University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Open Access Master's Theses

2004

Victim Empathy as a Function of Attachment Style, Sex, Self-Esteem and Type of Victimization

Molly Ann Hedrick

University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Hedrick, Molly Ann, "Victim Empathy as a Function of Attachment Style, Sex, Self-Esteem and Type of Victimization" (2004). *Open Access Master's Theses*. Paper 1620.
<https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses/1620>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

BF 575
E 55
H 437
2004

VICTIM EMPATHY AS A FUNCTION OF ATTACHMENT STYLE, SEX, SELF-
ESTEEM AND TYPE OF VICTIMIZATION

BY

MOLLY ANN HEDRICK

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

2004

Abstract

The conceptualization of adult attachment styles corresponding internal working models is a useful frame when considering empathetic responses to victims. This study explored empathy for fictional victims of several types of traumas, including date and stranger rape, as a function of ideal and actual attachment style, self-esteem, and rape victim-perpetrator association. Forty male and 157 female undergraduates at a large state university completed a questionnaire packet consisting of demographic information, a self-esteem scale, an actual and an ideal relationship style measure, and a philosophies of human nature scale utilized to measure related attachment dimensions. They then read 10 trauma scenarios designed by the principal investigator and rated level of empathy toward the victim. For both actual and ideal attachment, participants were categorized into one of four styles: secure, preoccupied, fearful and dismissing. As a continuous measure of attachment styles, participants were also asked to rate the degree to which each of these styles described them. Results of multiple regression analyses with 16 potential variables predicting empathy found that empathy toward rape victims was predicted only by sex of participant and actual preoccupied relationship style, while overall victim empathy was predicted by sex of participant and ideal secure relationship style. ANOVA results indicated no difference in rape victim empathy as a function of victim-perpetrator association, although a main effect for sex was found, with females indicating greater rape victim empathy than males. T-tests were utilized to explore differences in empathy across paired scenarios and results indicated greater participant empathy for a mentally ill

person who was medication and treatment compliant compared to one who was not; a college woman whose boyfriend broke up with her who nonetheless performed well on mid-terms compared to one who performed poorly; and someone with a positive cancer prognosis compared to a terminal patient. ANOVAs across four actual attachment styles indicated that individuals who had a secure actual relationship style had lower self esteem than individuals with a preoccupied or a fearful actual relationship style. There were no significant differences in self esteem as a function of the ideal attachment style. The results conflict with existing literature, indicating possible problems in the measures and methodology utilized in the current study and suggesting future research directions, such as examining internal working models of attachment in greater depth, particularly as they related to sexual assault.

Acknowledgements

As a clinical psychologist in training, I tend to take a process oriented and interpersonal approach to my life. The process that has included the conceptualization of my thesis topic, the thesis proposal, the data collection, the data entry, analysis, the writing of my thesis, the defense of my thesis, and the revisions of my thesis could not have been possible without several interpersonal relationships that I am blessed to have in my life. First and foremost, I need to thank the Montana and Oregon contingency; my mother for keeping me secure, my father for keeping me motivated, my grandmother for keeping me inspired and my brothers for keeping me humble. Thank you also to the Rhode Island contingency; Jaime and his family for keeping me sane. For my amazing friends/roommates-Maheen, Andrea, Leah, Danielle, Cathy, Senait, Marnelle, Kim, Simona, and Erica (among many others)-who are constantly helping me keep things in perspective; I can not give you enough of my gratitude and respect. I am extremely fortunate to be able to study, work, and play with people I consider my best friends.

A huge thanks to my major professor, Kat Quina, for always stepping in when I need her most. Thanks to my other committee members Jerry Cohen (for the support surrounding my statistic anxiety), Stephen Grubman-Black (for the flexibility and commitment), Al Berman (for the personal reassurances at just the right times) and Jim Campbell (for knowing me and believing in me). I would also like to acknowledge my appreciation for my current clinical supervisor, Dan Hurley, and my wonderful supervision team, for continually reminding me why I love attachment and clinical psychology.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....ii

Acknowledgements.....iv

Table of Contents.....v

List of Tables.....vi

List of Figures.....vii

Introduction.....1

 Hypotheses.....10

Methods.....13

Results.....18

Discussion.....30

Appendix.....40

Bibliography.....67

List of Tables

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviations by Sex.....	19
Table 2: Standard Multiple Regression of Sex and Preoccupied Relationship Style on Total Rape Victim Empathy.....	24
Table 3: Standard Multiple Regression of Sex and Ideal Secure Relationship Style on Total Empathy.....	26

List of Figures

Figure 1: Four-category Model of Attachment.....	4
--	---

Introduction

In recent years, attachment theory has become a widely used model of child and adult interpersonal relationships. A secure attachment is viewed as paramount in healthy interpersonal functioning, whereas insecure attachment styles are seen as a hindrance to relationships. Some maintain that the primary mechanism by which secure attachments develop and operate involves the ability to empathize with others (e.g., Joireman, Needham, & Cummings, 2001). Although several lines of research have explored the relationship between attachment styles, situational empathy and interpersonal interactions, I am aware of none that have expanded this framework to include sexual violence within relationships. Studies of rape inform us that individuals are more likely to blame the victim or perceive the rape as less severe in acquaintance, date, and marital rape situations when compared to stranger rape scenarios (e.g., Simonson & Subich, 1999). The fact that rape victim blame increases with the degree of familiarity between the victim and the perpetrator seems contrary to the assumption that secure relationships serve as a protective factor in interpersonal interactions (Sheldon-Keller, Lloyd-McGarvey, West, & Canterbury, 1994). The purpose the present study, therefore, was to expand on past research linking global attachment styles to empathetic responses to rape victims in both stranger and date rape scenarios and to further explore empathetic responses across several different domains.

The British psychiatrist, John Bowlby, first introduced the concept of attachment in 1969. Bowlby (1969) defined attachment as an instinctive, deep and enduring

connection between a child and a caregiver. This attachment relationship is formed during the first several years of a child's life and profoundly affects the child's future development. Bowlby's research focused on instinctual behaviors demonstrated by children, such as sucking, clinging, crying, and smiling that serve to keep the mother close. If a child's needs are met, the child develops a secure base from which to explore the world and establish loving and trusting relationships. On the other hand, Bowlby claimed that maternal deprivation leads to detrimental effects in children such as disturbed development, emotional detachment, inability to love and trust, and depression. Attachment theory, as applied to children, has led to an abundance of studies relating to the importance of early experience on children's biological, social, cognitive, and emotional development.

Researchers such as Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (1978) extended Bowlby's theory with the discovery of three different attachment styles. Through the use of the Strange Situation, Ainsworth found that children can be classified as either secure, avoidant or anxious-ambivalent. The Strange Situation involves separating children from their mothers, introducing a stranger, then reunifying the children with their mothers. Children classified as secure demonstrate distress upon separation, but seek comfort from their mothers upon reunification. In contrast, children classified as avoidant demonstrate little distress upon separation and no interest in seeking affection from their mothers upon reunification. Children classified as anxious/ambivalent demonstrate distress upon separation, but simultaneously seek out and reject the care of their mother upon reunification. In a review of American studies, Campos, Barret, Lamb, Goldsmith, and Stenberg (1983) concluded that 62% of American infants can

be classified as secure, 23% can be classified as avoidant, and 15% are anxious/ambivalent. Main and Solomon (1986) discovered the additional category of disorganized attachment in children who did not seem to have a consistent pattern of responding to separation and reunification. This category is most often seen in children with histories of abuse and/or neglect.

More recently, the study of attachment styles has extended to the adult population. Hazan and Shaver's (1987) pioneering study discovered parallel attachment styles in adult romantic relationships, based on a self-report questionnaire. These styles occur in about the same proportion as childhood attachment styles. Approximately 56% percent of the adults that responded to their questionnaire classified themselves as secure, approximately 24% classified themselves as avoidant, and approximately 20% classified themselves as anxious/ambivalent. Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) have revised Hazen and Shaver's three-category measure, and classified adult relationships into four separate categories.

