, $\beta = .020$, $t(118) = .587 p > .05$. Thus, the data provide no support for the second hypothesis.

8.7 Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis predicted that Investment Model construct scores obtained during the first data collection period would emerge as significant predictors of Investment Model construct scores during the second data collection period. This hypothesis was tested within the more parsimonious modified baseline model. Within this model, romantic relationship satisfaction during the first data collection period was a statistically significant predictor of romantic relationship satisfaction during the second data collection period, $\gamma = .928$, $t(118) = 5.494, p < .001$. Romantic relationship investment at the start of the study emerged as a statistically significant predictor of romantic relationship investment at the end of the study, $\gamma = .737$, $t(118) = 7.342, p < .001$. The quality of an individual’s alternative romantic relationship partners early in the semester was a statistically significant predictor of the quality of the individual’s alternative romantic relationship partners later in the semester, $\gamma = .568$, $t(118) = 4.400, p < .001$. Finally, romantic commitment during the first period of data collection did not emerge as a statistically significant predictor of romantic relationship commitment during the second period of data collection, $\beta = .005$, $t(118) = .042, p > .05$. Three of the four Investment Model constructs measured at the start of the experiment emerged as statistically significant
predictors of their respective Investment Model constructs at the end of the experiment. These findings provide general support for the third hypothesis.

Further examination of the modified baseline model concerning the Investment Model constructs revealed statistically significant intercorrelations among all constructs during the first period of data collection. Romantic relationship satisfaction was found to be negatively correlated with quality of alternatives, \( r(117) = -.49, p < .001 \), and moderately positively correlated with investment, \( r(117) = .54, p < .001 \). Investment and quality of alternatives were found to be negatively correlated, \( r(117) = -.38, p < .001 \). Satisfaction, \( \gamma = .123, t(118) = 4.352, p < .001 \), investment, \( \gamma = .127, t(118) = 5.376, p < .05 \), and quality of alternatives, \( \beta = -.053, t(118) = 2.224, p < .05 \), during the final experimental session emerged as statistically significant predictors of the commitment that was observed during this same time.

Romantic relationship commitment at the first data collection period was not found to predict satisfaction during the second data collection period, \( \beta = -.020, t(118) = -.04, p > .05 \); however this construct did predict quality of alternatives during the second data collection period, \( \beta = -.752, t(118) = -2.108, p < .05 \). No data suggested that satisfaction, \( \gamma = 6.609, t(118) = .306, p > .05 \), investment, \( \gamma = 15.226, t(118) = .805, p > .05 \), quality of alternatives, \( \gamma = -29.489, t(118) = -1.705, p > .05 \), or commitment, \( \beta = -20.747, t(118) = -.259, p > .05 \), during the initial experimental phase predicted the initial likelihood to fabricate corroborate composite score.

Values of satisfaction, \( \beta = .218, t(118) = 9.589, p < .001 \), investment, \( \beta = .116, t(118) = 3.988, p < .001 \), and quality of alternatives, \( \beta = -.130, t(118) = -4.098, p < .001 \), during the final data collection period significantly predicted commitment during the second data collection period. All Investment Model constructs measured during the final experimental session, among them satisfaction, \( \beta = 27.526, t(118) = 1.865, p > .05 \), investment, \( \beta = .044, t(118) = .003 \),
p > .05, quality of alternatives, $\beta = 24.228$, $t(118) = 1.676$, $p > .05$, and commitment, $\beta = 8.762$, $t(118) = .163$, $p > .05$, did not emerge as statistically significant predictors of the final likelihood to falsely corroborate composite. The initial likelihood to falsely corroborate composite score did emerge as a statistically significant predictor of its respective final value, $\beta = .533$, $t(118) = 6.746$, $p < .001$.

8.8 Additional Analyses

Post-hoc, hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to understand better what variables were associated with a participant’s willingness to fabricate an alibi on behalf of his or her romantic partner at both the start of the experiment and at the end of the experiment. Participants’ initial composite ratings of their willingness to fabricate an alibi on behalf of their romantic partner were regressed upon three sets of variables. The first set of variables that were entered into the regression equation reflected the demographic characteristics of the participant (i.e., age, gender). The second set of variables that were entered into the regression equation described the romantic relationship of the participant. These variables measured whether the participant was dating or engaged to his or her partner, the presence or absence of a past break-up, the year in which the relationship started, and if the participant had any children. The third and final set of variables entered into the regression equation contained the Investment Model Scale subscale scores observed during the first time period.

Neither the statistical model containing the first set of variables, $F(2, 112) = 1.841$, $p = .163$, $Adjusted R^2 = .015$, $N = 115$, nor the model containing the first two sets of variables, $F(6, 108) = 1.301$, $p = .263$, $Adjusted R^2 = .016$, $N = 115$, was statistically significant. The addition of the final set of variables did represent a marginally statistically significant improvement in the proportion of variability explained in an individual’s willingness to corroborate a partner’s alibi.
Participants’ final composite ratings of their willingness to fabricate an alibi on behalf of their romantic partner were regressed upon five sets of variables. The first three sets of variables that were entered into the regression equation were nearly identical to those entered into the regression models predicting an individual’s willingness to falsely corroborate an alibi on behalf of his or her partner during the first data collection period. The variable measuring whether a participant was dating or was engaged to his or her partner was removed from the second set of variables because both engaged participants cancelled their engagement between the first data collection period and the second, rendering the sample composed entirely of individuals in dating relationships. The fourth set of variables contained the positive and negative SRRS composite scores and the initial willingness to fabricate composite score while the final set of variables contained the Investment Model Scale subscale scores measured during the second data collection period.

The regression model containing the first set of variables was not statistically significant, $F(2, 113) = 2.22, p = .113$, $Adjusted \ R^2 = .021$, $N = 116$. While the addition of the second set of variables did not explain additional variability in the dependent measure above and beyond the first regression model, $F(3, 110) = 2.12, p = .116$, the second model was marginally statistically significant, $F(5, 110) = 2.12, p = .068$, $Adjusted \ R^2 = .047$, $N = 116$. Within this model, having
children (β = .189, p = .041) was as a statistical significant predictor of falsely corroborating an alibi for a partner and being a woman (β = -.169, p = .068) was a marginally statistically significant predictor of doing so. Although adding the third set of variables containing Investment Model construct scores did not produce a statistically significant increase in variability explained \( F(4, 106) = 1.88, p = .116 \), the third regression equation was statistically significant, \( F(9, 106) = 2.05, p = .041 \), \( \text{Adjusted } R^2 = .076 \), \( N = 116 \). In this model, being a woman (β = -.170, p = .076) and having children (β = .173, p = .06) were marginally statistically significant predictors of being willing to fabricate an alibi across a variety of crimes on the behalf of a romantic partner. Adding the fourth set of variables significantly improved the ability of the regression equation to explain variability in the dependent measure \( F(3, 103) = 9.78, p < .001 \); this regression equation was statistically significant, \( F(12, 103) = 4.37, p < .001 \), \( \text{Adjusted } R^2 = .26, N = 116 \). An individual’s initial willingness to fabricate an alibi composite score (β = .472, p < .001) was a statistically significant predictor of this person’s final willingness to fabricate an alibi composite score. The initial rating of a person’s quality of alternative partners was a marginally statistically significant predictor (β = .183, p = .067) of a person’s final willingness to fabricate composite score. While the inclusion of the Investment Model subscale scores during the second data collection period did not significantly improve the amount of variability in the terminal willingness to falsely corroborate composite score, \( F(4, 99) = 1.95, p = .108 \), the final regression was statistically significant, \( F(16, 99) = 3.88, p < .001 \), \( \text{Adjusted } R^2 = .286, N = 116 \). The only statistically significant predictor of the terminal composite rating of an individual’s willingness to fabricate an alibi on behalf of their partner was their initial willingness to do so (β = .505, p < .001). Model parameters for this final statistically significant model are presented in Table 12.
Chapter 9: Experiment 2 Discussion

The second study attempted to determine how the natural progression of a romantic relationship affected participants’ overall likelihood to fabricate an alibi in support of their romantic partner. Interdependency theory (Kelley, 1979; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) holds that individuals in a successful romantic relationship learn to coordinate their behavior in such a manner so that it benefits both partners. By using Interdependency Theory as a theoretical framework for her Investment Model (Rusbult, 1980a; Rusbult, 1983), changes that occur within a romantic relationship should alter each partner’s commitment to one another and this commitment, or lack thereof, should predict how people interpret and respond to stressful life events. Above and beyond this, the interpretation that individuals give to stressful life events that they experienced during the progression of their romantic relationship should indirectly influence the likelihood that they would provide false alibi corroboration for their partner later in their relationship. Responding positively or negatively to the obstacles that life presents could improve one’s satisfaction in the relationship, how much he or she invests in the relationship, and whether or not alternative romantic partners appear more attractive. Those constructs would then, in turn, predict an individual’s commitment to his or her romantic partner and this commitment would explain the participant’s likelihood of fabricating an alibi for his or her romantic partner.

Evidence was found to provide some support for the fit of the latent variable models. Hu and Bentler (1999) have proposed three fit indices that, taken together, testify to the fit of data to a particular model. Both models featured in the longitudinal study exceeded one threshold fit index and approached the standard for acceptable fit with the other two fit indices. The modest success of the latent variable models appears to have been driven by the Investment Model. At
the measurement model level, the items of each Investment Model Scale (Rusbult et al., 1998) subscale loaded onto their respective construct at both data collection time points. The subscales of the Investment Model Scale (Rusbult et al., 1998) all provided good to excellent indices of internal reliability, mirroring previous findings (Rhatigan & Axsom, 2006; Rhatigan et al., 2005; Rusbult et al., 1998). Moderate correlations were observed between satisfaction, investment, and quality of alternatives that were consistent with past literature (Le & Agnew, 2003) and the ability of the Investment Model constructs to predict romantic relationship commitment in their respective periods of data collection supported the findings of previous studies (Le & Agnew, 2003; Rusbult, 1983). These Investment Model constructs did not emerge as statistically significant predictors of their respective likelihood of alibi fabrication composites, however. Coupled with the finding that the likelihood of alibi fabrication composite at the start of the study could predict the second likelihood of alibi fabrication composite, this would suggest that stable factors beyond the domain of the romantic relationship should be investigated to explain why a person in a relationship may be likely to provide false testimony on behalf of his or her partner and why this persists across time.

Post-hoc, hierarchal multiple regression revealed that two variables could predict an individual’s willingness to fabricate an alibi across a variety of criminal scenarios during the study’s final data collection period in the absence of knowledge concerning one’s initial willingness to commit perjury. Women, on average, were less willing than men to fabricate an alibi for their partner and this may reflect the fact that women are more averse towards criminal activity (i.e., perjury) than men. Additionally, participants who had children were more willing to fabricate an alibi than were those participants who were not parent. This suggests that people
would be willing to risk perjury to protect a partner who may provide financial resources and
social support not only for the alibi corroborator, but also for the alibi corroborator’s children.

These variables did not remain in the regression equation as statistically significant
predictors when the fourth set of variables was entered into the regression equation. The initial
willingness of an individual to fabricate an alibi on behalf of a partner emerged as a strong
predictor of the final willingness of the individual to fabricate an alibi for a partner. The more
willing one was to perjure him or herself during the initial data collection period, the more
willing this person was to do so at the final data collection period. An individual who has a
predisposition towards perjury does not lose this tendency over time. Furthermore, the addition
of the fourth set of variables to the regression equation revealed that quality of alternative
partners during the initial data collection period predicted an individual’s willingness to fabricate
an alibi at the second data collection point. As participants perceived a higher quality of
available partners available to them earlier in their relationship, they became more willing to
fabricate an alibi for their partner later in their relationship. This initially counterintuitive
finding can be explained. All participants who provided data during the final data collection
period reported that they were still in the same romantic relationship that they described at the
start of the study. Thus, those who avoided the temptation to terminate their romantic
relationship in search of a better partner would be those willing to demonstrate the depth of their
devotion by fabricating an alibi for their significant other later in their relationship. The final
regression model featured only one statistically significant predictor of a participant’s terminal
willingness to commit perjury and that was the initial willingness of a person to engage in this
behavior. When considered in combination with all the other variables measuring
characteristics of the participant (e.g., age) and characteristics of the quality of the participant’s
romantic relationship (e.g., satisfaction), this single variable remained the best predictor of an individual’s willingness to engage in perjury for a significant other as a relationship progressed. Lacking knowledge of this variable, judges, jurors, and law enforcement personnel may best be served by knowing an individual’s gender and if he or she is a parent of a child in order to gauge this person’s willingness to engage in perjury over the course of a criminal investigation or trial.

The wording of the question soliciting participants’ ratings of their willingness to fabricate an alibi for their partner across a variety of criminal scenarios provided little opportunity for the participants to misinterpret the question. In contrast, the wording of the question soliciting participants’ ratings of behalf their willingness to corroborate an alibi for their partner if they knew that he or she could not have committed the crime could be misinterpreted. False testimony constitutes perjury. Asking participants if they would corroborate an alibi provided by their partner in connection to a crime in which they knew their partner was innocent could be interpreted as an opportunity for the participant to commit perjury. A participant may have imagined a scenario in which his or her significant other offered the claim that he or she was home alone at the time the crime took place. In this situation, the participant would have had no way of corroborating the claim of innocence without perjuring him or herself. Alternatively, a participant may have imagined a scenario in which the pair was together at the time during which a crime was alleged to have occurred. The corroboration of the partner’s alibi would entail no perjury in this scenario because both the accused and the corroborator were together during a specified period of time. The different patterns of means observed between the questions would suggest that participants responding to the question regarding the corroboration of their innocent partner’s alibi imagined the later scenario rather than the former scenario. A majority of participants would corroborate an alibi for a known innocent while few
would corroborate an alibi for a known perpetrator, lending credence to the belief that few participants misinterpreted the intent of the question regarding their willingness to corroborate an alibi for a romantic partner who was innocent.

The failure of a participant’s initial level of commitment to predict his or her level of commitment at the end of the study was surprising given that all other Investment Model constructs during the first time period predicted their respective Investment Model constructs during the second time period. One possible interpretation is that the experimental error introduced in the rating scale of the commitment subscale at both experimental sessions produced this outcome. This error limited the response options for participants from nine to four choices; however, the internal reliability of the commitment subscale remained excellent both at the start of the experiment and at the end of the termination of the experiment. These Cronbach alphas are consistent with those reported in past research featuring the Investment Model Scale (Rhatigan & Axsom, 2006; Rhatigan, Moore, & Stuart, 2005; Rusbult et al., 1998). An alternative interpretation is that participants who remain in a romantic relationship across an academic semester are, by definition, committed to their partner.

The modified full model did not represent a significant improvement over the modified baseline model and this may be attributed to the overall failure of the SRRS composite variables to emerge as statistically significant predictors of Investment Model constructs during the final experimental session. Furthermore, no evidence emerged to suggest that positive and negative SRRS composites indirectly influenced an individual’s likelihood of fabricating an alibi. While the full model proposed that a more thorough understanding of how a romantic partner’s willingness to fabricate an alibi could be influenced by the occurrence of significant life events, model fit indices indicated that a model without these predictors was an equal fit of the data. If
two models display equally good model fit indices and one model requires fewer parameters to be estimated, the more parsimonious model should be retained. In the second experiment, the baseline, or more parsimonious model, was retained. Several limitations of the current study may have contributed to this failure of the full model to emerge as a better model than the baseline model.

One limitation of the current study was the condensed timeframe in which it was conducted. Some of the items that are featured in the Social Readjustment Rating Scale (Holmes & Rahe, 1967) are relatively rare (e.g., being fired from work) and the likelihood that a participant would encounter the event would naturally increase as the time between the pair of data collection points increases. A longitudinal study featuring a student sample that extends over an academic semester would be methodologically difficult, however, owing to the fact that the participant loses the experimental participation incentive to complete the study after he or she completes his or her Introductory Psychology course. One remedy to this problem is to recruit a sample of participants from the community that is not limited to artificial data collection timeframes.

Another limitation of the study concerned the content of the SRRS (Holmes & Rahe, 1967). The failure of the SRRS composite scores to be predicted by commitment scores obtained during the first data collection period may indicate that many of the items listed on the SRRS occur independent of one’s commitment to his or her romantic relationship. Romantic relationship commitment may predict the occurrence of some significant life events (e.g., marriage, pregnancy, in-law troubles) for an individual, but other significant life events (e.g., death of a close friend, outstanding personal achievement) cannot be theoretically linked to ratings of commitment. For example, there is no reason to suggest that knowing if a man is
commitment to his girlfriend can predict whether or not he is fired from his job. A similar argument can be advanced for the failure of the SRRS composite scores to predict, with the exception of satisfaction, Investment Model construct scores during the second data collection period. While some significant life events (e.g., detention in jail or other institution, sexual difficulties) may be theoretically linked to Investment Model constructs, others (e.g., troubles with the boss, change in residence) may not. For this reason, researchers interested in examining how stressful life events impact romantic relationships should carefully examine SRRS items and remove those items where the theoretical link between the item and the romantic relationship outcome is weak or nonexistent. Alternatively, the researcher can ask the participant to indicate whether the occurrence of a particular event affected his or her romantic relationship. The researcher can then include only those items that the participant indicated influenced his or her romantic relationship in subsequent statistical analyses.

Above and beyond the concern that many SRRS items were irrelevant to the study of romantic relationship outcomes is the fact that many of the life events featured in the SRRS are not developmentally appropriate for a typical student sample. Not one student, for example, reporting retiring during the semester or having his or her child leave home. Past researchers have attempted to revise the SRRS (Hobson et al., 1998) and future researchers may benefit from attempts to develop a version of the SRRS that features stressful life events that occur more frequently for young adults (e.g., joining a campus activity group, being selected for a prestigious scholarship). Alternatively, the researcher may consider recruiting a community sample that might be more appropriate for the SRRS.

A larger sample size would have been desirable for the second study. The sample from which participants could be recruited was smaller than that of other studies owing to the
requirement that the participant must have been in his or her romantic relationship for a minimum of two weeks at the time of experimental registration. Furthermore, many participants at the second data collection point reported not being in the same romantic relationship that they described at the start of the study and this prevented their data from being considered for the latent variable path models. Despite this, a retention rate of approximately 90% represented a highlight of the study and suggested that a diligent effort and personalized plan to prevent attrition can be successful in limited longitudinal studies, regardless of whether the data can be used in the formal statistical analysis.
Chapter 10: General Discussion

The presence of physical evidence or the testimony of an alibi corroborator may be critical to a defendant’s argument that he or she could not have perpetrated a criminal act. Video surveillance footage could show that the defendant was attending a minor league baseball game at the time during which the crime was alleged to have occurred. In contrast to physical evidence substantiating a claim of innocence, alibi testimony remains far from unassailable. Olson and Wells (2004) have argued that an alibi corroborator must be able to both be able to accurately identify the defendant as being the person he or she was with at a specified time. The inability of the alibi corroborator to identify the defendant as the person he was with at a particular time has been found to produce greater conviction rates than when the alibi corroborator substantiates the claim of innocence (McAllister & Bregman, 1989). This result supports the argument made by Olson and Wells (2004) that an alibi witness must be accurate in recalling whom he or she was with on a given date during a specified time.

Olson and Wells (2004) further proposed that an alibi corroborator must also be perceived not to have a motivation to lie on behalf of the accused. It is not difficult to imagine a scenario in which a mother elects to produce false testimony in an effort to protect her son from going to jail or a husband distorts the truth so that his children will not be deprived of their mother for a considerable period of time. Indeed, conviction rates have been found to be greater in experimental conditions featuring alibi corroboration provided by an individual who had a known relationship to the accused (i.e., a girlfriend, a brother-in-law) than those experimental conditions featuring testimony provided by an individual with a superficial relationship (e.g., a neighbor) to the accused or no relationship at all (Culhane & Hosch, 2004; McAllister & Bregman, 1989). Research in press (Hosch et al., in press) expands upon these findings by
proposing that evolutionary psychology may explain the predilection of jurors to be skeptical of testimony provided by those with whom the defendant shares a relationship.

Alibi literature has not yet examined whether differences exist among the spectrum of labels given to the same relationship. A woman’s father, for example, always remains her father, regardless of how they feel towards each other; this woman’s boyfriend, however, may eventually be labeled her fiancé or, later, her husband. The gradual change from a boyfriend to a fiancé and from a fiancée to a husband may be indicative of increasing interdependency between the pair (Kelley, 1979; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). As a romantic relationship progresses, each partner would be expected to transition from engaging in behavior that maximizes dyadic outcomes for him or herself to patterns of behavior that are mutually beneficial to both partners. The Investment Model (Rusbult, 1980a; Rusbult, 1983) constructs were derived, in part, from Interdependency Theory (Kelley, 1979; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) and proposed that commitment to a romantic relationship is a function of relationship satisfaction, investment, and the quality of alternative partners available to an individual. There is no doubt that romantic relationships exist for couples who describe themselves as dating, engaged to be married, or married. The question is really if the increasing commitment and interdependency inherent in the terms used to describe the quality of the romantic relationship affects how jurors evaluate the alibi offered by one partner in defense of the other partner and the likelihood that this partner would engage in perjury. The first study sought to address this research question.

Fluctuations and changes in Investment Model constructs are not unusual (Arriaga, 2001; Rusbult, 1983; Goodfriend & Agnew, 2008) and these changes may be the product of stressful life events that are experienced by one or both members of a romantic relationship. Holmes and
Rahe (1967) proposed that a stressful life event such as the death of a friend or a change in sleeping habits requires differing psychological readjustment from a person in order to cope with the occurrence of that event. Not all stressful life events are negative, however, as a pregnancy may be both exciting and imposing to an expectant mother (Holmes & Rahe, 1967). An individual in a romantic relationship may be willing or likely to fabricate an alibi on behalf of his or her romantic partner on the basis of his or her levels of satisfaction, investment, quality of alternatives, and commitment in the romantic relationship. While these Investment Model constructs may have a direct effect on one’s likelihood to provide across-the-board fabricated alibi testimony, how an individual responds to stressful life events may have a profound effect upon the Investment Model constructs that bolster or undermine commitment to a romantic relationship. If these stressful life events do influence the Investment Model constructs that are the antecedents of commitment, the magnitude of these stressful life events should indirectly predict composite scores of an individual’s likelihood to fabricate an alibi for his or her romantic partner. Thus, the second study sought to determine over the course of one academic semester how the natural growth in a successful romantic relationship and the influence of these stressful life events influenced a partner’s likelihood to fabricate a wide range of alibis.

10.1 Experiment 1

The first study failed to find support for the experimental hypotheses that manipulations to the length of a couple’s romantic relationship and the status used to describe that partnership would alter the believability of a defendant’s alibi claim and the likelihood that his partner would fabricate false testimony on his behalf. Ratings on these two variables did not differ statistically across experimental conditions in which an individual who described her current romantic relationship with the accused as being either two months or two years old provided the
testimony. Similarly, manipulations to the relationship status provided to the alibi corroborator (i.e., girlfriend, fiancée, wife) produced no change on the dependent measures. Post-hoc analyses were similarly disappointing, although some evidence was found that participants perceive that a wife of two months is more motivated to lie in order to protect her husband than a girlfriend of two months would be to protect her boyfriend.

One important finding reported by Olson and Wells (2004) was that alibi believability did not change when the relationship of the corroborator to the accused was manipulated across conditions in which strong physical evidence was present. These findings suggested that physical evidence had a tendency to overwhelm any type of testimonial evidence. The lack of results from the first study may suggest a similar phenomenon is occurring. Specifically, any sort of corroboration from a witness who has a known relationship to the accused may overwhelm any variation that exists within that particular type of relationship. Given that an alibi corroborator and a defendant have a romantic relationship, any effects that are observed due to the presence of that partnership may simply subsume any effects produced by the length of that relationship.

The first study was not without limitation. The first limitation was that a large proportion of the experimental sample was excluded from the analysis on the grounds that they failed one or more manipulation checks. Their exclusion exacerbated statistical power concerns produced by surprisingly small effect sizes. Alibi research is limited (Burke, 2003) and has only focused on differences between alibi corroborators (Culhane & Hosch, 2004; Hosch et al., in press; Olson & Wells, 2004). Thus, little guidance has been offered for the selection of effect sizes necessary to achieve desirable levels of statistical power. Qualitative change across a relationship is not limited to the romantic relationship and may include how a friend becomes a
best friend. If the evaluation of an alibi could be affected by changes introduced within a narrowly specified type of relationship, romantic relationships would have presented the ideal testing ground for such a demonstration. The small effect sizes obtained in the first study should caution researchers if they choose to focus upon one type of relationship. If small effects are present across a romantic relationship, even smaller effects may exist across platonic relationships. Furthermore, the selection of the two dependent measures was not ideal.

Research opportunities remain for psychologists interested in examining how change in a romantic relationship affects alibi evaluation. The reported research examined how changes to the status of a romantic relationship affected an individual’s perceptions of the believability of an alibi, the motivation of an alibi corroborator to lie for her partner, and the likelihood that she would provide false testimony. Experimental manipulations incorporated qualitatively different labels to the same romantic partnership were designed to reflect increasing levels of commitment (e.g., girlfriend, fiancée, wife). Future research can examine how the deterioration of a romantic relationship affects a man’s likelihood to corroborate the alibi of his ex-wife or ex-girlfriend. If a man is accused of a crime and his alibi corroborator is his ex-wife, jurors may consider her to be a non-motivated familiar other rather than a motivated familiar other, to use the parlance of Olson and Wells (2004). All other variables held equal, randomized experiments featuring the testimony of either a spouse or ex-spouse can help to refine the guiding theoretical frameworks of alibi research (Olson & Wells, 2004; Hosch et al., in press). If the simple presence of a romantic relationship overwhelms any differences that may be observed across that romantic relationship (i.e., length of romantic relationship), a divorce that publicly terminates a romantic partnership may effectively remove a juror’s perception that a pair of individuals shares a meaningful relationship.
10.2 Experiment 2

The second study found some support for the experimental hypotheses. Evidence suggested that both models adequately fit the data using at least one of the multiple criteria for fit; the baseline model was retained on the basis that it displayed greater parsimony than the full model, however. The moderate correlations observed among Investment model constructs is consistent with data that was reported in a large meta-analysis (Le & Agnew, 2003) and the ability of satisfaction, investment, and quality of alternatives to predict romantic relationship commitment replicates past findings (Impett, Beals, & Peplau, 2001; Le & Agnew, 2003; Rusbult, 1983). Surprisingly, romantic relationship commitment at the start of the study did not predict romantic relationship commitment at the end of the study, although this may be due to measurement error introduced into the scoring of the Investment Model Scale commitment subscale (Rusbult et al., 1998) by limiting response options. The addition of the SRRS composite scores to the baseline latent variable model produced disappointing results in that no improvement in model fit was observed and this is attributable to the weaknesses of the positive and negative SRRS composite variables. Positive and negative SRRS composite scores were not predicted by an individual’s commitment to his or her romantic relationship at the initial data collection point in the study. These scores almost universally did not predict any of the theoretical antecedents of commitment, with the exception being that increases in negative SRRS composite scores were found to be associated with decreases in romantic relationship satisfaction at the end of the study. Thus, there was no evidence to suggest that there was any indirect effect of SRRS composite scores upon an individual’s likelihood to fabricate an alibi composite score. Indeed, no Investment Model construct predicted an individual’s likelihood to fabricate alibis on
behalf of their partner either at the start of the longitudinal study or at the end of the it, respectively.

The second study was not without its limitations. Funding and time constraints limited the scale of the second study and by doing so, may have undercut the impact of the role of stressful life events (Holmes & Rahe, 1967) on the larger investigation of how romantic relationship change affects one’s likelihood to provide false testimony. A significantly expanded timeframe between experimental sessions would likely have afforded participants a greater opportunity to experience not only a greater number of major life events, but also to experience events that require greater psychological readjustment. Furthermore, the Social Readjustment Rating Scale (Holmes & Rahe, 1967) featured items that varied on their theoretical connections to Investment Model constructs. Knowing a woman’s level of commitment to her boyfriend, for example, should not influence her interactions with her boss at work and her interactions with her boss at work should not influence how she feels about her boyfriend. Her commitment to her boyfriend, however, may predict whether the pair gets married and the occurrence of this event may ultimately influence how she feels about her relationship. A researcher would be wise to examine the items of the SRRS to eliminate those that have little or no connection to romantic relationship outcomes. Furthermore, not all of the SRRS items were developmentally appropriate for use within a young sample. Participants were, on average, a little over 19 years of age and these participants were unlikely to have encountered several life events featured on the SRRS (e.g., retirement from work, son or daughter leaving home). Future researchers interested in addressing this limitation may consider a sample of participants from the community. The community members would not be bound by artificial semester time
constraints and these individuals could potentially experience more stressful life events over the 
course of the study.

Despite these limitations, two important findings have emerged from the second study 
that can serve to guide future alibi research. The first important finding was the complete 
failure of Investment Model constructs to predict one’s likelihood to engage in alibi fabrication 
for his or her partner at both the start of the study and at the conclusion of the study. Knowing 
or perceiving that an individual is more satisfied with a partner or less invested in a relationship 
tells a researcher nothing about his or her likelihood to engage in perjury. Taken together with 
the results of the first study, this lack of findings may suggest that the presence or absence of a 
romantic relationship between an alibi corroborator and a defendant should remain the focus of 
alibi research. Additional information about the quality of a relationship provides does not alter 
jurors’ perceptions of an alibi provided by one member of a romantic relationship; jurors do 
believe that this corroborator is motivated to lie, however. The second important finding was 
that the alibi fabrication composite score during the first data collection period predicted the 
second alibi fabrication composite score and post-hoc, hierarchal regression analyses suggested 
that the addition of this single variable removed gender and parenthood as predictors of this 
composite score to commit perjury. Increases in one’s likelihood to falsely corroborate at the 
early stage of a relationship were associated with increases in one’s likelihood to corroborate at a 
later point in a relationship. Future research may want to examine the individual differences or 
personality characteristics that influence a person’s likelihood of perjuring himself or herself. 
By isolating the stable factors that influence an individual’s initial perjury predilections, the 
persistence of the variable over time can be explained.
10.3 The Future of Alibi Research

In combination, the two studies reported in this dissertation attempted to expand the boundaries of alibi research by focusing exclusively upon one type of relationship that may exist between an alibi corroborator and a defendant, namely the romantic relationship. Past alibi literature (Culhane & Hosch, 2004; Hosch et al, in press; Olson & Wells, 2004) has featured experimental manipulations to the nature of the relationship between a pair of individuals at the exclusion of factors that might vary across a relationship. The current studies represent an attempt to advance the field of alibi research beyond that limited domain. Almost no evidence was found to suggest that the label of the level of commitment used to describe one member of a romantic couple or the length of the relationship affected perceptions of the alibi corroborator or the alibi claim itself. The second study adopted a longitudinal design that produced results that dovetailed with those reported in the first study. Specifically, no Investment Model (Rusbult, 1980a; Rusbult, 1983) constructs predicted an individual’s across-the-board likelihood to fabricate an alibi at two different periods of time. In sum, these unexpected outcomes serve as a warning to alibi researchers that while differences observed across a romantic relationship may appear to be theoretically meaningful, the simple presence or absence of a relationship between two people may yet remain the single most important finding guiding alibi research.
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Appendix
Table 1.