According to Bartholomew (1990), adults and adolescents can be classified as positive or negative on two different dimensions labeled "Model of Self" and "Model of Other" (see Figure 1). Securely attached individuals have both a positive view of self and others and are comfortable with intimacy and autonomy. Preoccupied individuals have a negative view of self, but a positive view of others and tend to exhibit anxiety and overly dependent characteristics in relationships. This category is similar to Hazan and Shaver's anxious-ambivalent coding. Individuals who are dismissing of intimacy and are counterdependent in relationships have a positive view

Model of Self			
		+	–
Model of Other	+	SECURE Comfortable with intimacy and autonomy	PREOCCUPIED Preoccupied with relationship (anxious/resistant/ ambivalent)
	–	DISMISSING Dismissing of intimacy Counterdependent (avoidant)	FEARFUL Fearful of intimacy Socially avoidant (disoriented/ disorganized)

Figure 1. Four-category model of attachment (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

of self, but a negative view of others. This category resembles Hazan and Shaver's avoidant coding. Finally, individuals classified as fearful have a negative view of self and a negative view of others. This category closely represents Main and Solomon's (1986) disoriented/disorganized coding. The development of adult attachment measures continues to be refined (e.g., Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998) and the impact of attachment classifications on interpersonal relationships has been explored in several lines of research. One such exploration attempts to delineate the relationship between attachment and empathy.

Clark (1980, p. 187) defines empathy as "that unique capacity of the human being to feel the experiences, needs, aspirations, frustrations, sorrows, joys, anxieties, hurt, or hunger of others as if they were his or her own." Attachment theory provides a conceptual framework for the development of empathy and responding to others' needs. Positive working models of the self and others develop through the dynamic relationship between a caregiver and a child. Bowlby (1969) argued that when attachment security is attained and an individual learns that he or she will be cared for, the individual can then direct attention and energy to the needs of others. The child eventually develops a mutually empathetic response to a primary caregiver, which he or she can generalize to others. For instance, Denham (1994) discovered that children labeled as securely attached exhibited greater empathy compared to children with less secure attachment styles. On the other hand, a child who does not receive empathy will develop a negative working model of the self or others and may become egotistical, self-focused, and unable to attend to and understand the needs of others.

These internal working models presumably serve as blueprints for future adult relationships and affective responses.

Many studies have shown that securely attached mothers demonstrate more helpful and supportive responses to their preschool child (e.g., Ward & Carlson, 1995), and are more sensitive to their infants' needs (e.g., Pearson, Cohn, Cowan, & Cowan, 1994). Fathers who are securely attached are also more sensitive to preschool children's needs (e.g., Ward & Carlson, 1995). Mikulincer, Gillath, Halevy, Avihou, Avidan, and Eshkoli (2001) conducted a series of five studies in which both contextual activation of the sense of attachment security and global attachment were related to empathetic responses and levels of personal distress. Specifically, participants' attachment security was primed by having participants read an interpersonal script relating to attachment security, by exposing participants to pictures relating to attachment security, by subliminally presenting words associated with secure attachment, or by having participants visualize specific secure episodes in a relationship. Self-reports of global attachment styles were also calculated. Measures of empathy and personal distress based on Batson's (1991) empathy-distress distinction were recorded in response to several different empathy-provoking situations. The results indicated that the contextual activation of attachment security through a variety of priming techniques led participants to respond more empathetically to the needs of others. Participants primed with these techniques also reported lower levels of personal distress. Attachment anxiety scores were positively related to personal distress in response to individuals in need. Lower scores on global dimensions of attachment avoidance and anxiety were significantly related to higher

empathetic responses. These results indicate that empathy is affected by priming of attachment security and by chronically accessible schemas of attachment.

The relationship between secure attachment and sensitivity to others' needs can also be seen in studies involving adult interpersonal relationships. Some researchers (e.g., Davis, 1983; Joireman, Needham, & Cummings, 2001) have demonstrated that adults with a secure attachment style indicate greater empathic concern and perspective taking when compared to adults with an insecure attachment style. In the Joireman, Needham, & Cummings (2001) study, empathy was measured by utilizing Davis' (1983) Interpersonal Reactivity Index. This index explores three forms of empathy; empathetic concern, perspective taking, and personal distress. Collins and Read's (1990) Adult Attachment Scale, Hazan and Shaver's (1987) three category attachment measure, and Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) four category attachment measure were utilized as a comparison of attachment measures as they related to empathy. Results of indicated that greater trust and comfort with closeness, as measured by the Adult Attachment Scale, were associated with greater empathetic concern and perspective taking and greater anxiety was associated with greater personal distress. There were no significant differences in the three forms of empathy as a function of attachment styles, as measured by the Hazan and Shaver (1987) three category measure. On the other hand, when utilizing the Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) four category measure, individuals with a secure attachment style indicated significantly higher empathetic concern than those reporting a fearful-avoidant style, and individuals with a secure attachment style reported less personal distress than those with preoccupied or fearful attachment styles.

The capacity for empathy also appears to facilitate interpersonal functioning (e.g. Davis & Oathout, 1987, 1992) and interpersonal satisfaction (e.g. Collins & Read, 1990). Carnelley, Pietromonaco, and Jaffe (1996) found that self-reported attachment security is significantly related to self-reported responsiveness to romantic partners' needs. Additionally, observational studies (e.g., Collins & Feeney, 2000; Simpson, Rholes, and Nelligan, 1992) revealed that men who score high on attachment security offer more comfort and reassurance to their female romantic partners during distressing situations. Westmaas and Silver (2001) found that participants in their study who scored low on attachment avoidance displayed more supportive reactions to a confederate who reportedly had cancer than did participants with high avoidance scores. Participants who scored high on attachment anxiety reported higher anxiety during the interaction with the confederate than those who scored low on this dimension. Further evidence examining the importance of attachment and empathy in interpersonal relationships can be viewed in light of sexually coercive behaviors.

Lack of empathy for rape victims has been associated with both self-reported likelihood to rape (Deitz, Blackwell, Daley, & Bentley, 1982), and sexually aggressive behavior (e.g., Rice, Chaplin, Harris, & Coutts, 1994). As a result, several rape prevention models and models of aggressive behavior (e.g., Hildebran & Pithers, 1992; Finkelhor, 1986) highlight the need to target poor victim empathy when treating and preventing sexually coercive behavior. Research involving victim empathy and sexually coercive attitudes and behaviors is essential given the prevalence of rape, particularly on college campuses.

A study conducted by Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski (1987) found that approximately 25% of college women were victims of sexual abuse or rape. Koss (1988, cited in Ching & Burke, 1999) estimated that one-in-four females will be a victim of sexually coercive behavior sometime in her life. In another survey, 39% of college males said it was “all right” to force sex if a girl was “stoned” or drunk” (Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989, cited in Ching & Burke, 1999). A study by Check and Malamuth (1983) found that 26% of college males admitted to have made a forceful attempt at sexual intercourse that caused observable distress to the women. Thirty percent of males in this same study claimed that they would rape a woman if they could be assured that they would never be caught.

Other statistics inform us that the most common type of rape is acquaintance rape (Koss & Harvey, 1991), which accounts for 80% to 90% of rapes. The Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski (1987) study also revealed that 84% of reported sexual assaults were committed by persons known to the victim and 57% were dates. Despite these facts, acquaintance rape was just recently considered a crime (Bechhofer & Parrot, 1991). This dismissal of rape within close interpersonal relationships can be seen in light of studies that examine individuals’ responses to different rape scenarios that manipulate the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator. Several studies have demonstrated that participants rate rape between more closely acquainted individuals (e.g., marital, date, or acquaintance rape) as less serious than rape involving strangers (e.g., Bridges, & McGrail, 1989; Simonson, & Subich, 1999). Here we see a strange paradox. Although secure, close relationships are presumed to provide a sense of safety and security (West & Sheldon, 1988), we nonetheless appear to condone sexual

violence within close relationships. In order to further understand this paradox, more research needs to be conducted.

As we have already seen, attachment styles have been associated with empathetic responses to others, yet no study, to date has examined whether or not this relationship generalizes to rape victims. The prevalence of sexually coercive behavior within interpersonal relationships warrants further investigation as we seek to understand the role of attachment styles as either a risk or protective factor. Furthermore, the role of empathy in response to rape victims has been well documented. I am aware of no studies, however, that have utilized global attachment style as a potential variable affecting responses to rape victim scenarios. To facilitate a bridge between the sometimes confusing results of the aforementioned studies on attachment, empathy, and interpersonal sexual violence, the main purpose of the proposed study was to examine the relationship between global attachment styles and situational empathy in response to rape victim as a function of the degree of relationship between the victim and the perpetrator.

Hypotheses

The main hypotheses of this study were as follows:

- 1) Individuals will demonstrate more empathy for victims of stranger rape than victims of date rape, based on prior research exploring judgments of severity and blame in regards to the degree of relationship between a rape victim and a perpetrator (e.g., Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Simonson & Subich, 1999).

- 2) Beliefs about human nature, self-esteem, participant sex, and actual and ideal attachment styles will predict total empathetic responses in general and rape victim empathy specifically.
- 3) Individuals who indicate insecure attachments on a self-report measure of global attachment will report less empathy toward fictional rape victims than individuals who indicate secure attachments on a self-report measure of global attachment. This hypothesis is based on prior research linking attachment style to empathetic responses (e.g. Joireman, Needham, & Cummings, 2001; Mikulincer, et. al., 2001). Furthermore, this hypothesis is based on Collins and Read's (1994) conceptualization of internal working models. Presumably, when faced with stressful situations (e.g., rape), internal working models are activated and guide responses. Individuals with insecure models are more likely to focus on their own anxiety and discomfort, rather than on the needs of another, whereas individuals with a secure model are able to direct their concern toward others in the form of empathy (Westmaas & Silver, 2001).
- 4) Individuals who indicate insecure attachments on a self-report measure of global attachment will report less self-esteem than individuals who indicate secure attachments on the global measure. This work is based on literature linking secure attachments to positive self-esteem (e.g., Collins & Read, 1990).

Other exploratory analyses included those based on variations in empathetic responses as a function of slightly different hypothetical scenarios. Finally individuals' perception of their ideal attachment style were queried in order to explore actual versus ideal relationship styles as they relate to interpersonal empathy. This inquiry is based on work by Higgins (1987), who claims that discrepancy between

actual-self and ideal-self forms a “negative motivational state.” Other researchers have found links between actual and ideal selves and self-esteem (e.g., Ickes, Wicklund, & Ferris, 1973). The impact of actual versus ideal interpersonal relationships in relation to empathetic responses has yet to be adequately explored in the literature (although see Elkins & Peterson, 1993, for an examination of ideal versus actual friendships). In conclusion, the aim of this study was to replicate past findings linking attachment styles to empathetic responses and to explore other possible contributors to the empathy construct.

Methods

Participants

Participants were 198 undergraduates at the University of Rhode Island who participated for extra credit and/or for course assignment purposes in their introductory psychology course or abnormal psychology course. The sample included 157 women and 40 men (1 subject did not indicate his/her sex), ranging in age from 18-42, with a mean age of 19.17. One hundred thirty-eight participants (69.7%) indicated that they were first year students; 41 (20.7%) indicated that they were second year students, 12 (6.1%) reported that they were third year students and 7 (3.5%) said that they were fourth year students. The sample was 88.9% White, 3.5% Black, 2.5% Latino/Hispanic, 1% Asian, 1.5% Multiracial and 2.5% Other.

Materials and Procedures

All measures were administered in a paper-and-pencil questionnaire (see Appendix A for questionnaire packet). The first section obtained background information on participant age, year in school, sex, and race. Participants then completed the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965), which focuses on general self acceptance. This scale asks participants to indicate level of agreement to 10 statements on a 4-point Likert scale (e.g. I feel that I have a number of good qualities). This is a commonly used measure of self-esteem, and several studies have attested to its reliability and validity (for review, see Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1991).

Next, participants completed measures of actual and ideal attachment styles. The Relationship Questionnaire (RQ), as developed by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991), was used to assess participant's current global attachment style. This measure includes four descriptions reflecting the four main types of attachment style (secure, dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful); individuals place a checkmark next to the description that best describes their general relationship style. For example, the preoccupied description reads, "I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them." This measure also includes a Likert scale, which asks participants to rate each of the descriptions on how well or poorly the descriptions correspond to their general relationship style.

The RQ was chosen over the original self-report attachment measure developed by Hazan and Shaver (1987, 1994) since the dimensional approach taken by Bartholomew and Horowitz relating to view of self versus view of others is particularly pertinent to the present examination of empathy. The RQ was validated through intercorrelations between self-report measures of self-concept, and interpersonal functioning (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Although systematic reliability studies have not been conducted on single-item measures of attachment, construct validity for the Hazan and Shaver (1987) measure has been demonstrated and 89% of the participants in their study checked the same descriptor at initial data collection and at a six-month follow up.

An adapted version of the Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) Relationship Questionnaire, developed by the principal investigator, was also used to measure ideal adult attachment styles. Participants received the same Relationship Questionnaire, but instructed to indicate their ideal style rather than their actual style on both the categorical and continuous measures.

Participants then completed a measurement of empathy related to ten different scenarios designed to invoke emotional responses. These scenarios, as developed by the principal investigator, included 5 topics: rape, blood donation, mental illness, cancer, and academic concerns related to the break-up of a relationship. The scenarios were paired in that each topic differed by only one variable. In the blood donation scenario, a protagonist who is afraid of giving blood is either supported or teased by his friends. In the mental illness scenario, the description varied according to whether or not the protagonist was treatment compliant. The cancer scenario varied in terms of whether or not the prognosis was full recovery or terminal. In the academic concern/break-up scenario the protagonist was “dumped” by her boyfriend the night before midterms and either does extremely well on the midterms or very poorly.

The central scenarios in this analysis concerned date rape versus stranger rape situations. These situations were adapted from scenarios used by Bridges (1991) and Simonson and Subich (1999):

Stranger rape:

One night Karen, a senior at a state university, went to the campus theater with several friends. Following the movie, she said goodbye to her friends. While she walked across the lot, Brian, a student whom Karen had never seen before, came up to her.

After attempting unsuccessfully to make conversation with Karen, he asked her if she were interested in having sex. Karen said "no" very forcefully, but Brian did not pay attention to her answer. He grabbed her, began to kiss her, and then lifted her skirt. Her repeated protests were ignored as he forced himself on her and completed the act of intercourse.

Date rape:

One night Lisa, a senior at a state university, went to the campus theater with Gary. Although Lisa and Gary were in a few classes together, this was their first date. Following the movie, Lisa and Gary went back to Lisa's apartment to watch the late show on television. While watching television, Gary put his arm around Lisa's shoulder. A few minutes later he asked her if she were interested in having sex. Lisa said "no" very forcefully, but Gary did not pay attention to her answer. He grabbed her, began to kiss her, and then lifted her skirt. Her repeated protests were ignored as he forced himself on her and completed the act of intercourse.

A Balanced Latin Square Design was utilized to control for potential order effects of the scenarios. This allowed for each scenario to precede and follow each other scenario once. After reading each scenario, participants were given a list of 6 adjectives describing different emotional states (sympathetic, softhearted, warm, compassionate, tender, and moved). Participants then used a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely), to describe how much they had personally experienced the particular emotion while reading the story. The adjectives are based on Batson's (1991) list of empathy adjectives and have been used in previous studies to measure empathy in response to scenarios (e.g., Mikulincer et. al., 2001). Internal

consistency for these adjectives, as indicated by Cronbach's alpha coefficient, was .94 in the study conducted by Mikulincer and his colleagues (2001).

Finally, participants completed the Wrightsman's Philosophies of Human Nature Scale (PHN, Wrightsman, 1964). The PHN is an 84-item self-report measure comprised of six subscales, designed to measure beliefs about various aspects of human nature and social behavior, including Trustworthiness, Altruism, Independence, Strength of Will and Rationality, Complexity of Human Nature, and Variability in Human Nature. Participants indicated their level of agreement based on a Likert scale ranging from -3 to +3. This scale has been used to explore internal working models of attachment (e.g., Collins & Read, 1990) and reliability and validity have been demonstrated (for review, see Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1991).

Participants completed the questionnaire in groups ranging from 10 to 49 students during 8 separate data collection times within a two week period. They were allowed as much time as they needed, and most finished within 1 hour.

Results

The means and standard deviations of the variables can be seen in Table 1.

Hypothesis One: Victim/Perpetrator Relationship and Empathetic Responses to Rape Victims

A principle component analysis was conducted on the two measures of rape victim empathy (date rape and stranger rape) in order to see if the six adjectives were measuring the same construct (empathy). Results of the principle component analysis indicated that all six adjectives in both the date rape and stranger rape conditions loaded onto one factor.