*Items Loadings for the Two Factors Extracted Using Principal Components Analysis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Alibi Believability</th>
<th>Witness Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Measures Form Question #10</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Measures Form Question #9.</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Measures Form Question #11</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Measures Form Question #6</td>
<td>-.646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Measures Form Question #8</td>
<td>-.610</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Measures Form Question #13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Measures Form Question #12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Measures Form Question #16</td>
<td></td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Measures Form Question #15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Measures Form Question #14</td>
<td>-.534</td>
<td>.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Measures Form Question #19</td>
<td></td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 242*

*Note.* Participants in the condition featuring no alibi corroboration did not complete these questions.
Table 2.

LCU Derived in Study One and the Frequency of SRRS Events Experienced During Study Two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRRS Life Event</th>
<th>LCU</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troubles with the boss</td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention in jail or other institution</td>
<td>49.84</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of a spouse</td>
<td>75.98</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in the sleeping habits (a lot more or a lot less sleep, or change in part of day when asleep)</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of a close family member</td>
<td>55.13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in eating habits (a lot more or a lot less food intake, or very different meal hours or surroundings)</td>
<td>21.02</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreclosure on a mortgage or loan</td>
<td>41.68</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision of personal habits (dress, manners, associations, etc.)</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of a close friend</td>
<td>46.29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor violations of the law (e.g., traffic tickets, jaywalking, disturbing the peace, etc.)</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding personal achievement</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>48.60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in the health or behavior of a family member</td>
<td>38.04</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual difficulties</td>
<td>33.63</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-law troubles</td>
<td>28.17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in number of family get-togethers (e.g., a lot more or a lot less than usual)</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in financial state (e.g., a lot worse off or a lot better off than usual)</td>
<td>40.29</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining a new family member (e.g., through birth, adoption, older moving in etc.)</td>
<td>42.15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in residence</td>
<td>26.49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son or daughter leaving home (e.g., marriage, attending college, etc.)</td>
<td>34.46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital separation from mate</td>
<td>38.81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in church activities (e.g., a lot more or a lot less than usual)</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital reconciliation with mate</td>
<td>38.82</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being fired from work</td>
<td>38.61</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>52.71</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing to a different line of work</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in the number of arguments with spouse (e.g., either a lot more or a lot less than usual regarding childrearing, personal habits, etc.)</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in responsibilities at work (e.g., promotion, demotion, lateral transfer)</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse beginning or ceasing work outside the home</td>
<td>28.36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in working hours or conditions</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major changes in usual type and/or amount of recreation</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking on a mortgage greater than $51,000 (e.g., purchasing a home, business, etc.)</td>
<td>46.87</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking on a mortgage less than $51,000 (e.g., purchasing a car, TV, freezer, etc.)</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major personal injury or illness</td>
<td>44.53</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major business readjustment (e.g., merger, reorganization, bankruptcy, etc.)</td>
<td>38.76</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in social activities (e.g., clubs, dancing, movies, visiting, etc.)</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change in living conditions (e.g., building a new home, remodeling, deterioration of home or neighborhood)</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement from work</td>
<td>35.99</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

Descriptive Analysis for Items Observed During the First Data Collection Period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>32.70</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 3</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 4</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 5</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 6</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 2</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 3</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 4</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 5</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 6</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 2</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 3</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 4</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 5</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 6</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 1</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 2</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 4</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 5</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 6</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 7</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication Composite</td>
<td>278.53</td>
<td>258.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 119 \)

Note: The first data collection period ran from February 12\textsuperscript{th}, 2010 to March 12\textsuperscript{th}, 2010.
Table 4.

Descriptive Analysis for Items Observed During the Second Data Collection Period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>29.44</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 3</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 4</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 5</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 6</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>25.62</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 2</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 3</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 4</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 5</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 6</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 2</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 3</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 4</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 5</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 6</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 1</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 2</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 3</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 4</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 5</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 6</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 7</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabrication Composite</td>
<td>267.55</td>
<td>262.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive SRRS Composite</td>
<td>169.86</td>
<td>213.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1381.46</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>9.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative SRRS Composite</td>
<td>132.86</td>
<td>181.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>869.07</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 119

Note: The second data collection period ran from April 23rd, 2010 to May 11th, 2010.
Table 5.

Descriptive Analysis for the Likelihood of Alibi Corroboration During the First Data Collection Period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truthful Corroboration of an Alibi</td>
<td>694.33</td>
<td>227.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>88.04</td>
<td>28.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-2.40</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Sexual Assault</td>
<td>85.53</td>
<td>32.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>88.34</td>
<td>27.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>87.91</td>
<td>28.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manslaughter</td>
<td>85.64</td>
<td>32.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>85.70</td>
<td>31.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-2.09</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>88.34</td>
<td>28.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>84.84</td>
<td>33.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely Corroborate Alibi</td>
<td>278.53</td>
<td>258.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>45.47</td>
<td>39.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Sexual Assault</td>
<td>24.39</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>46.34</td>
<td>38.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>44.56</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manslaughter</td>
<td>29.76</td>
<td>37.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>23.47</td>
<td>35.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>44.95</td>
<td>38.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>34.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The first data collection period ran from February 12th, 2010 to March 12th, 2010. The likelihood of truthfully corroborating an alibi was measured on the item, “Without knowing anything else about the following crimes, what is the likelihood that you would corroborate your romantic partner’s alibi if you knew that he or she did not commit the crime?” The likelihood of falsely corroborating an alibi was measured on the item, “Without knowing anything else about the following crimes, what is the likelihood that you would corroborate your romantic partner’s alibi if you knew that he or she did commit the crime?”
Table 6.

Descriptive Analysis for the Likelihood of Alibi Corroboration During the Second Data Collection Period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truthful Corroboration of an Alibi</td>
<td>668.12 (246.93)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>-2.82</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>85.03 (30.30)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Sexual Assault</td>
<td>81.47 (34.92)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>85.72 (29.94)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>84.19 (31.13)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manslaughter</td>
<td>82.90 (33.68)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>82.98 (33.67)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>84.45 (31.66)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>81.39 (35.01)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsely Corroborate Alibi</td>
<td>267.55 (262.83)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>42.60 (37.41)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Sexual Assault</td>
<td>24.16 (36.21)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>41.79 (38.23)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>44.46 (39.37)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manslaughter</td>
<td>26.98 (37.21)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>25.10 (37.23)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>40.90 (38.50)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>21.56 (35.18)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 119

Note: The second data collection period ran from April 23rd, 2010 to May 11th, 2010. The likelihood of truthfully corroborating an alibi was measured on the item, “Without knowing anything else about the following crimes, what is the likelihood that you would corroborate your romantic partner’s alibi if you knew that he or she did not commit the crime?” The likelihood of falsely corroborating an alibi was measured on the item, “Without knowing anything else about the following crimes, what is the likelihood that you would corroborate your romantic partner’s alibi if you knew that he or she did commit the crime?”
Table 7.

*Intercorrelations Among Investment Model Subscale Scores, Composite SRRS Scores, and Willingness to Fabricate Composite Scores.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Satisfaction (T1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfaction (T2)</td>
<td>.594**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Investment (T1)</td>
<td>.487**</td>
<td>.279**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Investment (T2)</td>
<td>.419**</td>
<td>.536**</td>
<td>.671**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quality of Alternatives (T1)</td>
<td>-.402**</td>
<td>-.275**</td>
<td>-.318**</td>
<td>-.192*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quality of Alternatives (T2)</td>
<td>-.371**</td>
<td>-.335**</td>
<td>-.347**</td>
<td>-.260**</td>
<td>.593**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Commitment (T1)</td>
<td>.707**</td>
<td>.407**</td>
<td>.652**</td>
<td>.485**</td>
<td>-.501</td>
<td>-.463**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Commitment Time (T2)</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>.765**</td>
<td>.330**</td>
<td>.586**</td>
<td>-.352**</td>
<td>-.534**</td>
<td>.510**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Willingness to Fabricate (T1)</td>
<td>.180*</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.185*</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.232**</td>
<td>-.190*</td>
<td>.198*</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Willingness to Fabricate (T2)</td>
<td>.228**</td>
<td>.229**</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.503**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. SRRS Positive Composite (T2)</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.195*</td>
<td>.163*</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. SRRS Negative Composite (T2)</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.210*</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 119.  T1 refers to a variable observed during the first data collection period while T2 refers to a variable observed during the second data collection period. A single asterisk (*) denotes that $p < .05$ while two asterisks (**) denotes that $p < .01$. 
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Table 8.

Factor Loadings and Standard Errors for Investment Model Constructs in the Modified Baseline Latent Variable Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable and Item</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Data Collection Period</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Data Collection Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized Factor Loading</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 3</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 4</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 5</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 6</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 3</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 4</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 5</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 6</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 3</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 4</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 5</td>
<td>1.257</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 6</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 2</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 3</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 4</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 5</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 6</td>
<td>1.722</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 7</td>
<td>1.669</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 119

Note: The first data collection period ran from February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2010 to March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2010. The second data collection period ran from April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 to May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010.
Table 9.
Factor Loadings and Standard Errors for Investment Model Constructs in the Modified Full Latent Variable Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable and Item</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Data Collection Period</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Data Collection Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized Factor Loading</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 3</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 4</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 5</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 6</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 3</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 4</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 5</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment 6</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 3</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 4</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 5</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives 6</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 2</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 3</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 4</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 5</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 6</td>
<td>1.722</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment 7</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 119
Note: The first data collection period ran from February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2010 to March 12<sup>th</sup>, 2010. The second data collection period ran from April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010 to May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010.
Table 10.

Model Fit Indices for the Latent Variable Models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>X^2</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Model</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1664.95</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.0695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Model with Modification Indices</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>1641.34</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.0684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Model</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1647.44</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.0694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 119
Table 11.
The Post-hoc Multiple Regression of the Initial Willingness to Fabricate an Alibi Composite Score Upon Experiment 2 Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(B)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-121.79</td>
<td>56.77</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-2.15</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship status</td>
<td>62.08</td>
<td>188.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous break-up</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>56.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have children</td>
<td>444.02</td>
<td>256.77</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year relationship began</td>
<td>20.57</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (Time 1)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment (Time 1)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives (Time 1)</td>
<td>-4.77</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (Time 1)</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 115

Note. The above regression equation was not statistically significant, \( F(10, 104) = 1.676, p = .096 \), Adjusted \( R^2 = .056 \).
Table 12.
The Post-hoc Multiple Regression of the Final Willingness to Fabricate an Alibi Composite Score Upon Experiment 2 Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(B)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-24.58</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-24.80</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous break-up</td>
<td>-10.55</td>
<td>50.88</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have children</td>
<td>200.17</td>
<td>179.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year relationship began</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (Time 1)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment (Time 1)</td>
<td>-5.90</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives (Time 1)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (Time 1)</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive SRRS Composite</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative SRRS Composite</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (Time 2)</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment (Time 2)</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Alternatives (Time 2)</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (Time 2)</td>
<td>-4.75</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 116

Note. The above regression equation was statistically significant, $F(16, 99) = 3.88 p < .001$, Adjusted $R^2 = .286$. 
Figure 1. Alibi believability, believability of alibi testimony, and motivation to lie by experimental condition.

Note: Bars represent standard error. Believability of the alibi claim was measured on the item, “How believable was the defendant’s claim that he was at a bar at the time during which the crime occurred?” Motivation to lie was measured on the item, “How motivated to lie to protect the defendant would this alibi witness be?” Believability of the alibi testimony provided by the alibi corroborator was measured on the item, “How believable was the testimony of the alibi witness in this case?”
Figure 2. Ratings of the likelihood that the alibi witness produced false testimony as a function of experimental condition.

Note: Bars represent standard error. Likelihood of false testimony was measured on the item, “In your opinion, how likely was it that the alibi witness provided false testimony to protect the defendant?”
Figure 3. Modified latent variable baseline model: Investment Model constructs and likelihood to fabricate composites change as a function of time.
Figure 4. Modified latent variable full model: Investment Model constructs and likelihood to fabricate composites change as a function of time and positive and negative life events.
Figure 5. Original latent variable baseline model: Investment Model constructs and likelihood to fabricate composites change as a function of time.
Figure 6. Original latent variable full model: Investment Model constructs and likelihood to fabricate composites change as a function of time and positive and negative life events.
Figure 7. Modified latent variable baseline model displaying unstandardized statistically significant model parameters.
Figure 8. Modified latent variable full model displaying unstandardized statistically significant model parameters.
Figure 9. Modified latent variable baseline model displaying unstandardized statistically significant model parameters including statistically significant disturbance terms among Investment Model constructs.
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University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) Institutional Review Board
Informed Consent Form for Research Involving Human Subjects

Protocol Title: Juror Evaluations of Courtroom Testimony

Principal Investigators: Kevin W. Jolly, M.A., Harmon M. Hosch, Ph.D.

UTEP Department of Psychology

Introduction
You are being asked to take part voluntarily in the research project described below. Please take your time making a decision. Before agreeing to take part in this research study, it is important that you read the consent form that describes the study. Please ask the study researcher or the study staff to explain any words or information that you do not clearly understand.

Why is this study being done?
This study is being conducted to evaluate how individual jurors evaluate testimony that is provided in court. Two hundred thirty individuals will be enrolling in this study. Psychology undergraduates will be recruited from the University of Texas at El Paso for this study. You are being asked to participate in this study because you are currently enrolled in an undergraduate course at UTEP.

If you decide to enroll in this study, your total involvement will last about one hour. Your participation will be completed in one session.

What is involved in the study?
If you agree to take part in this study, the research team will:

1. Ask you to sign and return this consent form.

2. Ask you to complete a *voir dire* form as if you were a juror and then to read a trial summary and to answer questions about that trial summary. You will be asked to sentence the defendant featured in the trial summary if you find him guilty of the crime featured in the trial summary.

3. You will be asked to look at a list of major life events and evaluate how much readjustment a person must undertake in order to cope with each major life event.

4. At the end, you will be debriefed and any questions you may have about the study will be answered.

What are the risks and discomforts of the study?
There is a minimal risk of discomfort associated with this research. Participants will be reading a trial summary; if you or someone you know have been a victim of a crime, reading the trial summary may bring back unpleasant memories. Participants will also evaluate the impact of major life events and several of these listed life events are negative. Evaluating these negative life events may bring back unpleasant memories if you have experienced similar events. If you were to feel uncomfortable due to your participation in this study, you will be referred to the
Are there benefits to taking part in this study?
There will be no direct benefits to you for taking part in this study. You may gain insight into the research process due to your participation. You may also better understand the variety of major life events that happen to you. This research may also help you to think about the legal system.

What other options are there?
You have the option not to take part in this study. You have the option to withdraw from the study at any time. There will be no penalties involved if you choose not to take part in this study or if you choose to discontinue your participation in the study.