In order to test the hypothesis that the degree of relationship between perpetrators and victims would affect empathetic responses, a 2X2 mixed design ANOVA was performed with sex as the between subject independent variable and victim/perpetrator association (date rape or stranger rape) as the within subjects independent variable. Results indicated that there was a significant main effect for sex; $F(1, 194)=5.52, p<.05$. Females ($M=4.58, SD=1.59$) reported significantly higher rape victim empathy than did males ($M=3.91, SD=1.29$). There was no main effect for victim/perpetrator association; $F(1, 194)=3.78, p>.05$, and the interaction was also not significant; $F(1, 194)=1.263, p>.05$. The correlation between date rape and stranger rape empathy was .79. As a result of this high communality, the combined average empathy score for both the date rape scenario and the stranger rape scenario was computed for a total rape victim empathy score to be used in the next analysis.

Table 1

Mean and Standard Deviations by Sex

	Males		Females	
	M	SD	M	SD
Actual Relationship Styles				
• Secure	5.00	1.87	4.88	1.71
• Fearful	3.11	1.35	4.14	1.84
• Preoccupied	3.89	1.66	3.66	1.78
• Dismissing	3.73	1.71	3.43	1.66
Ideal Relationship Styles				
• Secure	5.49	1.82	5.69	1.41
• Fearful	3.19	1.43	3.31	1.78
• Preoccupied	3.62	1.64	3.17	1.57
• Dismissing	3.76	1.86	3.68	1.71
Philosophies of Human Nature				
• Trustworthiness	0.49	0.55	0.36	0.47
• Altruism	0.38	0.59	0.27	0.52
• Independence	0.46	0.48	0.53	0.49
• Strength of Will	0.24	0.50	0.38	0.53
• Complexity	0.28	0.48	0.23	0.57
• Variability	0.52	0.50	0.57	0.46

Table 1 (continued)

Mean and Standard Deviations by Sex

	Males		Females	
	M	SD	M	SD
Empathy				
• Mental illness: tx compliant	3.72	1.27	4.70	1.20
• Mental illness: not tx compliant	2.95	1.76	3.67	1.45
• Terminal cancer	5.10	1.01	5.77	1.03
• Full recovery from cancer	4.61	1.05	5.29	1.14
• Dumped and pass midterms	2.80	1.17	3.07	1.38
• Dumped and failed midterms	3.27	1.09	4.22	1.23
• Give blood and teased	2.90	1.27	4.01	1.32
• Give blood and supported	3.01	1.40	4.00	1.50
• Date Rape	3.77	1.27	4.54	1.65
• Stranger Rape	4.05	1.55	4.62	1.69

Table 1 (continued)

Mean and Standard Deviations by Sex

	Males		Females	
	M	SD	M	SD
• Rape Victim	3.91	1.29	4.58	1.59
Total Empathy	3.62	0.83	4.39	.92
Self Esteem	1.71	0.47	1.82	.47

Hypothesis Two: Predictors of Rape Victim Empathy and Total Empathy

As a measure of reliability for the Philosophy of Human Nature sub-scales, Chronbach's alpha was computed and found to be .80, thus indicating adequate reliability for this scale.

Frequency analysis revealed that 48.5% (n=96) of the sample indicated a secure actual relationship style, 24.2% (n=48) reported a fearful actual relationship style, 16.7% (n=33) reported a preoccupied actual relationship style, and 9.6% (n=19) reported a dismissing actual relationship style. These frequencies are similar to frequencies obtained in the original Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) study of the 4 category measure of adult attachment, although in that study, approximately 18 % of individuals were classified as dismissing. When participants were asked to indicate their ideal relationship style, 68.7% (n=136) of the sample indicated a secure ideal relationship style, 9.1% (n=18) reported a fearful ideal relationship style, 4.5% (n=9) reported a preoccupied ideal relationship style, and 13.1% (n=26) reported a dismissing ideal relationship style.

A standard multiple regression analysis examined predictors of the total rape victim empathy score, entering participant sex (bivariate coded), self-esteem, the four actual and the four ideal attachment styles (secure, dismissing, preoccupied, fearful), and the six dimensions of the PHN scale (Trustworthiness, Altruism, Independence, Strength of Will and Rationality, Complexity of Human Nature, and Variability in Human Nature) as potential predictor variables. Evaluation of assumptions for multiple regression analyses indicated that the data met criteria for normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of residuals. With the use of a $p < .001$ criterion for Mahalanobis

distance, no outliers among the cases were found. All cases had less than 5% missing data, and no suppressor variables were found. Variables that had missing data were excluded from the analyses.

A stepwise multiple regression was performed between rape victim empathy as the dependent variable and sex, self esteem, actual secure, dismissing, preoccupied and fearful relationship styles; ideal secure, dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful relationship styles, and all six components of PHN as the 16 independent variables. Only sex and actual preoccupied relationship style (RQC) were found to be significant predictors of rape victim empathy. After step 1, with sex entered into the regression equation, $R^2=0.03$, $F(1, 174) = 5.87$, $p<.05$. After step 2, with preoccupied relationship style added to the prediction of rape victim empathy, $R^2=0.06$, $F(2, 173) = 5.38$, $p<.05$. Table 2 displays the correlations between the variables, the unstandardized regression coefficients (B) and intercept, the standardized regression coefficients (β) the semipartial correlations (sr_i^2) and R^2 , and adjusted R^2 of the final model. Consistent with the previous ANOVA findings, females ($M=4.58$, $SD=1.59$) demonstrated greater empathy for fictional rape victims than did males ($M=3.91$, $SD=1.29$). Sex accounted for 3% of the variance, as indicated by sr_i^2 . Preoccupied actual relationship style accounted for 3% of the variance, as indicated by sr_i^2 . Greater endorsement of preoccupied actual relationship style predicted greater rape victim empathy. Altogether, 6% of the variability in rape victim empathy could be attributed to sex and preoccupied attachment style, as indicated by R^2 .

When total mean empathy was considered as the dependent variable, results were slightly different. The total empathy score was obtained by summing the

TABLE 2

Standard Multiple Regression of Sex and Preoccupied Relationship Style on Total

Rape Victim Empathy

Variables	RAPEEMP (DV)	SEX	RQC	B	β	sr_i^2
SEX	0.17			0.71*	0.19	0.03
RQC	0.14	-0.06		0.14*	0.16	0.03

Intercept=2.59

 $R^2=0.06$ Adjusted $R^2=0.05$ $R=0.24$ * $p<.05$

empathetic responses to all ten scenarios. A stepwise multiple regression was performed to determine whether the 16 independent variables (self-esteem, sex, the four actual and the four ideal attachment styles; secure, dismissing, preoccupied, fearful, and the six dimensions of the PHN scale; Trustworthiness, Altruism, Independence, Strength of Will and Rationality, Complexity of Human Nature, and Variability in Human Nature) predicted total victim empathy. Only sex and ideal secure relationship style (RQI) were found to be significant predictors of total victim empathy. After step 1, with sex entered into the equation, $R^2=0.11$, $F(1, 173) = 20.78$, $p<.05$. After step 2, with ideal secure relationship style added to the prediction of total victim empathy, $R^2=0.13$, $F(2, 172) = 13.16$, $p<.05$. Table 3 displays the correlations between the variables, the unstandardized regression coefficients (B) and intercept, the standardized regression coefficients (β) the semipartial correlations (sr_i^2) and R^2 , and adjusted R^2 of the final model. Females ($M=4.39$, $SD=0.92$) demonstrated greater empathy for fictional victims than did males ($M=3.62$, $SD=0.83$). Sex accounted for 10.7% of the variance, as indicated by sr_i^2 . Secure ideal relationship style accounted for 2.6% of the variance, as indicated by sr_i^2 . Greater endorsement of secure ideal relationship style predicted greater rape victim empathy. Altogether, 13.3% of the variability in total victim empathy could be attributed to sex and secure ideal relationship style, as indicated by R^2 .

Hypothesis Three: Actual and Ideal Relationship Styles and Rape Victim Empathy and Total Empathy

In order to better understand the relationship between rape victim empathy and total empathy, 4 Single-Factor ANOVAS for Relationship Style were performed.