Who is paying for this study?
This study is not funded by an outside agency.

What are my costs?
There are no direct costs to you for participation.

Will I be paid to participate in this study?
You will not be paid for participating in this study.

What if I want to withdraw, or am asked to withdraw from this study?
Taking part in this study is voluntary. You have the right to choose not to take part in this study. If you do not take part in the study, there will be no penalty.

If you choose to take part, you have the right to stop at any time. However, we encourage you to talk to a member of the research group so that they know why you are leaving the study. If there are any new findings during the study that may affect whether you want to continue to take part, you will be told about them.

The researchers may decide to stop your participation without your permission if he or she thinks that being in the study may cause you harm.

Who do I call if I have questions or problems?
You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may contact any of the principal investigators either by phone or email. Their contact information at UTEP is the following:

Kevin W. Jolly (915) 747-8032 kwjolly@miners.utep.edu
Harmon M. Hosch (915) 747-8861 hhosch@utep.edu

If you have questions or concerns about your participation as a research subject, please contact the UTEP Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (915-747-8841) or irb.orsp@utep.edu.

What about confidentiality?
1. Your participation in this study is confidential. None of the information will identify you by name.

2. Every effort will be made to keep your information confidential. Your personal information may be disclosed if required by law. Organizations that may inspect and/or copy your research records for quality assurance and data analysis include, but are not necessarily limited to:
   
   - UTEP Institutional Review Board

Because of the need to release information to these parties, absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. The results of this research study may be presented at meetings or in publications. However, your identity will not be disclosed in those presentations.

All records will be maintained on a secure computer in a locked office. Participants will be identified by ID rather than by name. Questionnaires will be kept in a locked laboratory.

**Mandatory reporting**
If information is revealed about child abuse or neglect, or potentially dangerous future behavior to you and/or others, the law requires that this information be reported to the proper authorities.

**Authorization Statement**
I have read each page of this form about the study (or it was read to me). I know that being in this study is voluntary and I choose to be in this study. I know I can stop being in this study without penalty. I will get a copy of this consent form now and can get information on results of the study later if I wish.

Participant Name: ____________________________ Date: ____________

Participant Signature: ____________________________ Time: ____________

Consent form explained/witnessed by: ____________________________

Signature

Printed name: ____________________________

Date: ____________ Time: ____________
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In this study, you will be assuming the role of a juror. As a juror, you will be asked to evaluate the evidence that is presented in several trials. Ultimately, you will be asked to make a decision regarding the guilt or innocence of the person standing trial.

You will review a summary of a trial that has been resolved in Van Horn, Texas. Following the trial summary, you will be asked to answer several questions about what you have read. When you have completed those questions, please give your binder to the experimenter. He or she will then explain the second half of the experiment to you.

In the second half of this study, you will be evaluating how much a person must readjust to certain stressful life events. You will see a list of stressful life events and you will be asked to indicate how much more or less stressful each event is relative to marriage.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The courtroom summary that you are about to read is based on a real criminal case that occurred within Van Horn, Texas. The names of all individuals have been changed in order to protect their identity.

The courtroom summary that you are about to read contains descriptions of violence that some may find disturbing. If at any time you experience any psychological discomfort while reading the trial summary, please inform the experimenter and he or she will excuse you from participation.

The list of stressful life events that you are about to read is comprehensive. You may have experienced some of these stressful life events and seeing them on the list may cause you psychological discomfort. If at any time you experience any psychological discomfort while reading the list of stressful life events, please inform the experimenter and he or she will excuse you from participation.

Should you desire to further discuss any psychological discomfort experienced as a result of this experiment, please contact:

Counseling Services
Union Building West Room 202
Phone Number: 915-747-5302
Fax Number: 915-747-5393
Website: www.utep.edu/counsel/
Department Email: ucc@utep.edu

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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Voir Dire Questionnaire

Age: _____ Gender: ___Male ____Female

Length of Residence in El Paso: _____________

Are you Hispanic/Latino?  Please check ONE:

___ Yes, Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano
___ Yes, Puerto Rican
___ Yes, Cuban
___ Yes, other Hispanic/Latino (Please specify): ______________________________
___ No, not Hispanic/Latino (Please specify): ________________________________

Licensed Driver: ___Yes ___ No
Registered Voter: ___Yes ___No

Relationship Status: ___ I am currently in a romantic relationship
In what month and year did this relationship begin?
____________________________

___ I am not currently in a romantic relationship
In what month and year did your last relationship begin?
____________________________
In what month and year did your last relationship end?
____________________________
Was the decision to end the relationship (circle one):

Mine    My significant other’s    Mutual

Do you have any children? ___ Yes ___ No If Yes, how many children do you have? _____

Your Occupation: _______________________
Employer: __________________________
Spouse’s Occupation: ___________________
Employer: __________________________

Last public school/college you attended:_____________________________________________
Grade you completed/degree received: ________________________________________________

What is (was) the principal profession or vocation of your parents:
Father: ____________________________________________
Mother: ____________________________________________

Your religious preference (if any): _________________________________________________

Have you actually served on a jury before? ___Yes ___No  If Yes, how many times? _____
Was it:  ___Civil ___Criminal ___Grand Jury
Was a verdict rendered? ___Yes ___ No

Have you ever served in a court martial (a military trial)?  ___Yes___ No

The term, “Law Enforcement Officer” means any of the following or any other kind of sworn law
enforcement officer:  Police, Sheriff, Deputy, Constable, Highway Patrol, State Police, Prison
Guard, F.B.I. Agent, Treasury Agent, Customs Agent, Postal Inspector, Immigration Agent,
Border Patrolman, Drug Enforcement Agent, Military Police, Shore Patrol, Private Investigator,
Security Guard, etc).

Are you now or have you ever been a law enforcement officer? ___Yes ___No
If Yes, state what type:
_________________________________________________________________
When were you a law enforcement officer?_____________________________________

Do you have a close friend/relative who is now or ever been a law enforcement officer? ___Yes
___No
If Yes, state the nature of the relationship:______________________________
Type of law enforcement officer: _______________________________________
When the individual was (is) a law enforcement officer:_____________________

Have you ever been a victim of a crime?  ___Yes__No
If Yes, state the nature of the crime:_____________________________________
When it occurred: ________________________
Has any close friend or relative been the victim of a crime? ___Yes ___No
If Yes, state the nature of the crime:_________________________________________________
When it occurred: ________________________

Have you ever been a witness in a criminal case: ___Yes ___No
If Yes, who were you a witness for? ___ Plaintiff ___ Defendant
If Yes, state the nature of the crime:_______________________________________________
When it occurred: ________________________
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IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF VAN HORN, TEXAS
No. 61 / 59-8335
Filed 02/17/2003

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

vs.

VASQUEZ, ALEJANDRO

Background Facts:

At 1:32 a.m. on January 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2003, police received a 911 call from the Lomax Shell. The caller indicated that a worker at the gas station was on his back behind the counter and appeared to be unconscious and bleeding heavily. Police were dispatched. Emergency crews arrived at the gas station at 1:35 a.m. and police arrived at 1:36 a.m. At this time the gas station employee had regained consciousness; the man was taken by ambulance to Culberson Hospital where he was admitted to the emergency room.

The victim, Alberto Gomez, received a total of 36 stitches to close his wounds. In addition, he suffered a mild concussion when he hit his head on the counter or the floor when he fell. There were no serious internal injuries. Mr. Gomez spoke with police at 2:30 p.m., nearly 12 hours after he was attacked. When he was the only person in the store, a man wearing a ski mask entered the store, ran behind the counter, and pulled a knife on him. The masked man told him to open the cash register, which Mr. Gomez did; the man then took two or three handfuls of money from the register and some packs of cigarettes that were within his reach. The perpetrator then instructed Mr. Gomez to open the gas station’s safe, but Mr. Gomez replied that he could not because he did not know the combination. The masked man did not believe this, and in anger he lifted up his ski mask and shouted at Mr. Gomez to open it. As he yelled, the masked man waved his knife in the air towards Mr. Gomez. When he did not open the safe, Mr. Gomez was slashed twice and stabbed once by the perpetrator. As a result, he staggered and fell backwards, hitting his head on the counter as he fell. The next thing he remembered seeing was a woman giving him first aid to stop his bleeding. Mr. Gomez also remembered the ambulance ride to the hospital, but he was unable to remember details of the ride (e.g., the names of the paramedics, the length of the ambulance ride).

Mr. Gomez said that his assailant was an Hispanic male who had brown eyes and black hair; the perpetrator had a moustache and had not shaved in the past few days. When asked how old he would estimate the perpetrator to be, the victim stated that he believed that the perpetrator to be approximately 35 or 40 years old. The victim could not be more specific in his description of the perpetrator’s face because the criminal removed his mask for only 5 or 10
seconds. He was, however, able to provide a more general description of his assailant. Mr. Gomez reported that the perpetrator was about two inches taller than him, which would make the suspect approximately 6’1”, and smelled as if he had been a smoker for most of his life. The victim also stated that the perpetrator had ugly teeth. Mr. Gomez informed the officers that the perpetrator had been wearing an old dark blue winter coat with silver trim with the Dallas Cowboys logo on it and black gloves because it was very cold that night.

At 10:21 p.m. on January 4th, police approached an individual who matched the description provided by Mr. Gomez. The Hispanic male who was stopped had a moustache and was wearing a Cowboys winter jacket that displayed wear-and-tear to the collar and zipper area. Alejandro Vasquez, 36, was questioned by police about his whereabouts at the time of assault and robbery at the Lomax Shell. Mr. Vasquez told officers that he and his fiancée of two months, Isabel Molina, had been at a local bar having a few drinks and snacks from approximately 11:00 p.m. to 2 a.m. before walking home to the apartment that they shared. He said that they both fell asleep at about 2:30 or 2:45 a.m. When asked if he had any physical evidence to support his alibi, Mr. Vasquez reported that he did not, but that his fiancée could attest to his whereabouts. Mr. Vasquez smelled heavily of cigarettes and when asked, the individual reported that he was a smoker and pulled out a pack of cigarettes. The gas station manager reported that several packs of cigarettes were stolen from his store in addition to the $85 taken from the register; the pack of Marlboro cigarettes shown to police by Mr. Vasquez matched the brand of cigarettes of those packs that were taken from the gas station following the assault. Police officers asked Mr. Vasquez if they could have him pose for a criminal photo lineup that they would show the victim; Mr. Vasquez agreed to be a member in the lineup. The next day, Mr. Gomez took less than 15 seconds to make an identification of Mr. Vasquez from the lineup and reported that he was 95% confidant that the person he identified was the culprit; police arrested Mr. Vasquez and charged him with aggravated assault, a second-degree felony in the State of Texas. The owner of the Lomax Shell gas station declined to press robbery charges because less than $150 of cash and merchandise were stolen from his store; the State of Texas chose not to prosecute Mr. Vasquez on robbery charges.

**Trial Proceedings:**

Alejandro Vasquez appeared in court on February 16th, 2003, to answer a second-degree felony aggravated assault charge stemming from a robbery that occurred a Lowmax Shell gas station on January 2nd, 2003. The defendant retained a defense attorney from El Paso, TX.

The prosecution’s opening statement argued that all of the collected evidence indicated that only Mr. Vasquez could have committed the aggravated assault. Jurors were told that video surveillance footage of the gas station on the night of the January 2nd, 2003, captured the assault of Mr. Gomez and would serve to support and corroborate the description of the suspect that was provided
to police officers. The prosecutor informed the court that it would hear testimony from the victim, police officers, and the owner of the store that would prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant was the perpetrator of the crime. Jurors were also informed that they would be hearing from the fiancée of the accused who would testify that they were together at the time of the assault and that any testimony they would hear from her is prejudiced because she would be willing to provide false testimony for the defendant to demonstrate her commitment to him and their two-month-old engagement.

The defense attorney’s opening statement emphasized that only circumstantial evidence will be offered over the course of the trial and that such evidence does not constitute grounds for the conviction of his client. As a demonstration, he pointed out that many individuals in southwestern Texas are Hispanic and that a noticeable proportion of these Hispanics are smokers. In addition, the winter coat that his client was wearing when police approached him was a popular brand in Texas because it displayed the colors of the Dallas Cowboys. He highlighted the fact that police never found the weapon or the ski mask and that his client’s clothes had no trace of blood on them, a surprising finding given the violent nature of the crime. Jurors were informed that the video surveillance footage showing the assault at the gas station failed to provide a view of the perpetrator’s face; furthermore, the attorney indicated that the victim’s identification of Mr. Vasquez from a police lineup might not be correct. The defense attorney also prepared jurors to hear testimony from the fiancée of the defendant; he stated that the fiancée would talk about how she and Mr. Vasquez had been engaged for two months and that they were simply alone together at a bar spending time together on the night in question. Specifically, the defendant’s fiancée would testify that she was sharing drinks and appetizers with the defendant at the time at which the crime was alleged to have occurred.

The police officers testified that they were confident that they apprehended the correct perpetrator and that the investigation was thorough; however, upon cross-examination by the defense counsel, the officers admitted that it was difficult to prosecute a criminal when the knife that was recovered at the crime scene did not possess DNA evidence that could be linked to the defendant. The officers admitted that two very small spots of blood were found on the jacket that was in the possession of the defendant; however, the blood tests were inconclusive as to whether or not blood belonged to the defendant. The defense attorney also got the pair to state that the description provided to them by the victim could describe many Hispanic males.

The owner of the store testified that five packs of Marlboro cigarettes were taken from the store in addition to the $85 taken from the cash register. When shown the pack of Marlboro cigarettes found on Mr. Vasquez, the storeowner testified that they could have been one of the packs that were taken during the assault. During the cross-examination of the storeowner, he admitted to not keeping an accurate inventory of the cigarettes that his store purchased and that he could not indicate a point in the security footage where the culprit pocketed more than one pack of Marlboro cigarettes.
Mr. Gomez testified that his description of his attacker was consistent with the appearance of the defendant and that he was extremely confident in his identification of the perpetrator from the police lineup. When asked to identify his attacker in court, Mr. Gomez pointed toward Mr. Vasquez. Upon being shown the winter coat that Mr. Vasquez wore when he first encountered police, the victim stated that it looked just like the one the criminal wore and that the damage seen on the jacket was consistent with the damage that Mr. Gomez observed on the jacket of the perpetrator on the night of the aggravated assault and robbery. Under cross-examination, the victim admitted to what the surveillance tape showed in that Mr. Gomez did not have long to look at the perpetrator’s face. He also admitted that he was more focused on the perpetrator’s knife than he was on getting a good look at the perpetrator’s face. Because of this Mr. Gomez said that his confidence in his identification may be incorrect; however, he maintained his confidence in his identification.

Mr. Vasquez testified that he was with his fiancée on the night of the aggravated assault. He told the court that he and his fiancée were at Ruby and Don’s Lounge from approximately 11 p.m. to 2 a.m. At 11:00 they ordered some mozzarella sticks and artichoke dip to share and each had a single beer. After they finished their food, Mr. Vasquez said that he and his fiancée drank water until it was 2 a.m. At 2 a.m., they returned to the apartment that they shared and they fell asleep around 2:30 or 2:45 a.m. Under direct examination, he admitted that he has been a smoker from the age of 17 and that Marlboros are his preferred brand of cigarette. Upon viewing the surveillance footage, he admitted that the perpetrator’s winter coat did look a lot like the one that he owned. Mr. Vasquez replied to the prosecutor’s line of questioning that he did have a Dallas Cowboys coat that matched the one seen in the surveillance footage and that it was cold enough on the night of the aggravated assault for most reasonable people to wear a coat. Mr. Vasquez acknowledged that his teeth were not in very good condition because his family could not afford to take him to the dentist very often when he was a kid. He admitted that no physical evidence could prove he was elsewhere at the time of the assault, but his fiancée would testify that he actually was elsewhere. When questioned by his defense attorney, Mr. Vasquez admitted that he purchased the coat at WalMart several years ago when it was on sale and that he supposed that many other people did the same thing.