TABLE 3

Standard Multiple Regression of Sex and Ideal Secure Relationship Style on Total

Empathy

Variables	TOTALEMP (DV)	SEX	RQIA	B	β	sr_i^2
SEX	0.33			0.74*	0.32	0.11
RQIA	0.17	0.05		0.10*	0.16	0.02

Intercept=2.31

 $R^2=0.13$ Adjusted $R^2=0.12$ $R=0.36$ * $p<.05$

These separate analyses looked at actual relationship style as the independent variable and rape victim empathy as the dependent variable; actual relationship style as the independent variable and total empathy as the dependent variable; ideal relationship style as the independent variable with rape victim empathy as the dependent variable; and ideal relationship style as the independent variable with total empathy as the dependent variable. ANOVA revealed no significant differences between types of actual relationship style on either rape victim empathy or total empathy, $F(3, 191)=1.085, p>.05$ and $F(3, 189)=2.061, p>.05$, respectively. There were also no significant differences in rape victim empathy or total empathy as a function of ideal relationship styles, $F(3, 184)=1.511, p>.05$ and $F(3, 183)=1.409, p>.05$, respectively.

Hypothesis Four: Attachment Styles and Self-esteem

A single-factor ANOVA was performed in order to explore the effect of actual attachment styles on self-esteem. The levels of the independent variable were the four actual attachment style groups. Overall results indicated that there was a significant difference in self esteem as a function of actual attachment style $F(3, 190)=7.285, p<.05$. Follow-up Tukey HSD tests revealed that individuals with a secure actual relationship style reported significantly lower self-esteem ($M=1.68, SD=0.42$), than individuals with a fearful actual relationship style ($M=1.95, SD=0.49$), and individuals with a preoccupied actual relationship style ($M=2.03, SD=0.47$). There was no significant difference in self esteem between individuals who indicated a secure actual relationship style and a dismissing actual relationship style ($M=1.69, SD=0.46$). No other comparisons of ideal relationship style revealed differences.

An additional single-factor ANOVA was run in order to determine differences in self esteem across the four ideal relationship styles. There were no significant differences in self esteem as a function of ideal relationship style, $F(3, 183)=0.775$, $p>.05$.

Exploratory analyses: Variations in Victim Scenarios and Actual Versus Ideal

Attachment styles

T-tests were used to explore other differences between empathetic responses as a function of variations in the ten scenarios. The difference between empathetic responses to an individual with a mental illness who either was or was not medication and treatment compliant, was statistically significant, $t(195)=-10.47$, $p<.01$.

Participants indicated greater empathy for the fictional individual who was medication and treatment compliant ($M=3.52$, $SD=1.45$) when compared to a fictional individual who was not medication and treatment compliant ($M=4.50$, $SD=1.27$; M difference = -0.98 , $SD=1.31$). Participants were also more empathetic towards a fictional individual diagnosed with terminal cancer ($M=5.63$, $SD=1.06$), when compared with an a fictional individual expected to make a full recovery from cancer ($M=5.15$, $SD=1.15$; M difference = -0.48 , $SD=0.96$, $t(195)=-7.02$, $p<.01$). Furthermore, participants were more empathetic towards a fictional student who was “dumped” by her boyfriend the night before midterms if she failed one of the midterms ($M=4.03$, $SD=1.26$), when compared to the fictional student who passed both of the midterms ($M=3.02$, $SD=1.34$; M difference = -1.02 , $SD=1.30$, $t(195)=-10.948$, $p<.01$). There was no difference in mean empathetic responses to a fictional student who was either teased or supported by friends while giving blood (M difference = 0.04 , $SD=1.27$,

$t(196)=-.412, p>.01$). A paired sample t -test was also conducted to explore the difference between total rape victim empathy and total cancer empathy. Individuals reported more empathy for victims of cancer ($M=5.39, SD=0.99$) than for victims of rape ($M=4.43, SD=1.55$; M difference $=-0.95, SD=1.32, t(195)=-10.13, p<.01$).

A final analysis was conducted in order to explore frequencies in actual and ideal attachment styles. A Chi-Squared, Goodness of Fit test was utilized to examine whether or not observed ideal global attachment styles matched expected attachment styles, as defined by frequencies of actual attachment styles in this sample. As already indicated, 48.5% ($n=96$) of the sample indicated a secure actual relationship style, 24.2% ($n=48$) reported a fearful actual relationship style, 16.7% ($n=33$) reported a preoccupied actual relationship style, and 9.6% ($n=19$) reported a dismissing actual relationship style. In contrast, 68.7% ($n=136$) of the sample indicated a secure ideal relationship style, 9.1% ($n=18$) reported a fearful ideal relationship style, 4.5% ($n=9$) reported a preoccupied ideal relationship style, and 13.1% ($n=26$) reported a dismissing ideal relationship style. The difference between the expected frequency of ideal attachment styles and the observed frequency of ideal attachment styles was statistically significant, $\chi^2(3, n=189) = 57.245, p<.01$.

Discussion

The present study aimed to examine a variety of empathetic responses under a range of conditions. Internal working models of attachment (both ideal and real) served as a main theoretical framework for this study. Other goals were primarily exploratory and included empathetic responses as a function of slight differences in vignettes describing hypothetical victims. Overall, this study and the corresponding statistical analyses revealed interesting, yet unexpected results.

Analysis 1: Victim/Perpetrator Association

Hypothesis one speculated that individuals will demonstrate more empathy for victims of stranger rape than victims of date rape. The present study did not support this hypothesis, however, and contradicted prior research indicating that degree of blame for rape victims is greater for date and acquaintance rape than for stranger rape (e.g., Bridges & McGrail, 1989; Simonson & Subich, 1999). Perhaps the construct of rape victim empathy is different than the construct of rape victim blame and evokes different cognitive and emotional reactions. It is also possible that with the increasing education and awareness of sexual assault at college campuses, students are becoming more aware of the unique issues surrounding date and acquaintance rape and these forms of sexual violence are becoming less acceptable.

Analysis 2: Predictors of Rape Victim Empathy and Total Empathy

The main hypothesis of the study was that beliefs about human nature, self-esteem, sex, and actual and ideal attachment styles would predict total empathetic responses to fictional individuals in general and empathetic responses to fictional rape

victims, specifically. Standard multiple regression analysis revealed that only sex and preoccupied actual relationship style predicted rape victim empathy. This study replicated other findings that indicate females demonstrate greater rape victim empathy than males (e.g., Ching & Burke, 1999). Since the present study utilized a novel approach to the study of rape victim empathy in the use of scenarios and Batson's empathy adjectives, this study lends greater reliability to the consistency of gender differences in rape victim empathy across studies and methodological differences. The present study implies that we still have a long way to go in terms of assisting males in their ability to empathize with victims of sexual violence.

The other significant predictor of rape victim empathy, preoccupied actual attachment style, was not consistent with other research findings. In this study stronger endorsement of a preoccupied relationship style, actually predicted greater rape victim empathy. Other studies (e.g. Denham, 1994; Mikulincer, et al, 2001, Westmaas & Silver, 2001) found that greater endorsement of insecure attachment styles, such as a preoccupied relationship styles, indicated less empathy for victims. The aforementioned studies, however, did not deal specifically with rape victim empathy. Nonetheless It is difficult to speculate why responding empathetically to rape victims should not be consistent with other research findings.

According to the Bartholomew (1990) model, individuals with a preoccupied relationship style have an internal working model that consists of a positive view of others, but a negative view of self. The theoretical framework offered by Bowlby (1969) would indicate that the rape scenarios utilized in this study should activate the internal working model schema of the participants. According to Bowlby, if the

participants indicated an insecure attachment style, such as preoccupied, they would lack the cognitive and affective tools to be able to accurately empathize with others due either to personal distress or complete lack thereof. Contrary to this assumption, the current study found that a negative view of self and a positive view of others, nonetheless, predicted greater rape victim empathy. This might suggest that responding to victims of sexual assault entails a different attachment schema/internal working model that is not as clear cut as that offered by Bowlby (1969) or Bartholomew (1990). For example, others (e.g. Main & Goldwyn, in press; cited in Rholes, Simpson, & Stevens, 1998) have demonstrated that individuals with preoccupied/anxious attachment styles actually have a range of positive and negative responses in reaction to stress. Perhaps anxiety triggered by reading scenarios related to sexual assault actually invoked more empathy for the participants in this study.

The fact that secure, dismissing and fearful relationship styles were not found to be significant predictors of rape victim empathy is also a complicated finding. Perhaps the outcome measures utilized in this study were not as sensitive as the outcome measures utilized in other studies. For instance, measurement of attachment continues to be refined and some (e.g., Collins & Read, 1990) advocate the use of an 18-item measure of adult attachment designed to improve on the 4 item categorical measure utilized in this study. In some studies, however, (e.g., Jaireman, Needham, & Cummings, 2001), attachment styles as measure by the Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) 4 category measure was associated with empathetic concern. The failure to find significant associations in the present study, therefore, may be due to the measurement of empathy.

The empathy scale utilized in the present study was developed by the principle investigator, and although the adjectives were based on Batson's list of empathy adjectives that have been used in several prior studies, it was perhaps not the best measure of rape victim empathy and served to limit the range of possible empathetic responses. Additionally, adjectives of personal distress designed to tap into egoistic motivation for empathy (as opposed to altruistic motivation) that have been utilized in prior studies (e.g., Batson, O'Quin, Fultz, & Vanderplas, 1983), may have been a helpful addition in exploring the internal working models of empathy toward the hypothetical victims in this study. Perhaps a modified Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1983) designed to test empathetic concern, perspective taking, and personal distress in victims of sexual violence could be developed and utilized in future studies. Finally, since an estimated 25% of college females have been victims of sexual assault, it is possible that participants in this study who were victims of sexual assault may have indicated insecure attachment styles, yet still have a large amount of empathy for rape victims. Future studies should consider prior victimization as an additional predictor of rape victim empathy.

The second part of analysis 2 explored predictors of total empathy. In this multiple regression equation, only sex and ideal attachment style predicted total empathy. Since ideal attachment styles have not been previously researched, this is a particularly interesting result. One could speculate that having access to an ideal secure working model may enable one to empathize with victims, regardless of the actual attachment style. More research should be conducted with a variety of

measures to better understand the role ideal attachment styles may play in empathetic responses and internal working models.

Analysis 3: Actual and ideal attachment styles and empathy

Hypothesis 3 stated that individuals who indicate insecure attachments on a self-report measure of global attachment will report less empathy toward fictional rape victims and less overall victim empathy than individuals who indicate secure attachments on a self-report measure of global attachment. ANOVA analyses determined that, for this set of data, there was no difference in either rape victim empathy or total victim empathy as a function of actual and/or ideal attachment style. These results are not consistent with prior research linking attachment style to empathetic responses (e.g., Collins & Read, 1994; Joireman, Needham, & Cummings, 2001; Mikulincer, et al., 2001; Westmaas & Silver, 2001). Again, methodological issues described above need to be considered when measuring attachment styles and empathetic responses. Nonetheless, it is important to note that the link between empathy and attachment is more complicated than previously reported in the literature.

Analysis Four: Self-esteem and attachment

The fourth hypothesis aimed to support past research (e.g., Collins & Read, 1990) linking secure attachment with greater self-esteem. In the present study, however, individuals with a secure actual relationship style reported significantly lower self-esteem than individuals with a fearful actual relationship style and individuals with a preoccupied actual relationship style. There was no significant difference in self esteem between individuals who indicated a secure actual relationship style and a dismissing actual relationship style. There was no difference

in self-esteem as a function of ideal relationship styles. Given the positive view of self framework represented by a secure internal working model, it is surprising that, in this study, individuals with a secure relationship style indicated less self-esteem than individuals with a fearful relationship style (negative view of self and others) and a preoccupied relationship style (negative view of self, positive view of others). These results, along with the aforementioned analyses point to the need of refining our views of internal working models if replication studies find similar discrediting results. The results should be interpreted with caution, however, as single measures of attachment and a self-esteem measure from the mid 1960s may not be the best way of exploring current internal working models.

Exploratory Analyses: Differences in empathetic responses across scenarios and actual versus ideal attachment styles

The measure of empathy utilized in this study was developed by the principle investigator and included 5 main topics scenarios; rape, blood donation, mental illness, cancer, and academic concerns related to the break-up of a relationship. The scenarios were paired in that each topic differed by only one variable. Degree of victim/perpetrator relationship varied in the rape victim scenario. In the blood donation scenario, a protagonist who is afraid of giving blood is either supported or teased by his friends. In the mental illness scenario, the description varied according to whether or not the protagonist was treatment compliant. The cancer scenario varied in terms of whether or not the prognosis was full recovery or terminal. In the academic concern/break-up scenario the protagonist was “dumped” by her boyfriend the night before midterms and either does either extremely well on the midterms or very poorly.

Results indicated that participants expressed greater empathy for the fictional individual with mental illness who was medication and treatment compliant when compared to a fictional individual who was not medication and treatment compliant. Participants were also more empathetic towards a fictional individual diagnosed with terminal cancer, when compared with a fictional individual expected to make a full recovery from cancer. Furthermore, participants were more empathetic towards a fictional student who was “dumped” by her boyfriend the night before midterms if she failed on of the midterms, when compared to the fictional student who passed both midterms. There was no difference in mean empathetic responses to a fictional student who was either teased or supported by friends while giving blood. I am aware of no prior studies that have utilized such variations in the measurement of victim empathy and these results warrant further study, especially as they relate to and vary with different internal working models.

Another interesting exploration of empathetic responses to victims involved comparing overall empathy for cancer victims and overall empathy for rape victims. In the present study, cancer empathy for both terminal and full recovery conditions provoked the greatest mean empathy scores. Overall scenario means and t-tests indicated that both males and females empathized more with cancer victims than rape victims regardless of whether or not the cancer was terminal. This would indicate that the values of this college sample, and perhaps society as a whole, empathize more with cases of physical illness than sexual assault. This may be a function of how physical illness is less of a taboo topic in our society, and we are taught at an early age to discuss cancer, yet rarely do we discuss rape. Furthermore, as a society, we still

tend to blame rape victims for the assault, which would naturally lead to less empathy. The degree of blame would hypothetically be less for cancer victims. These results should be considered when planning prevention efforts that target males and rape victim empathy. Furthermore, prevention efforts could possibly target specific differences in emotional and cognitive reactions to victims of physical violence versus emotional and cognitive reactions to victims of rape as these reactions may represent different internal working models/schema.

A final exploratory analysis revealed a statistically significant difference in the frequency distribution of actual versus ideal attachment styles. Frequency analysis revealed that the majority of participants would ideally like to have a secure attachment style. The ability to access this ideal internal working model warrants further research, especially since ideal attachment security was linked to stronger total empathetic responses in the previous analysis. Also interesting is that the percentage of individuals who indicated that they would ideally like to have a dismissing attachment style was actually greater than the percentage of individuals who indicated that they actually had a dismissing attachment style. It is possible that in our overly individual-focused culture, we are encouraging others not to depend on others, not to have others depend on them, and not to develop close emotional relationships. This is indeed a troublesome finding.

Future Research and Conclusions

In retrospect, the questions I wanted to ask about the relationship between attachment styles and rape victim empathy might have better been answered through a qualitative or mixed method design. What exactly do people describe as they discuss

empathetic responses to rape victims? This type of description can not easily be captured in a simple scale. Furthermore, how do people describe their actual and ideal internal working models in regard to their overall relationship style? Again, a simple choice between four styles may not adequately reach the subtle nuances in how people approach how they see themselves and others. Finally, how does this view of self and others contribute to how one views sexual violence? Are there certain factors that can be identified in individuals who express deep empathy for victims when compared to individuals who do not or individuals who blame victims? These are essential questions when exploring sexual violence both within and outside of close relationships. Minimizing these questions through the use of forced choice questionnaires, not only revealed few straight-forward statistical results, it may have also overly simplified and trivialized the nature of relationships, sexual violence, and empathy.

In conclusion, the present study explored the relationship between empathy, relationship/attachment styles, self-esteem, sex, and philosophies of human nature. Findings indicate that a greater emphasis needs to be placed on exploring different sub-types of attachment and the specific contents of the internal working models. Furthermore, results of this research would indicate that the link between attachment, empathy and self-esteem is not as clear cut as stated in the past. To my knowledge, however, this study is the first to examine the concept of ideal attachment styles, which warrants further research, particularly as an important predictor of victim empathy. The potential of increasing victim empathy through interventions, possibly through the exploration of internal working models, should also be the focus of further

study. As we continue to find sex differences in the expression of empathy, these sex differences must be taken into consideration when planning intervention strategies. Finally, the way we measure the constructs of empathy, attachment, philosophies of human nature, and self-esteem needs continual refinement in order to best capture these complicated, yet essential variables.

Appendix: Questionnaire Packet Given to Participants

Background Information

AGE _____

Year in School (please circle)

Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Non-matriculating

Sex (please circle)

Male Female

Racial/Ethnic Background (please circle)

Latino/Hispanic African American/Black Caucasian/White Asian

American Indian Multiracial Other (please specify) _____

You may now begin to fill out your survey/questionnaire packet.