Isabel Molina, the defendant’s fiancée, testified that she and Mr. Vasquez had been engaged for two months. Isabel corroborated the testimony of Mr. Vasquez. She stated for the Court that she and Mr. Vasquez went out to a local bar at 11 p.m. and ordered a light appetizer and a beer for each of them. Ms. Molina said that they had several glasses of water each as the night progressed and when it was 2 a.m., they left the bar to walk back to their apartment. She stated that they arrived at the apartment at about 2:30 a.m. and they both quickly fell asleep. The prosecutor inquired if she would be willing to fabricate testimony for Mr. Vasquez to protect their two-month-old engagement and she replied that she would not.
The defense attorney’s closing statement reminded the jury that the evidence against his client was coincidental at best and that millions of Texans wear a Dallas Cowboys jacket when it gets cold and that this is not unique. The attorney reminded the jury that blood that was found on the jacket could not scientifically be demonstrated to belong to either Mr. Gomez or his client, Mr. Vasquez; the knife that was found possessed no evidence that could be linked to Mr. Vasquez. He reminded the court that the description that was provided of the culprit was very vague and could describe many Hispanic males in the area. Furthermore, the video surveillance footage never showed the perpetrator’s face and the victim himself was unable to get a good view of the suspect because he was paying attention to the knife and not the criminal. As testament to his client’s innocence, the defense attorney reminded the jury that his client was with his fiancée at the time of the aggravated assault and robbery and that their story was consistent.

The prosecutor’s closing statement reminded the court that Mr. Vasquez was positively identified as being the perpetrator by the victim and that the victim pointed him out in the courtroom as being the man that assaulted him. Members of the jury were told that the confidence that Mr. Gomez had in his identification of Mr. Vasquez remained very strong. Jurors were reminded that it would be statistically unlikely for a witness to describe a man in such detail and to be correct on so many details, especially the Dallas Cowboys logo on the man’s coat and the condition of the jacket. The prosecutor also highlighted the incredible accuracy that Mr. Gomez displayed when he correctly described the condition of Mr. Vasquez’s teeth. Mr. Vasquez also displayed a pack of Marlboro cigarettes to police officers on the day that he was arrested and the pack that he displayed to police was the very brand of cigarettes that the owner of the store reported as having been stolen from his store. The prosecutor also instructed the jurors to be very skeptical about the alibi witness; he instructed the jurors to remember that there was a two-month-old engagement between the alibi corroborator and the defendant and that it would not be surprising for a fiancée to provide false testimony to protect her fiancé.
IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF VAN HORN, TEXAS
No. 61 / 59-8335
Filed 02/17/2003

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

vs.

VASQUEZ, ALEJANDRO

Background Facts:

At 1:32 a.m. on January 2nd, 2003, police received a 911 call from the Lomax Shell. The caller indicated that a worker at the gas station was on his back behind the counter and appeared to be unconscious and bleeding heavily. Police were dispatched. Emergency crews arrived at the gas station at 1:35 a.m. and police arrived at 1:36 a.m. At this time the gas station employee had regained consciousness; the man was taken by ambulance to Culberson Hospital where he was admitted to the emergency room.

The victim, Alberto Gomez, received a total of 36 stitches to close his wounds. In addition, he suffered a mild concussion when he hit his head on the counter or the floor when he fell. There were no serious internal injuries. Mr. Gomez spoke with police at 2:30 p.m., nearly 12 hours after he was attacked. When he was the only person in the store, a man wearing a ski mask entered the store, ran behind the counter, and pulled a knife on him. The masked man told him to open the cash register, which Mr. Gomez did; the man then took two or three handfuls of money from the register and some packs of cigarettes that were within his reach. The perpetrator then instructed Mr. Gomez to open the gas station’s safe, but Mr. Gomez replied that he could not because he did not know the combination. The masked man did not believe this, and in anger he lifted up his ski mask and shouted at Mr. Gomez to open it. As he yelled, the masked man waved his knife in the air towards Mr. Gomez. When he did not open the safe, Mr. Gomez was slashed twice and stabbed once by the perpetrator. As a result, he staggered and fell backwards, hitting his head on the counter as he fell. The next thing he remembered seeing was a woman giving him first aid to stop his bleeding. Mr. Gomez also remembered the ambulance ride to the hospital, but he was unable to remember details of the ride (e.g., the names of the paramedics, the length of the ambulance ride).

Mr. Gomez said that his assailant was an Hispanic male who had brown eyes and black hair; the perpetrator had a moustache and had not shaved in the past few days. When asked how old he would estimate the perpetrator to be, the victim stated that he believed that the perpetrator to be approximately 35 or 40 years old. The victim could not be more specific in his description of the
perpetrator's face because the criminal removed his mask for only 5 or 10 seconds. He was, however, able to provide a more general description of his assailant. Mr. Gomez reported that the perpetrator was about two inches taller than him, which would make the suspect approximately 6'1", and smelled as if he had been a smoker for most of his life. The victim also stated that the perpetrator had ugly teeth. Mr. Gomez informed the officers that the perpetrator had been wearing an old dark blue winter coat with silver trim with the Dallas Cowboys logo on it and black gloves because it was very cold that night.

At 10:21 p.m. on January 4th, police approached an individual who matched the description provided by Mr. Gomez. The Hispanic male who was stopped had a moustache and was wearing a Cowboys winter jacket that displayed wear-and-tear to the collar and zipper area. Alejandro Vasquez, 36, was questioned by police about his whereabouts at the time of assault and robbery at the Lomax Shell. Mr. Vasquez told officers that he had been at a local bar having a few drinks and snacks from approximately 11:00 p.m. to 2 a.m. before walking home to his apartment. He said that he fell asleep at about 2:30 or 2:45 a.m. When asked if he had any physical evidence to support his alibi, Mr. Vasquez reported that he did not, but that a waitress from the bar could attest to his whereabouts. Mr. Vasquez smelled heavily of cigarettes and when asked, the individual reported that he was a smoker and pulled out a pack of cigarettes. The gas station manager reported that several packs of cigarettes were stolen from his store in addition to the $85 taken from the register; the pack of Marlboro cigarettes shown to police by Mr. Vasquez matched the brand of cigarettes of those packs that were taken from the gas station following the assault. Police officers asked Mr. Vasquez if they could have him pose for a criminal photo lineup that they would show the victim; Mr. Vasquez agreed to be a member in the lineup. The next day, Mr. Gomez took less than 15 seconds to make an identification of Mr. Vasquez from the lineup and reported that he was 95% confident that the person he identified was the culprit; police arrested Mr. Vasquez and charged him with aggravated assault, a second-degree felony in the State of Texas. The owner of the Lomax Shell gas station declined to press robbery charges because less than $150 of cash and merchandise were stolen from his store; the State of Texas chose not to prosecute Mr. Vasquez on robbery charges.

**Trial Proceedings:**

Alejandro Vasquez appeared in court on February 16th, 2003, to answer a second-degree felony aggravated assault charge stemming from a robbery that occurred a week prior, on January 2nd, 2003. The defendant retained a defense attorney from El Paso, TX.

The prosecution's opening statement argued that all of the collected evidence indicated that only Mr. Vasquez could have committed the aggravated assault. Jurors were told that video surveillance footage of the gas station on the night of the January 2nd, 2003, captured the assault of Mr. Gomez and would serve to support and corroborate the description of the suspect that was provided.
to police officers. The prosecutor informed the court that it would hear testimony from the victim, police officers, and the owner of the store that would prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant was the perpetrator of the crime. Jurors were also informed that they would be hearing from a waitress who would testify that Mr. Vasquez was at a bar at the time of the assault and that any testimony they would hear from her is prejudiced because she could easily be mistaken in remembering whom she saw during her work shift.

The defense attorney’s opening statement emphasized that only circumstantial evidence will be offered over the course of the trial and that such evidence does not constitute grounds for the conviction of his client. As a demonstration, he pointed out that many individuals in southwestern Texas are Hispanic and that a noticeable proportion of these Hispanics are smokers. In addition, the winter coat that his client was wearing when police approached him was a popular brand in Texas because it displayed the colors of the Dallas Cowboys. He highlighted the fact that police never found the weapon or the ski mask and that his client’s clothes had no trace of blood on them, a surprising finding given the violent nature of the crime. Jurors were informed that the video surveillance footage showing the assault at the gas station failed to provide a view of the perpetrator’s face; furthermore, the attorney indicated that the victim’s identification of Mr. Vasquez from a police lineup might not be correct. The defense attorney also prepared jurors to hear testimony from the waitress who saw the defendant at the bar; he stated that the waitress would talk about how she had been working at the bar on the night in question and that she had seen Mr. Vasquez eating that night. Specifically, the waitress would testify that she saw the defendant eating some light appetizers and having some refreshments during her work shift.

The police officers testified that they were confident that they apprehended the correct perpetrator and that the investigation was thorough; however, upon cross-examination by the defense counsel, the officers admitted that it was difficult to prosecute a criminal when the knife that was recovered at the crime scene did not possess DNA evidence that could be linked to the defendant. The officers admitted that two very small spots of blood were found on the jacket that was in the possession of the defendant; however, the blood tests were inconclusive as to whether or not blood belonged to the defendant. The defense attorney also got the pair to state that the description provided to them by the victim could describe many Hispanic males.

The owner of the store testified that five packs of Marlboro cigarettes were taken from the store in addition to the $85 taken from the cash register. When shown the pack of Marlboro cigarettes found on Mr. Vasquez, the storeowner testified that they could have been one of the packs that were taken during the assault. During the cross-examination of the storeowner, he admitted to not keeping an accurate inventory of the cigarettes that his store purchased and that he could not indicate a point in the security footage where the culprit pocketed more than one pack of Marlboro cigarettes.

Mr. Gomez testified that his description of his attacker was consistent with the appearance of the defendant and that he was extremely confident in his
identification of the perpetrator from the police lineup. When asked to identify his attacker in court, Mr. Gomez pointed toward Mr. Vasquez. Upon being shown the winter coat that Mr. Vasquez wore when he first encountered police, the victim stated that it looked just like the one the criminal wore and that the damage seen on the jacket was consistent with the damage that Mr. Gomez observed on the jacket of the perpetrator on the night of the aggravated assault and robbery. Under cross-examination, the victim admitted to what the surveillance tape showed in that Mr. Gomez did not have long to look at the perpetrator’s face. He also admitted that he was more focused on the perpetrator’s knife than he was on getting a good look at the perpetrator’s face. Because of this Mr. Gomez said that his confidence in his identification may be incorrect; however, he maintained his confidence in his identification.

Mr. Vasquez testified that he was at a bar on the night of the aggravated assault. He told the court that he was at Ruby and Don’s Lounge from approximately 11 p.m. to 2 a.m. At 11:00 he ordered some mozzarella sticks and artichoke dip to eat and had a single beer. After he finished his food, Mr. Vasquez said that he drank water until it was 2 a.m. At 2 a.m., he returned to the apartment that he rented and fell asleep around 2:30 or 2:45 a.m. Under direct examination, he admitted that he has been a smoker from the age of 17 and that Marlboros are his preferred brand of cigarette. Upon viewing the surveillance footage, he admitted that the perpetrator’s winter coat did look a lot like the one that he owned. Mr. Vasquez replied to the prosecutor’s line of questioning that he did have a Dallas Cowboys coat that matched the one seen in the surveillance footage and that it was cold enough on the night of the aggravated assault for most reasonable people to wear a coat. Mr. Vasquez acknowledged that his teeth were not in very good condition because his family could not afford to take him to the dentist very often when he was a kid. He admitted that no physical evidence could prove he was elsewhere at the time of the assault, but a waitress at the bar would testify that he actually was elsewhere. When questioned by his defense attorney, Mr. Vasquez admitted that he purchased the coat at WalMart several years ago when it was on sale and that he supposed that many other people did the same thing.

Isabel Molina, the waitress employed at Ruby and Don’s Lounge, testified that she was working from 9 p.m. to 2 a.m. on the night in question. Isabel corroborated the testimony of Mr. Vasquez. She stated for the Court that a man who resembled Mr. Vasquez arrived at the bar at 11 p.m. Even though she was not his waitress, she could see that he ordered a light appetizer and was drinking a beer. The waitress stated that she and Mr. Vasquez were classmates in high school and that she wanted to stop by his table to see how he has been since then, but she was very busy that night. Ms. Molina said that after he finished his food and beer, he had several glasses of water as the night progressed; however, when her shift was over at 2 a.m., he was no longer at the bar and so she was unable to speak to him. She stated that it was reasonable for Mr. Vasquez to walk home. When she was given the distance from the bar to Mr. Vasquez’s apartment, she estimated that it would take him 30 minutes to walk
home. The prosecutor inquired if she would be willing to fabricate testimony for Mr. Vasquez to protect him and she replied that she would not.

The defense attorney’s closing statement reminded the jury that the evidence against his client was coincidental at best and that millions of Texans wear a Dallas Cowboys jacket when it gets cold and that this is not unique. The attorney reminded the jury that blood that was found on the jacket could not scientifically be demonstrated to belong to either Mr. Gomez or his client, Mr. Vasquez; the knife that was found possessed no evidence that could be linked to Mr. Vasquez. He reminded the court that the description that was provided of the culprit was very vague and could describe many Hispanic males in the area. Furthermore, the video surveillance footage never showed the perpetrator’s face and the victim himself was unable to get a good view of the suspect because he was paying attention to the knife and not the criminal. As testament to his client’s innocence, the defense attorney reminded the jury that a waitress at a local bar testified as to Mr. Vasquez’s whereabouts at the time of the aggravated assault and robbery and that the story both told was consistent.

The prosecutor’s closing statement reminded the court that Mr. Vasquez was positively identified as being the perpetrator by the victim and that the victim pointed him out in the courtroom as being the man that assaulted him. Members of the jury were told that the confidence that Mr. Gomez had in his identification of Mr. Vasquez remained very strong. Jurors were reminded that it would be statistically unlikely for a witness to describe a man in such detail and to be correct on so many details, especially the Dallas Cowboys logo on the man’s coat and the condition of the jacket. The prosecutor also highlighted the incredible accuracy that Mr. Gomez displayed when he correctly described the condition of Mr. Vasquez’s teeth. Mr. Vasquez also displayed a pack of Marlboro cigarettes to police officers on the day that he was arrested and the pack that he displayed to police was the very brand of cigarettes that the owner of the store reported as having been stolen from his store. The prosecutor also instructed the jurors to be very skeptical about the alibi witness; he instructed the jurors to remember that the waitress at the bar could have been mistaken about who she saw in the bar on the night that she was working.
IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF VAN HORN, TEXAS
No. 61 / 59-8335
Filed 02/17/2003

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

vs.

VASQUEZ, ALEJANDRO

Background Facts:

At 1:32 a.m. on January 2nd, 2003, police received a 911 call from the Lomax Shell. The caller indicated that a worker at the gas station was on his back behind the counter and appeared to be unconscious and bleeding heavily. Police were dispatched. Emergency crews arrived at the gas station at 1:35 a.m. and police arrived at 1:36 a.m. At this time the gas station employee had regained consciousness; the man was taken by ambulance to Culberson Hospital where he was admitted to the emergency room.

The victim, Alberto Gomez, received a total of 36 stitches to close his wounds. In addition, he suffered a mild concussion when he hit his head on the counter or the floor when he fell. There were no serious internal injuries. Mr. Gomez spoke with police at 2:30 p.m., nearly 12 hours after he was attacked. When he was the only person in the store, a man wearing a ski mask entered the store, ran behind the counter, and pulled a knife on him. The masked man told him to open the cash register, which Mr. Gomez did; the man then took two or three handfuls of money from the register and some packs of cigarettes that were within his reach. The perpetrator then instructed Mr. Gomez to open the gas station’s safe, but Mr. Gomez replied that he could not because he did not know the combination. The masked man did not believe this, and in anger he lifted up his ski mask and shouted at Mr. Gomez to open it. As he yelled, the masked man waved his knife in the air towards Mr. Gomez. When he did not open the safe, Mr. Gomez was slashed twice and stabbed once by the perpetrator. As a result, he staggered and fell backwards, hitting his head on the counter as he fell. The next thing he remembered seeing was a woman giving him first aid to stop his bleeding. Mr. Gomez also remembered the ambulance ride to the hospital, but he was unable to remember details of the ride (e.g., the names of the paramedics, the length of the ambulance ride).

Mr. Gomez said that his assailant was an Hispanic male who had brown eyes and black hair; the perpetrator had a moustache and had not shaved in the past few days. When asked how old he would estimate the perpetrator to be, the victim stated that he believed that the perpetrator to be approximately 35 or 40 years old. The victim could not be more specific in his description of the
perpetrator's face because the criminal removed his mask for only 5 or 10 seconds. He was, however, able to provide a more general description of his assailant. Mr. Gomez reported that the perpetrator was about two inches taller than him, which would make the suspect approximately 6'1", and smelled as if he had been a smoker for most of his life. The victim also stated that the perpetrator had ugly teeth. Mr. Gomez informed the officers that the perpetrator had been wearing an old dark blue winter coat with silver trim with the Dallas Cowboys logo on it and black gloves because it was very cold that night.

At 10:21 p.m. on January 4th, police approached an individual who matched the description provided by Mr. Gomez. The Hispanic male who was stopped had a moustache and was wearing a Cowboys winter jacket that displayed wear-and-tear to the collar and zipper area. Alejandro Vasquez, 36, was questioned by police about his whereabouts at the time of assault and robbery at the Lomax Shell. Mr. Vasquez told officers that he had been at a local bar having a few drinks and snacks from approximately 11:00 p.m. to 2 a.m. before walking home to his apartment. He said that he fell asleep at about 2:30 or 2:45 a.m. When asked if he had any physical evidence to support his alibi, Mr. Vasquez reported that he did not. Mr. Vasquez smelled heavily of cigarettes and when asked, the individual reported that he was a smoker and pulled out a pack of cigarettes. The gas station manager reported that several packs of cigarettes were stolen from his store in addition to the $85 taken from the register; the pack of Marlboro cigarettes shown to police by Mr. Vasquez matched the brand of cigarettes of those packs that were taken from the gas station following the assault. Police officers asked Mr. Vasquez if they could have him pose for a criminal photo lineup that they would show the victim; Mr. Vasquez agreed to be a member in the lineup. The next day, Mr. Gomez took less than 15 seconds to make an identification of Mr. Vasquez from the lineup and reported that he was 95% confident that the person he identified was the culprit; police arrested Mr. Vasquez and charged him with aggravated assault, a second-degree felony in the State of Texas. The owner of the Lomax Shell gas station declined to press robbery charges because less than $150 of cash and merchandise were stolen from his store; the State of Texas chose not to prosecute Mr. Vasquez on robbery charges.

**Trial Proceedings:**

Alejandro Vasquez appeared in court on February 16th, 2003, to answer a second-degree felony aggravated assault charge stemming from a robbery that occurred at a Lomax Shell gas station on January 2nd, 2003. The defendant retained a defense attorney from El Paso, TX.

The prosecution’s opening statement argued that all of the collected evidence indicated that only Mr. Vasquez could have committed the aggravated assault. Jurors were told that video surveillance footage of the gas station on the night of the January 2nd, 2003, captured the assault of Mr. Gomez and would serve to support and corroborate the description of the suspect that was provided to police officers. The prosecutor informed the court that it would hear testimony
from the victim, police officers, and the owner of the store that would prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant was the perpetrator of the crime. Jurors were also informed that they would be hearing from Mr. Vasquez that he was at a bar at the time of the assault and that he had no alibi witness to corroborate his claim that he was at a bar.

The defense attorney’s opening statement emphasized that only circumstantial evidence will be offered over the course of the trial and that such evidence does not constitute grounds for the conviction of his client. As a demonstration, he pointed out that many individuals in southwestern Texas are Hispanic and that a noticeable proportion of these Hispanics are smokers. In addition, the winter coat that his client was wearing when police approached him was a popular brand in Texas because it displayed the colors of the Dallas Cowboys. He highlighted the fact that police never found the weapon or the ski mask and that his client’s clothes had no trace of blood on them, a surprising finding given the violent nature of the crime. Jurors were informed that the video surveillance footage showing the assault at the gas station failed to provide a view of the perpetrator’s face; furthermore, the attorney indicated that the victim’s identification of Mr. Vasquez from a police lineup might not be correct. The defense attorney also prepared jurors to hear testimony from Mr. Vasquez that he was eating at a local bar that night. Specifically, he would testify that he was eating some light appetizers and having some refreshments on the night in question.

The police officers testified that they were confident that they apprehended the correct perpetrator and that the investigation was thorough; however, upon cross-examination by the defense counsel, the officers admitted that it was difficult to prosecute a criminal when the knife that was recovered at the crime scene did not possess DNA evidence that could be linked to the defendant. The officers admitted that two very small spots of blood were found on the jacket that was in the possession of the defendant; however, the blood tests were inconclusive as to whether or not blood belonged to the defendant. The defense attorney also got the pair to state that the description provided to them by the victim could describe many Hispanic males.

The owner of the store testified that five packs of Marlboro cigarettes were taken from the store in addition to the $85 taken from the cash register. When shown the pack of Marlboro cigarettes found on Mr. Vasquez, the storeowner testified that they could have been one of the packs that were taken during the assault. During the cross-examination of the storeowner, he admitted to not keeping an accurate inventory of the cigarettes that his store purchased and that he could not indicate a point in the security footage where the culprit pocketed more than one pack of Marlboro cigarettes.

Mr. Gomez testified that his description of his attacker was consistent with the appearance of the defendant and that he was extremely confident in his identification of the perpetrator from the police lineup. When asked to identify his attacker in court, Mr. Gomez pointed toward Mr. Vasquez. Upon being shown the winter coat that Mr. Vasquez wore when he first encountered police, the victim stated that it looked just like the one the criminal wore and that the
damage seen on the jacket was consistent with the damage that Mr. Gomez observed on the jacket of the perpetrator on the night of the aggravated assault and robbery. Under cross-examination, the victim admitted to what the surveillance tape showed in that Mr. Gomez did not have long to look at the perpetrator’s face. He also admitted that he was more focused on the perpetrator’s knife than he was on getting a good look at the perpetrator’s face. Because of this Mr. Gomez said that his confidence in his identification may be incorrect; however, he maintained his confidence in his identification.

Mr. Vasquez testified that he was at a bar on the night of the aggravated assault. He told the court that he was at Ruby and Don’s Lounge from approximately 11 p.m. to 2 a.m. At 11:00 he ordered some mozzarella sticks and artichoke dip to eat and had a single beer. After he finished his food, Mr. Vasquez said that he drank water until it was 2 a.m. At 2 a.m., he returned to the apartment that he rented and fell asleep around 2:30 or 2:45 a.m. Under direct examination, he admitted that he has been a smoker from the age of 17 and that Marlboros are his preferred brand of cigarette. Upon viewing the surveillance footage, he admitted that the perpetrator’s winter coat did look a lot like the one that he owned. Mr. Vasquez replied to the prosecutor’s line of questioning that he did have a Dallas Cowboys coat that matched the one seen in the surveillance footage and that it was cold enough on the night of the aggravated assault for most reasonable people to wear a coat. Mr. Vasquez acknowledged that his teeth were not in very good condition because his family could not afford to take him to the dentist very often when he was a kid. He admitted that no physical evidence could prove he was elsewhere at the time of the assault. When questioned by his defense attorney, Mr. Vasquez admitted that he purchased the coat at Walmart several years ago when it was on sale and that he supposed that many other people did the same thing.

The defense attorney’s closing statement reminded the jury that the evidence against his client was coincidental at best and that millions of Texans wear a Dallas Cowboys jacket when it gets cold and that this is not unique. The attorney reminded the jury that blood that was found on the jacket could not scientifically be demonstrated to belong to either Mr. Gomez or his client, Mr. Vasquez; the knife that was found possessed no evidence that could be linked to Mr. Vasquez. He reminded the court that the description that was provided of the culprit was very vague and could describe many Hispanic males in the area. Furthermore, the video surveillance footage never showed the perpetrator’s face and the victim himself was unable to get a good view of the suspect because he was paying attention to the knife and not the criminal.

The prosecutor’s closing statement reminded the court that Mr. Vasquez was positively identified as being the perpetrator by the victim and that the victim pointed him out in the courtroom as being the man that assaulted him. Members of the jury were told that the confidence that Mr. Gomez had in his identification of Mr. Vasquez remained very strong. Jurors were reminded that it would be statistically unlikely for a witness to describe a man in such detail and to be correct on so many details, especially the Dallas Cowboys logo on the man’s coat and the condition of the jacket. The prosecutor also highlighted the
incredible accuracy that Mr. Gomez displayed when he correctly described the condition of Mr. Vasquez’s teeth. Mr. Vasquez also displayed a pack of Marlboro cigarettes to police officers on the day that he was arrested and the pack that he displayed to police was the very brand of cigarettes that the owner of the store reported as having been stolen from his store.
Appendix G.

1. Please indicate the name of the defendant and the crime the defendant was charged with:

______________________________________________________________________________

An alibi is considered to be a claim that an individual was elsewhere when a crime occurred.

An alibi witness is a person who provides an alibi. This witness testifies that a person accused of a crime was not where the crime was committed at the time it occurred.

The penalty for perjury (lying under oath) is a fine up to $3,000 and/or up to one year confinement in jail.

2. According to the courtroom summary, did the defendant have an alibi, or claim that he was elsewhere at the time at which the crime was committed?

   _____ Yes, he had an alibi
   _____ No, he did not have an alibi

3. According to the courtroom summary, did the defendant have alibi witness testimony to support his story?

   _____ Yes, his girlfriend testified
   _____ Yes, his fiancée testified
   _____ Yes, his wife testified
   _____ Yes, there was someone else who testified
   _____ No, there was no alibi witness who testified

4. According to the courtroom summary, did the defendant have physical evidence to support his story?

   _____ Yes, a newspaper he bought earlier that day
   _____ Yes, a picture of him taken at a rock concert
   _____ Yes, a receipt from a supermarket
   _____ No, there was no physical evidence to support his story

For the following questions, please write any percentage from 0% to 100%

5. In your opinion, how certain must you be of the defendant’s guilt in order to vote guilty in a case like this? ______%

6. Based upon your review of this case, what is the likelihood that the defendant actually committed the crime with which he was charged? ______%

7. How certain are you that the verdict that you will arrive at is correct? ______%
8. In your opinion, how likely was it that the alibi witness provided false testimony to protect the defendant? ______ %

9. How believable was the defendant’s claim that he was at a bar at the time during which the crime occurred?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely Unbelievable</td>
<td>Completely Believable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How believable was the testimony of the defendant in this case?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely Unbelievable</td>
<td>Completely Believable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How believable was the testimony of the alibi witness in this case?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely Unbelievable</td>
<td>Completely Believable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How easy would it be for the defendant to have the alibi witness lie for him?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Easy</td>
<td>Very Difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How motivated to lie to protect the defendant would this alibi witness be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely Unmotivated</td>
<td>Completely Motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How much do you think the alibi witness altered her testimony to make it consistent with the testimony of the defendant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Altered At All</td>
<td>Altered Completely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How often do you think the defendant and alibi witness discussed the nature of their testimony before the trial took place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Rarely</td>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. How close would you characterize the relationship between the alibi witness and the defendant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Distant |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Very
| Close |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

17. How much would the relationship between the alibi witness and the defendant change if the defendant is found guilty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| At All |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Change
| Completely |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Completely |

18. How much would the relationship between the alibi witness and the defendant change if the defendant is acquitted (i.e., found to be innocent)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| At All |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Change
| Completely |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Completely |

19. How skeptical would the average juror be of the testimony provided by the alibi witness?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Not Skeptical |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Very
| At All |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Skeptical |

20. How much did the testimony of the alibi witness strengthen the defense’s case?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Not Strengthen |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Very Much
| At All |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Strengthen |

21. How critical was the testimony of the alibi witness to the arguments made by the defense?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Not Critical |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Very
| Critical |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Critical |
Appendix H.

1. Please indicate the name of the defendant and the crime the defendant was charged with:

____________________________________________________________________________________

*An alibi is considered to be a claim that an individual was elsewhere when a crime occurred.*

*An alibi witness is a person who provides an alibi. This witness testifies that a person accused of a crime was not where the crime was committed at the time it occurred.*

*The penalty for perjury (lying under oath) is a fine up to $3,000 and/or up to one year confinement in jail.*

2. According to the courtroom summary, did the defendant have an alibi, or claim that he was elsewhere at the time at which the crime was committed?

   _____ Yes, he had an alibi
   _____ No, he did not have an alibi

3. According to the courtroom summary, did the defendant have alibi witness testimony to support his story?

   _____ Yes, his girlfriend testified
   _____ Yes, his fiancée testified
   _____ Yes, his wife testified
   _____ Yes, there was someone else who testified
   _____ No, there was no alibi witness who testified

4. According to the courtroom summary, did the defendant have physical evidence to support his story?

   _____ Yes, a newspaper he bought earlier that day
   _____ Yes, a picture of him taken at a rock concert
   _____ Yes, a receipt from a supermarket
   _____ No, there was no physical evidence to support his story

*For the following questions, please write any percentage from 0% to 100%*

5. In your opinion, how certain must you be of the defendant’s guilt in order to vote guilty in a case like this? ______% 

6. Based upon your review of this case, what is the likelihood that the defendant actually committed the crime with which he was charged? ______% 

7. How certain are you that the verdict that you will arrive at is correct? ______%
9. How believable was the defendant’s claim that he was at a bar at the time during which the crime occurred?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely Unbelievable</td>
<td>Completely Believable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How believable was the testimony of the defendant in this case?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely Unbelievable</td>
<td>Completely Believable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How truthful was the testimony of the defendant in this case?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely Untruthful</td>
<td>Completely Truthful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How accurate was the testimony of the defendant in this case?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely Inaccurate</td>
<td>Completely Accurate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the following questions:

*Imagine that a waitress who worked at the bar testified that she saw the defendant in the bar during the time at which the aggravated assault was alleged to have occurred.*

13. How easy would it be for the defendant to have this alibi witness lie for him?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Easy</td>
<td>Very Difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How motivated to lie to protect the defendant would this alibi witness be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely Unmotivated</td>
<td>Completely Motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. How much do you think this alibi witness would alter her testimony to make it consistent with the testimony of the defendant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Alter</td>
<td>At All</td>
<td>Alter</td>
<td>Completely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How often do you think the defendant and alibi witness would discuss the nature of their testimony before the trial took place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Rarely</td>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. How close would you characterize the relationship between the alibi witness and the defendant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Distant</td>
<td>Very Close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the following questions:

*Imagine that the girlfriend of the defendant that she was at the bar with the defendant at the time at which the aggravated assault was alleged to have occurred.*

18. How easy would it be for the defendant to have this alibi witness lie for him if they were together for:

- **Two Months**
  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
  | Very Easy | Very Difficult |
- **Two Years**
  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
  | Completely Unmotivated | Completely Motivated |

19. How motivated to lie to protect the defendant would this alibi witness be if they were together for:

- **Two Months**
  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
  | Completely Unmotivated | Completely Motivated |
- **Two Years**
  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
  | Not Alter | Alter | Completely |

20. How much do you think this alibi witness would alter her testimony to make it consistent with the testimony of the defendant if they were together for:

- **Two Months**
  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
  | Not Alter | Alter | Completely |
- **Two Years**
  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
  | Not Alter | Alter | Completely |
21. How often do you think the defendant and alibi witness would discuss the nature of their testimony before the trial took place if they were together for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very | Rarely | Frequently

22. How close would you characterize the relationship between the alibi witness and the defendant if they were together for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very | Distant | Close

For the following questions:

Imagine that the fiancée of the defendant that she was at the bar with the defendant at the time at which the aggravated assault was alleged to have occurred.