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS, THEN INDICATE YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT BY CIRCLING THE NUMBER THAT MOST CLOSELY REPRESENTS YOUR LEVEL OF AGREEMENT. PLEASE RESPOND TO EVERY STATEMENT (Rosenberg, 1965).

1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.

1. STRONGLY
AGREE | 2. AGREE | 3. DISAGREE | 4. STRONGLY
DISAGREE |
|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------------------------|

2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

1. STRONGLY
AGREE | 2. AGREE | 3. DISAGREE | 4. STRONGLY
DISAGREE |
|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------------------------|

3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

1. STRONGLY
AGREE | 2. AGREE | 3. DISAGREE | 4. STRONGLY
DISAGREE |
|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------------------------|

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

1. STRONGLY
AGREE | 2. AGREE | 3. DISAGREE | 4. STRONGLY
DISAGREE |
|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------------------------|

5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

1. STRONGLY
AGREE | 2. AGREE | 3. DISAGREE | 4. STRONGLY
DISAGREE |
|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------------------------|

6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

1. STRONGLY
AGREE | 2. AGREE | 3. DISAGREE | 4. STRONGLY
DISAGREE |
|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------------------------|

7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

1. STRONGLY
AGREE | 2. AGREE | 3. DISAGREE | 4. STRONGLY
DISAGREE |
|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------------------------|

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

1. STRONGLY
AGREE | 2. AGREE | 3. DISAGREE | 4. STRONGLY
DISAGREE |
|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------------------------|

9. I certainly feel useless at times.

1. STRONGLY
AGREE | 2. AGREE | 3. DISAGREE | 4. STRONGLY
DISAGREE |
|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------------------------|

10. At times I think I am no good at all.

1. STRONGLY
AGREE | 2. AGREE | 3. DISAGREE | 4. STRONGLY
DISAGREE |
|----------------------|----------|-------------|-------------------------|

The Relationship Questionnaire (RQ)
Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991)

Following are four general relationship styles that people often report. Place a checkmark next to the letter corresponding to the style that best describes you or is the closest to the way you are.

_____ **A.** It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others not accept me.

_____ **B.** I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.

_____ **C.** I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.

_____ **D.** I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

Now please rate each of the relationship styles above to indicate how well or how poorly each description corresponds to your general relationship style.

Style A

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Style B

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Style C

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Style D

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Ideal Styles
The Relationship Questionnaire (RQ)
Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991)

People sometimes report that they behave, think, and feel differently than they would ideally like. Place a checkmark next to the letter corresponding to the style that best describes how you would **IDEALLY** like to be in relationships, or is the closest to how you would ideally like to be.

_____ **A.** It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others not accept me.

_____ **B.** I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.

_____ **C.** I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.

_____ **D.** I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

Now please rate each of the relationship styles above to indicate how well or how poorly each description corresponds to your ideal relationship style.

Style A

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Style B

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Style C

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Style D

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly			Neutral/ Mixed			Agree Strongly

Please read the following scenarios, then indicate your reactions as explained after each story. Please read each scenario carefully, as they may seem similar to each other at Brianes. They are to be read as separate stories and responded to independently.

One night Karen, a senior at a state university, went to the campus theater with several friends. Following the movie, she said goodbye to her friends. While she walked across the lot, Brian, a student whom Karen had never seen before, came up to her. After attempting unsuccessfully to make conversation with Karen, he asked her if she were interested in having sex. Karen said "no" very forcefully, but Brian did not pay attention to her answer. He grabbed her, began to kiss her, and then lifted her skirt. Her repeated protests were ignored as he forced himself on her and completed the act of intercourse.

Please circle the number on this 7 point scale that indicates how much you personally experienced the following emotions while reading the above story:

Sympathetic

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Softhearted

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Warm

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Compassionate

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Tender

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Moved

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

One night Lisa, a senior at a state university, went to the campus theater with Gary. Although Lisa and Gary were in a few classes together, this was their first date. Following the movie, Lisa and Gary went back to Lisa's apartment to watch the late show on television. While watching television, Gary put his arm around Lisa's shoulder. A few minutes later he asked her if she were interested in having sex. Lisa said "no" very forcefully, but Gary did not pay attention to her answer. He grabbed her, began to kiss her, and then lifted her skirt. Her repeated protests were ignored as he forced himself on her and completed the act of intercourse.

Please circle the number on this 7 point scale that indicates how much you personally experienced the following emotions while reading the above story:

Sympathetic

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Softhearted

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Warm

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Compassionate

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Tender

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Moved

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Barbara, a junior at a state university, was concerned about several upcoming mid-terms. On one day, she had two exams in a row. To make matters worse, the night before the two exams, she got into a fight with her boyfriend and they broke up. Barbara was too upset to study and barely got any sleep. When she received the results of the midterms, she found that she received an “A” on one exam, and a “B” on the second exam.

Please circle the number on this 7 point scale that indicates how much you personally experienced the following emotions while reading the above story:

Sympathetic

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Softhearted

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Warm

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Compassionate

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Tender

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Moved

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Carol, a junior at a state university, was concerned about several upcoming mid-terms. On one day, she had two exams in a row. To make matters worse, the night before the two exams, she got into a fight with her boyfriend and they broke up. Carol was too upset to study and barely got any sleep. When she received the results of the midterms, she found that she passed one, but failed the second exam.

Please circle the number on this 7 point scale that indicates how much you personally experienced the following emotions while reading the above story:

Sympathetic

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Softhearted

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Warm

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Compassionate

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Tender

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Moved

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Thomas, a freshman at a state university, heard about a blood drive that was being held on campus. Thomas's friends were all donating blood and asked Thomas to join them. Thomas did not like needles, but he didn't want to admit this to his friends, so he agreed to go along. While waiting in line to get his blood drawn, however, he started feeling sick and had to leave. Later, when Thomas met his friends for dinner, they teased him for being a "baby."

Please circle the number on this 7 point scale that indicates how much you personally experienced the following emotions while reading the above story:

Sympathetic

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Softhearted

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Warm

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Compassionate

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Tender

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Moved

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

David, a freshman at a state university, heard about a blood drive that was being held on campus. David's friends were all donating blood and asked David to join them. David did not like needles, but he didn't want to admit this to his friends, so he agreed to go along. While waiting in line to get his blood drawn, however, he started feeling sick and had to leave. Later, when David met his friends for dinner, they apologized for pressuring him to give blood.

Please circle the number on this 7 point scale that indicates how much you personally experienced the following emotions while reading the above story:

Sympathetic

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Softhearted

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Warm

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Compassionate

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Tender

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Moved

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Robert, a senior at a state university, was referred to the Counseling Center on campus by his girlfriend due to concerns regarding his “peculiar” behavior. Robert reported that he would often experience periods of depression, in which he would stay in bed for days at a time. He also reported that he would sometimes experience periods of extreme “highs” in which he would become impulsive and stay away for days at a time. Robert’s counselor told him that he may have bipolar disorder and suggested that he try medication and attend regular counseling sessions in order to help stabilize his moods. Robert agreed to these recommendations, but he eventually had to drop out of school due to his inability to keep up with school work.

Please circle the number on this 7 point scale that indicates how much you personally experienced the following emotions while reading the above story:

Sympathetic

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Softhearted

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Warm

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Compassionate

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Tender

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Moved

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

John, a senior at a state university, was referred to the Counseling Center on campus by his girlfriend due to concerns regarding his “peculiar” behavior. John reported that he would often experience periods of depression, in which he would stay in bed for days at a time. He also reported that he would sometimes experience periods of extreme “highs” in which he would become impulsive and stay away for days at a time. John’s counselor told him that he may have bipolar disorder and suggested that he try medication and attend regular counseling sessions in order to help stabilize his moods. John refused to take medication and stopped seeing the counselor. He eventually had to drop out of school due to his inability to keep up with school work.

Please circle the number on this 7 point scale that indicates how much you personally experienced the following emotions while reading the above story:

Sympathetic

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Softhearted

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Warm

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Compassionate

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Tender

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Moved

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Theresa, a sophomore at a state university, complained of feeling tired and sick all of the time. Her friends and family urged her to make an appointment with her physician. Theresa initially refused, stating that she was just “stressed out.” One day, however, Theresa fainted while leaving one of her classes. She was taken to the doctor immediately, who ran a series of tests. The results of these tests indicated that Theresa had cancer. The doctors told Theresa that she would have to begin aggressive chemotherapy, but since the cancer was caught early, she could expect a full recovery.