23. How easy would it be for the defendant to have this alibi witness lie for him if they were together for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very | Easy | Difficult

24. How motivated to lie to protect the defendant would this alibi witness be if they were together for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completely | Unmotivated | Completely | Motivated

25. How much do you think this alibi witness would alter her testimony to make it consistent with the testimony of the defendant if they were together for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not Alter | Alter | Completely

Alter At All | Completely
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26. How often do you think the defendant and alibi witness would discuss the nature of their testimony before the trial took place if they were together for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two Months</th>
<th>Two Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Very**    **Rarely**    **Very**    **Frequently**

27. How close would you characterize the relationship between the alibi witness and the defendant if they were together for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two Months</th>
<th>Two Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Very**    **Distant**    **Very**    **Close**

---

For the following questions:

*Imagine that the wife of the defendant that she was at the bar with the defendant at the time at which the aggravated assault was alleged to have occurred.*

28. How easy would it be for the defendant to have this alibi witness lie for him if they were together for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two Months</th>
<th>Two Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Very**    **Easy**    **Very**    **Difficult**

29. How motivated to lie to protect the defendant would this alibi witness be if they were together for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two Months</th>
<th>Two Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Completely**    **Unmotivated**    **Completely**    **Motivated**

30. How much do you think this alibi witness would alter her testimony to make it consistent with the testimony of the defendant if they were together for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two Months</th>
<th>Two Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not Alter**    **At All**    **Alter**    **Completely**
31. How often do you think the defendant and alibi witness would discuss the nature of their testimony before the trial took place if they were together for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Rarely</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. How close would you characterize the relationship between the alibi witness and the defendant if they were together for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Close</th>
<th>Very Distant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF VAN HORN, TEXAS  
TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

THE STATE OF TEXAS  

V.  

VASQUEZ, ALEJANDRO  

In order to find the defendant guilty of aggravated assault, it must be established beyond a reasonable doubt that he:

(1) caused serious bodily injury to another, including the person’s spouse; or

(2) used or exhibiting a deadly weapon during the commission of the assault.

where a deadly weapon is defined as being:

(A) a firearm or anything manifestly designed, made, or adapted for the purpose of inflicting death or serious bodily injury; or

(B) anything that in the manner of its use or intended use is capable of causing death or serious bodily injury.
IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF VAN HORN, TEXAS
TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

THE STATE OF TEXAS
V.
VASQUEZ, ALEJANDRO

VERDICT
I find the defendant (check one):  _____ guilty of aggravated assault.
_____ not guilty of aggravated assault.

PUNISHMENT  (Complete only if you found the defendant GUILTY)
When a defendant is found guilty, the State of Texas requires the jury to set a
punishment within the following guidelines:

(1) a jail term   between 2 and 20 years

   The defendant will serve a jail term of _______ years

(2) an optional fine not to exceed $10,000

   The defendant will receive a fine of _______ dollars
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SRRS Weighting Form

(A) Social readjustment includes the amount and duration of change in one’s accustomed pattern of life resulting from various life events. As defined, social readjustment measures the intensity and length of time necessary to accommodate to a life event, regardless of the desirability of the event.

(B) You are asked to rate a series of life events as to their relative degrees of necessary readjustment. In scoring, use all of your experience in arriving at the answer. This means personal experience where it applies as well as what you have learned to be the case for others. Some persons accommodate to change more readily than others; some persons adjust with particular ease or difficulty to only certain events. Therefore, strive to give your opinion of the average degree of readjustment necessary for each event rather than the extreme.

(C) The mechanics of rating are these: Event 1, Marriage, has been given the arbitrary value of 500. As you complete each of the remaining events think to yourself, “Is this event indicative of more or less readjustment than marriage?” If you decide the readjustment is more intense and protracted, then chose a proportionally larger number and place it in the blank directly opposite the event in the column marked “VALUES.” If you decide the event represents less and shorter readjustment than marriage then indicate how much less by placing a proportionally smaller number in the opposite blank. (If an event requires intense readjustment over a short time span, it may approximate in value an event requiring less intense readjustment over a long period of time.) If the event is equal in social readjustment to marriage, record the number 500 opposite the event.

For example: If you feel that “Being fired from work” requires half as much readjustment as marriage, you would put 250 in the space beside “Being fired from work.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marriage</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Troubles with the boss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Detention in jail or other institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Death of a spouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Major change in sleeping habits (a lot more or a lot less sleep, or change in part of day when asleep)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Death of a close family member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Major change in eating habits (a lot more or a lot less food intake, or very different meal hours or surroundings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Foreclosure on a mortgage or loan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Revision of personal habits (dress, manners, associations, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Death of a close friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Minor violations of the law (e.g. traffic tickets, jay walking, disturbing the peace, etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Outstanding personal achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Major change in the health or behavior of a family member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sexual difficulties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. In-law troubles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Major change in number of family get-togethers (e.g. a lot more or a lot less than usual)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Major change in financial state (e.g. a lot worse off or a lot better off than usual)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Gaining a new family member (e.g. through birth, adoption, oldster moving in etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Change in residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Son or daughter leaving home (e.g. marriage, attending college, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Marital separation from mate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Major change in church activities (e.g. a lot more or a lot less than usual)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Marital reconciliation with mate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Being fired from work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Divorce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Changing to a different line of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Major change in the number of arguments with spouse (e.g. either a lot more or a lot less than usual regarding childrearing, personal habits, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. Major change in responsibilities at work (e.g. promotion, demotion, lateral transfer) ____________
30. Spouse beginning or ceasing work outside the home ____________
31. Major change in working hours or conditions ____________
32. Major change in usual type and/or amount of recreation ____________
33. Taking on a mortgage greater than $51,000 (e.g. purchasing a home, business, etc.) ____________
34. Taking on a mortgage less than $51,000 (e.g. purchasing a car, TV, freezer, etc.) ____________
35. Major personal injury or illness ____________
36. Major business readjustment (e.g. merger, reorganization, bankruptcy, etc.) ____________
37. Major change in social activities (e.g. clubs, dancing, movies, visiting, etc.) ____________
38. Major change in living conditions (e.g. building a new home, remodeling, deterioration of home or neighborhood) ____________
39. Retirement from work ____________
40. Vacation ____________
41. Christmas ____________
42. Changing to a new school ____________
43. Beginning or ceasing formal schooling ____________
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University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) Institutional Review Board
Informed Consent Form for Research Involving Human Subjects

Protocol Title: Romantic Relationships Over Time

Principal Investigators: Kevin W. Jolly, M.A., Harmon M. Hosch, Ph.D.

UTEP Department of Psychology

Introduction
You are being asked to take part voluntarily in the research project described below. Please take your time making a decision. Before agreeing to take part in this research study, it is important that you read the consent form that describes the study. Please ask the study researcher or the study staff to explain any words or information that you do not clearly understand.

Why is this study being done?
This study is being conducted to evaluate how romantic relationships change over time and how that change may relevant to the study of alibis. Three hundred thirty individuals will be enrolling in this study. Psychology undergraduates will be recruited from the University of Texas at El Paso for this study. You are being asked to participate in this study because you are currently enrolled in an undergraduate course at UTEP.

If you decide to enroll in this study, your total involvement will last about two hours. Your participation will be completed in two online sessions – one session will be in January and one session will be in May. Each session will last about one hour.

What is involved in the study?
If you agree to take part in this study, the research team will:

5. Ask you to sign and return this consent form.

6. Ask you to answer a series of questions about your current romantic relationship and about what you would do for your romantic partner if he or she were facing several serious criminal charges.

7. Ask you to complete the study in May by contacting you via letter and e-mail. In May, you will be asked the same questions about your romantic relationship and about what you would do for your romantic partner if he or she were facing several serious criminal charges. In addition, you will be asked about what major life events occurred to you during the past academic semester and how you felt about them.

8. At the end, you will be debriefed and any questions you may have about the study will be answered.
What are the risks and discomforts of the study?

There are no known risks associated with this research. If you were to feel uncomfortable due to your participation in this study, you will be referred to the UTEP Counseling Center located at 202 Union West. You will be told that the Counseling Center can also be contacted by phone at (915) 747-5302 or email directed to ucc@utep.edu.

Are there benefits to taking part in this study?

There will be no direct benefits to you for taking part in this study. You may gain insight into the research process due to your participation. This research may also help you to think about your current romantic relationship and about the legal system.

What other options are there?
You have the option not to take part in this study. You have the option to withdraw from the study at any time. There will be no penalties involved if you choose not to take part in this study or if you choose to discontinue your participation in the study.

Who is paying for this study?
This study is not funded by an outside agency.

What are my costs?
There are no direct costs to you for participation. All participation is conducted online.

Will I be paid to participate in this study?
You will not be paid for participating in this study, although there is a chance that you may be randomly selected to receive a prize if you complete both experimental sessions.

What if I want to withdraw, or am asked to withdraw from this study?

Taking part in this study is voluntary. You have the right to choose not to take part in this study. If you do not take part in the study, there will be no penalty.

If you choose to take part, you have the right to stop at any time. However, we encourage you to talk to a member of the research group so that they know why you are leaving the study. If there are any new findings during the study that may affect whether you want to continue to take part, you will be told about them.

The researchers may decide to stop your participation without your permission if he or she thinks that being in the study may cause you harm.

Who do I call if I have questions or problems?
You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may contact any of the principal investigators either by phone or email. Their contact information at UTEP is the following:

Kevin W. Jolly (915) 747-8032 kwjolly@miners.utep.edu
If you have questions or concerns about your participation as a research subject, please contact the UTEP Institutional Review Board (IRB) at (915-747-8841) or irb.orsp@utep.edu.

**What about confidentiality?**

1. Your participation in this study is confidential. None of the information will identify you by name. The answers that you provide for three questions will be used to match the data that you provide at the two different time periods.

2. Every effort will be made to keep your information confidential. Your personal information may be disclosed if required by law. Organizations that may inspect and/or copy your research records for quality assurance and data analysis include, but are not necessarily limited to:

   - UTEP Institutional Review Board

Because of the need to release information to these parties, absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. The results of this research study may be presented at meetings or in publications. However, your identity will not be disclosed in those presentations.

All records will be maintained on a secure computer in a locked office. Participants will be identified by ID rather than name.

**Mandatory reporting**

If information is revealed about child abuse or neglect, or potentially dangerous future behavior to you and/or others, the law requires that this information be reported to the proper authorities.

**Authorization Statement**

I have read each page of this form about the study (or it was read to me). I know that being in this study is voluntary and I choose to be in this study. I know I can stop being in this study without penalty. I will get a copy of this consent form now and can get information on results of the study later if I wish.

Participant Name: ____________________________ Date: __________

Participant Signature: ________________________ Time: __________

Consent form explained/witnessed by: ____________________________

Printed name: _____________________________________________

Date: ____________________________ Time: ______________________
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In this study, you will be asked to answer questions about your current romantic relationship and about what you would do for your romantic partner if he or she faced criminal charges.

As you complete the questions, please think about your current romantic partner and answer the questions to the best of your ability.

This study is a two-part study – in May, you will be asked to complete your participation in this study. The personal information that you provide today will be used to contact you in the future to complete the study.

The relationship questionnaire that you are about to complete asks you to think about your current romantic relationship. Thinking about your current romantic relationship may cause you some psychological distress as you remember things that have happened during this romantic relationship. If at any time you experience any psychological discomfort while reading the list of stressful life events, please discontinue the experiment and inform the experimenter at 915-747-8032 or kwjolly@miners.utep.edu.

The list of possible criminal charges with which your current romantic partner can be charged is comprehensive. Thinking about such criminal charges may cause you some psychological distress if you or someone you know has experienced these crimes. If at any time you experience any psychological discomfort while reading the list of stressful life events, please discontinue the experiment and inform the experimenter at 915-747-8032 or kwjolly@miners.utep.edu.

Should you desire to further discuss any psychological discomfort experienced as a result of this experiment, please contact:

Counseling Services
Union Building West Room 202
Phone Number: 915-747-5302
Fax Number: 915-747-5393
Website: www.utep.edu/counsel/
Department Email: ucc@utep.edu

Should you desire to further discuss any psychological discomfort experienced as a result of this experiment, please contact:
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In this study, you will be asked to answer questions about your current romantic relationship, what major life events you have experienced in the past academic semester, and about what you would do for your romantic partner if he or she faced criminal charges. As you complete the questions, please think about your current romantic partner and answer the questions to the best of your ability.

Are you currently in a romantic relationship with the same partner with whom you were in a romantic relationship with in January?  _____Yes  _____No

IMPORTANT: If you and the romantic partner that you were in a relationship with at the start of the semester are no longer a couple, please think about that relationship when you respond to the questions.

The relationship questionnaire that you are about to complete asks you to think about your current romantic relationship. Thinking about your current romantic relationship may cause you some psychological distress as you remember things that have happened during this romantic relationship. If at any time you experience any psychological discomfort while reading the list of stressful life events, please discontinue the experiment and inform the experimenter at 915-747-8032 or kwjolly@miners.utep.edu.

The list of possible criminal charges with which your current romantic partner can be charged is comprehensive. Thinking about such criminal charges may cause you some psychological distress if you or someone you know has experienced these crimes. If at any time you experience any psychological discomfort while reading the list of stressful life events, please discontinue the experiment and inform the experimenter at 915-747-8032 or kwjolly@miners.utep.edu.

The list of stressful life events that you are about to read is comprehensive. You may have experienced some of these stressful life events and seeing them on the list may cause you psychological discomfort. If at any time you experience any psychological discomfort while reading the list of stressful life events, please discontinue the experiment and inform the experimenter at 915-747-8032 or kwjolly@miners.utep.edu.

Should you desire to further discuss any psychological discomfort experienced as a result of this experiment, please contact:

Counseling Services
Union Building West Room 202
Phone Number: 915-747-5302
Fax Number: 915-747-5393
Website: www.utep.edu/counsel/
Department Email: ucc@utep.edu

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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Age: _____
Gender: Male    Female

My romantic partner and I are:

                                     Dating    Engaged    Married

Our romantic relationship began on: _____________________________
(If you do not remember the exact day, just report the month and the year)

Since that date, have you and your romantic partner ever broken up?

Yes: _____    No: ______

If yes, about how long were you and your romantic partner broken up:

___________________________

If yes, whose idea was it to break up?

My idea    My romantic partner’s idea    It was a mutual decision

Do you and your romantic partner have any children together?

Yes: _____    No: ______

If yes, how many children do you and your romantic partner have?  _________

The answers to the following questions will be used to match the data that you provide today with the data that you will provide in May:

Mother’s Maiden Name: ___________________________________

Make and Model of First Car: _________________________________

Birthday: _________________________________

The information that you provide here will be used to remind you to return to complete the experiment in May:

UTEP e-mail address: ___________________________________

Personal e-mail address: _________________________________

Mailing Address: ___________________________________

___________________________________
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Satisfaction Level Facet and Global Items

1. Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each of the following statements regarding your current relationship (circle an answer for each item).

   a) My partner fulfills my needs for intimacy (sharing personal thoughts, secrets, etc.)

   b) My partner fulfills my needs for companionship (doing things together, enjoying each other’s company, etc.)

   c) My partner fulfills my sexual needs (holding hands, kissing, etc.)

   d) My partner fulfills my needs for security (feeling trusting, comfortable in a stable relationship, etc.)

   e) My partner fulfills my needs for emotional involvement (feeling emotionally attached, feeling good when another feels good etc.)

2. I feel satisfied with our relationship (please circle a number).

   Do Not Agree      Agree      Agree      Agree
   At All             Slightly   Moderately Completely

3. My relationship is much better than other’s relationships.

   Do Not Agree      Agree      Agree      Agree
   At All             Somewhat   Moderately Completely

4. My relationship is close to ideal.

   Do Not Agree      Agree      Agree      Agree
   At All             Somewhat   Moderately Completely

5. Our relationship makes me very happy.

   Do Not Agree      Agree      Agree      Agree
   At All             Somewhat   Moderately Completely

6. Our relationship does a good job of fulfilling my needs for intimacy, companionship, etc.

   Do Not Agree      Agree      Agree      Agree
   At All             Somewhat   Moderately Completely
Investment Size Facet and Global Items

1. Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each of the following statements regarding your current relationship (circle an answer for each item).

a) I have invested a great deal of time in my relationship.  
   Don’t Agree  Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All  Slightly  Moderately  Completely

b) I have told my partner many private things about myself (I disclose secrets to him/her).  
   Don’t Agree  Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All  Slightly  Moderately  Completely

c) My partner and I have an intellectual life together that would be difficult to replace.  
   Don’t Agree  Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All  Slightly  Moderately  Completely

d) My sense of personal identity (who I am) is linked to my partner and our relationship  
   Don’t Agree  Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All  Slightly  Moderately  Completely

e) My partner and I share many memories  
   Don’t Agree  Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All  Slightly  Moderately  Completely

2. I have put a great deal into my relationship that I would lose if the relationship were to end (please circle a number).

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
   Do Not Agree  Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All  Somewhat  Completely

3. Many aspects of my life have become linked to my partner (recreational activities, etc.), and I would lose all of this if we were to break up.

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
   Do Not Agree  Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All  Somewhat  Completely

4. I feel very involved in our relationship – like I have put a great deal into it.

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
   Do Not Agree  Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All  Somewhat  Completely

5. My relationships with friends and family members would be complicated if my partner and I were to break up (e.g., partner is friends with people I care about).

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
   Do Not Agree  Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All  Somewhat  Completely

6. Compared to other people I know, I have invested a great deal in my relationships with my partner.

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
   Do Not Agree  Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All  Somewhat  Completely
**Quality of Alternatives Facet and Global Items**

1. Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each statement regarding the fulfillment of each need in alternative relationships (e.g., by another dating partner, friends, family).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Don’t Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>At All</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>At All</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>At All</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>At All</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>At All</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Completely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The people other than my partner with whom I might become involved are very appealing (please circle a number).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do Not Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At All</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My alternatives to our relationship are close to ideal (dating another, spending time with friends or on my own, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do Not Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At All</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If I weren’t dating my partner, I would do fine – I would find another appealing person to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do Not Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At All</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My alternatives are attractive to me (dating another, spending time with friends or on my own, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do Not Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At All</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My needs for intimacy, companionship, etc., could be easily fulfilled in an alternative relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do Not Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At All</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Commitment Level Items

1. I want our relationship to last a very long time (please circle a number).
   0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8
   Do Not Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All        Somewhat   Completely

2. I am committed to maintaining my relationship with my partner.
   0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8
   Do Not Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All        Somewhat   Completely

3. I would not feel very upset if our relationship were to end in the near future.
   0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8
   Do Not Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All        Somewhat   Completely

4. It is likely that I will date someone other than my partner within the next year.
   0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8
   Do Not Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All        Somewhat   Completely

5. I feel very attached to our relationship – very strongly linked to my partner.
   0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8
   Do Not Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All        Somewhat   Completely

6. I want our relationship to last forever.
   0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8
   Do Not Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All        Somewhat   Completely

7. I am oriented toward the long-term future of my relationship (for example, I imagine being
   with my partner several years from now).
   0    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8
   Do Not Agree  Agree  Agree
   At All        Somewhat   Completely
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Each of the following pages contains a list of major life events that you may have experienced in the past academic semester. If you experienced one of these major life events at least once in that time period, put an X on the line that corresponds to that event. You will then be asked to indicate the impact of those events upon your life – you will circle that corresponds to the level of impact that event had upon your life. If you have experienced the same life event multiple times in the past academic semester, think back to the most recent occurrence when evaluating the event’s impact on your life.

1. Death of a spouse
2. Marital separation from mate
3. Son or daughter leaving home (e.g. marriage, attending college, etc.)
4. Death of a close family member
5. Major change in usual type and/or amount of recreation
6. Taking on a mortgage greater than $51,000 (e.g. purchasing a home, business, etc.)
7. Major change in responsibilities at work (e.g. promotion, demotion, lateral transfer)
8. Being fired from work
9. Marriage
10. Vacation

Which of the above events did you experience in the past academic semester?

1. _______ 2. _______ 3. _______ 4. _______ 5. _______
6. _______ 7. _______ 8. _______ 9. _______ 10. _______

Please indicate the extent to which you viewed each of the above events as having either a positive or negative impact on your life at the time the event occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Extremely negative</th>
<th>Moderately negative</th>
<th>Somewhat negative</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Slightly positive</th>
<th>Moderately positive</th>
<th>Extremely positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event 1.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 2.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 3.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 4.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 5.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 6.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 7.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 8.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 9.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 10.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Troubles with the boss
12. Major change in financial state (e.g. a lot worse off or a lot better off than usual)
13. Major change in working hours or conditions
14. Retirement from work
15. Major change in social activities (e.g. clubs, dancing, movies, visiting, etc.)
16. Outstanding personal achievement
17. Changing to a new school
18. Minor violations of the law (e.g. traffic tickets, jay walking, disturbing the peace, etc)
19. Major business readjustment (e.g. merger, reorganization, bankruptcy, etc.)
20. Major personal injury or illness

**Which of the above events did you experience in the past academic semester?**

11. _______ 12. _______ 13. _______ 14. _______
15. _______
16. _______ 17. _______ 18. _______ 19. _______
20. _______

**Please indicate the extent to which you viewed each of the above events as having either a positive or negative impact on your life at the time the event occurred.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Extremely negative</th>
<th>Moderately negative</th>
<th>Somewhat negative</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Slightly positive</th>
<th>Moderately positive</th>
<th>Extremely positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event 11.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 12.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 13.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 14.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 15.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 16.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 17.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 18.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 19.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 20.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Taking on a mortgage greater than $51,000 (e.g. purchasing a car, TV, freezer, etc.)
22. Major change in sleeping habits (a lot more or a lot less sleep, or change in part of day when asleep)
23. In-law troubles
24. Revision of personal habits (dress, manners, associations, etc.)
25. Major change in the number of arguments with spouse (e.g. either a lot more or a lot less than usual regarding childrearing, personal habits, etc.)
26. Major change in living conditions (e.g. building a new home, remodeling, deterioration of home or neighborhood)
27. Detention in jail or other institution
28. Beginning or ceasing formal schooling
29. Change in residence
30. Major change in church activities (e.g. a lot more or a lot less than usual)

**Which of the above events did you experience in the past academic semester?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please indicate the extent to which you viewed each of the above events as having either a positive or negative impact on your life at the time the event occurred.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Extremely negative</th>
<th>Moderately negative</th>
<th>Somewhat negative</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Slightly positive</th>
<th>Moderately positive</th>
<th>Extremely positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. Changing to a different line of work  
32. Major change in eating habits (a lot more or a lot less food intake, or very different meal hours or surroundings)  
33. Death of a close friend  
34. Divorce  
35. Sexual difficulties  
36. Pregnancy  
37. Major change in number of family get-togethers (e.g. a lot more or a lot less than usual)  
38. Christmas  
39. Gaining a new family member (e.g. through birth, adoption, oldster moving in etc.)  
40. Spouse beginning or ceasing work outside the home

**Which of the above events did you experience in the past academic semester?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>31.</th>
<th>32.</th>
<th>33.</th>
<th>34.</th>
<th>35.</th>
<th>36.</th>
<th>37.</th>
<th>38.</th>
<th>39.</th>
<th>40.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please indicate the extent to which you viewed each of the above events as having either a positive or negative impact on your life at the time the event occurred.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Extremely negative</th>
<th>Moderately negative</th>
<th>Somewhat negative</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Slightly positive</th>
<th>Moderately positive</th>
<th>Extremely positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41. Major change in the health or behavior of a family member  
42. Foreclosure on a mortgage or loan  
43. Marital reconciliation with mate

Which of the above events did you experience in the past academic semester?  
41. ________  42. ________  43. ________

Please indicate the extent to which you viewed each of the above events as having either a positive or negative impact on your life at the time the event occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Extremely negative</th>
<th>Moderately negative</th>
<th>Somewhat negative</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Slightly positive</th>
<th>Moderately positive</th>
<th>Extremely positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event 41.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 42.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event 43.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix R.

Alibis are claims that help to demonstrate that a person could not have been the perpetrator of a crime. For example, a friend of the accused may tell police that the two of them were watching television at a certain time.

An alibi may be true or it may be false and police and jurors must determine if the alibi that is provided is genuine. An individual who provides a false alibi may face up to one year in jail in addition to a $3,000 fine.

Listed below are several crimes with which an individual can be charged.
When you are responding to the questions below, please imagine that your current romantic partner is facing that criminal charge.

Without knowing anything else about the following crimes, what is the likelihood that you would corroborate your romantic partner’s alibi if you knew that he or she did not commit the crime?

(Please write any value from 0% to 100% to reflect your willingness to corroborate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Sexual Assault</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manslaughter</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without knowing anything else about the following crimes, what is the likelihood that you would corroborate your romantic partner’s alibi if you knew that he or she did commit the crime?

(Please write any value from 0% to 100% to reflect your willingness to corroborate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Sexual Assault</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manslaughter</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>_______%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The answers to the following questions will be used to match the data that you provide today with the data that you will provide in May:

Mother’s Maiden Name: ___________________________________
Make and Model of First Car: ________________________________
Birthday: ___________________________________________
Appendix S.

Alibis are claims that help to demonstrate that a person could not have been the perpetrator of a crime. For example, a friend of the accused may tell police that the two of them were watching television at a certain time.

An alibi may be true or it may be false and police and jurors must determine if the alibi that is provided is genuine. An individual who provides a false alibi may face up to one year in jail in addition to a $3,000 fine.

Listed below are several crimes with which an individual can be charged.

When you are responding to the questions below, please imagine that your current romantic partner is facing that criminal charge.

Without knowing anything else about the following crimes, what is the likelihood that you would corroborate your romantic partner’s alibi if you knew that he or she did not commit the crime?

(Please write any value from 0% to 100% to reflect your willingness to corroborate)

- Aggravated Assault _______%
- Aggravated Sexual Assault _______%
- Assault _______%
- Burglary _______%
- Manslaughter _______%
- Murder _______%
- Robbery _______%
- Sexual Assault _______%

Without knowing anything else about the following crimes, what is the likelihood that you would corroborate your romantic partner’s alibi if you knew that he or she did commit the crime?

(Please write any value from 0% to 100% to reflect your willingness to corroborate)

- Aggravated Assault _______%
- Aggravated Sexual Assault _______%
- Assault _______%
- Burglary _______%
- Manslaughter _______%
- Murder _______%
- Robbery _______%
- Sexual Assault _______%

The answers to the following questions will be used to match the data that you provide today with the data that you provided in January:

Mother’s Maiden Name: ___________________________________
Make and Model of First Car: ___________________________________
Birthday: ___________________________________
Appendix T.

Hello <Participant First Name>!

Happy Valentine’s Day!

I personally wanted to thank you for agreeing to participate in my study, “Romantic Relationships Over Time.” I also wanted to wish you and your significant other the very best on this romantic day – I hope that you both are very happy together! ☺

Regards,

Kevin
Appendix U.

Hello <Participant Full Name>,

This letter is to remind you that you agreed in January to participate in a two-part study, “Romantic Relationships Over Time.” Several months have passed since your participation in the first part of the study and now it is time to complete the second part of the study.

*Even if the romantic relationship you described in January has ended, it is very important that you complete this study because the study seeks to investigate how and why romantic relationships change over time.*

**Here is what you'll need to do to complete the experiment:**

1. During the month of May, log onto [website address at Survey MonkeyTM].

2. Complete several study forms about the romantic relationship that you described in January - this should take less than one hour.

3. Receive research participation credit and a token of thanks for your participation.

This letter is simply a follow-up to the e-mail that you received several days ago – I just wanted to send you this as a reminder for you to complete your participation in the study. Those who complete the study will be entered into a raffle for a prize, so please make sure that you complete it!

In case you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me by e-mailing [kwjolly@miners.utep.edu](mailto:kwjolly@miners.utep.edu) or by calling 915-747-8032.

Again, thank you for your participation!

Sincerely,

Kevin Jolly
Appendix V.

Hello <Participant First Name>!

This e-mail is to remind you that you agreed in January to participate in a two-part study, “Romantic Relationships Over Time.” Several months have passed since your participation in the first part of the study and now it is time to complete the second part of the study.

Even if the romantic relationship you described in January has ended, it is very important that you complete this study because the study seeks to investigate how and why romantic relationships change over time.

Here is what you’ll need to do to complete the experiment:

1. During the month of May, log onto [website address at Survey Monkey™].

4. Complete several study forms about the romantic relationship that you described in January - this should take less than one hour.

5. Receive experimental participation credit and a token of thanks for your participation.

In the coming days, you should receive a letter providing you with this same information – I just wanted to e-mail you this information as soon as possible so that you could complete your participation in the study. Those who complete the study will be entered into a raffle for a prize, so please make sure that you complete it!

In case you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me by e-mailing kwjolly@miners.utep.edu or by calling 915-747-8032.

Again, thank you for your participation!

Sincerely,

Kevin Jolly
Appendix W.

Hello <Participant First Name>!

Happy Birthday!

I saw that your birthday fell between the two times that you are participating in my experiment so I wanted to surprise you by wishing you a happy birthday!

Wishing you the best,

Kevin
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