Please circle the number on this 7 point scale that indicates how much you personally experienced the following emotions while reading the above story:

Sympathetic

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Softhearted

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Warm

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Compassionate

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Tender

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Moved

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Sandra, a sophomore at a state university, complained of feeling tired and sick all of the time. Her friends and family urged her to make an appointment with her physician. Sandra initially refused, stating that she was just “stressed out.” One day, however, Sandra fainted while leaving one of her classes. She was taken to the doctor immediately, who ran a series of tests. The results of these tests indicated that Sandra had cancer. The doctors told Sandra that she would have to begin aggressive chemotherapy, but since the cancer was in a very advanced stage, she could not expect to live for more than one year.

Please circle the number on this 7 point scale that indicates how much you personally experienced the following emotions while reading the above story:

Sympathetic

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Softhearted

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Warm

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Compassionate

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Tender

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Moved

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at All			Somewhat			Extremely

Philosophy of Human Nature (Wrightsman, 1964)

Here is a series of attitude statements. Each represents a commonly held opinion and there are no right or wrong answers. You will probably disagree with some items and agree with others. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with such matters of opinion. Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement. The numbers and their meaning are indicated below:

If you agree strongly	-	circle +3
If you agree somewhat	-	circle +2
If you agree slightly	-	circle +1
If you disagree strongly	-	circle -3
If you disagree somewhat	-	circle -2
If you disagree slightly	-	circle -1

First impressions are usually best in such matters. Read each statement, decide if you agree or disagree and the strength of your opinion, and then circle the appropriate number in front of the statement. Give your opinion on every statement.

If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately indicate your own opinion, use the one which is closest to the way you feel.

1. Great successes in life, like great artists and inventor, are usually motivated by forces they are unaware of.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

2. Most students will tell the instructor when he has made a mistake in adding up their score, even if he had given them more points than they deserved.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

3. Most people will change the opinion they express as a result of an onslaught of criticism, even though they really don't change the way they feel.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

4. Most people try to apply the Golden Rule even in today's complex society.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

5. I find that my first impression of a person is usually correct.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

6. Our success in life is pretty much determined by forces outside our own control.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

7. If you give the average person a job to do and leave him to do it, he will finish it successfully.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

8. Nowadays many people won't make a move until they find out what other people think.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

9. Most people do not hesitate to go out of their way to help someone in trouble.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

10. A person's reaction to things differs from one situation to another.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

11. People can be described accurately by one term, such as "introverted," or "moral," or "sociable."

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

12. People usually tell the truth, even when they know they would be better off by lying.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

13. The important thing in being successful nowadays is not how hard you work, but how well you fit in with the crowd.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

14. Most people will act as "Good Samaritans" if given the opportunity.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

15. Different people react to the same situation in different ways.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

16. It's not hard to understand what really is important in a person.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

17. Attempts to understand ourselves are usually futile.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

18. Most students do not cheat when taking an exam.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

19. "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" is a motto most people follow.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

20. Each person's personality is different from the personality of every other person.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

21. I think I get a good idea of a person's basic nature after a brief conversation with him/her.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

22. There's little one can do to alter his fate in life.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

23. Most people are basically honest.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

24. The typical student will cheat on a test when everybody else does, even though s/he has a set of ethical standards.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

25. People are quite different in their basic interests.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

26. If I could ask a person three questions about him/herself (and assuming s/he would answer them honestly), I would know a great deal about him.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

27. If a person tries hard enough, s/he will usually reach his/her goals in life.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

28. People claim they have ethical standards regarding honesty and morality, but few people stick to them when the chips are down.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

29. Most people have the courage of their convictions.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

30. The average person is conceited.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

31. People are pretty much alike in their basic interest.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

32. I find that my first impressions of people are frequently wrong.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

33. The average person has an accurate understanding of the reasons for his/her behavior.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

34. If you want people to do a job right, you should explain things to them in great detail and supervise them closely.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

35. Most people can make their own decisions, uninfluenced by public opinion.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

36. It's only a rare person who would risk his/her own life and limb to help someone else.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

37. People are basically similar in their personalities.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

38. Some people are too complicated for me to figure out.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

39. If people try hard enough, wars can be prevented in the future.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

40. If most people could get into a movie without paying and be sure they were not seen, they would do it.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

41. It is achievement, rather than popularity with others, that gets you ahead nowadays.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

42. It's pathetic to see an unselfish person in today's world because so many people take advantage of him/her.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

43. If you have a good idea about how several people will react to a certain situation, you can expect most other people to react the same way.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

44. I think you can never really understand the feeling of other people.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

45. The average person is largely the master of his/her own life.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

46. Most people are not really honest for a desirable reason; they're afraid of getting caught.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

47. The average person will stick to his/her opinion if s/he thinks s/he's right, even if others disagree.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

48. People pretend to care more about one another than they really do.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

49. Most people are consistent from situation to situation in the way they react to things.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

50. You can't accurately describe a person in just a few words.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

51. In a local or national election, most people select a candidate rationally and logically.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

52. Most people would tell a lie if they could gain by it.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

53. If a student does not believe in cheating, s/he will avoid it even if s/he sees many others doing it.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

54. Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

55. A child who is popular will be popular as an adult, too.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

56. You can't classify everyone as good or bad.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

57. Most people have little influence over the things that happen to them.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

58. If you act in good faith with people, almost all of them will reciprocate with fairness toward you.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

59. It's a rare person who will go up against the crowd.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

60. The typical person is sincerely concerned about the problems of others.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

61. People are pretty different from one another in what "makes them tick."

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

62. Most people have an unrealistically favorable view of their own capabilities.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

63. Most people have to rely on someone else to make their important decisions for them.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

64. Most people with a fallout shelter would let their neighbors stay in it during a nuclear attack.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

65. When I meet a person, I look for one basic characteristic through which I try to understand him/her.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

66. Most persons have a lot of control over what happens to them in life.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

67. Most people would cheat on their income tax, if they had a chance.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

68. The person with novel ideas is respected in our society.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

69. Most people exaggerate their troubles in order to get sympathy.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

70. If I can see how a person reacts to one situation, I have a good idea of how s/he will react to other situations.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

71. People are too complex to ever be understood fully.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

72. Most people have a good idea of what their strengths and weaknesses are.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

73. Often a person's basic personality is altered by such things as a religious conversion, psychotherapy, or a charm course.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

74. Most people vote for a political candidate on the basis of unimportant characteristics such as his/her appearance or name, rather than because of his/ her stand on the issues.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

75. Most people lead clean, decent lives.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

76. The average person will rarely express his/her opinion in a group when s/he sees the others disagree with him/her.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

77. Most people would stop and help a person whose car is disabled.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

78. People are unpredictable in how they'll act from one situation to another.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

79. People are so complex it is hard to know what "makes them tick."

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

80. Nowadays people commit a lot of crimes and sins that no one else ever hears about.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

81. Most people will speak out for what they believe in.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

82. People are usually out for their own good.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

83. When you get right down to it, people are quite alike in their emotional makeup.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

84. Give me a few facts about a person and I'll have a good idea of whether I'll like him/her or not.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree
Strongly	Somewhat	Slightly	Slightly	Somewhat	Strongly

Bibliography

- Ainsworth, M. D., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7, 147-178.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 226-244.
- Batson, C. D. (1991). *The altruism question: Toward a social-psychological answer*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bechhofer, L., & Parrot, A. (1991). What is acquaintance rape? In A. Parrot & L. Bechhofer (Eds.), *Acquaintance rape: The hidden crime* (pp. 9-25). New York: Wiley.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment Theory and Close Relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Bridges, J. S., & McGrail, C. A. (1989). Attributions of responsibility for date and stranger rape. *Sex Roles*, 21, 217-230.
- Campos, J. J., Barret, K. C., Lamb, M. E., Goldsmith, H. H., & Stenberg, C. (1983).

- Socioemotional development. In M. M. Haith & J. J. Campos (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 2. Infancy and psychobiology* (pp. 783-915). New York: Wiley.
- Carnelley, K. A., Pietromonaco, P. R., & Jaffe, K. (1996). Attachment, caregiving, and relationship functioning in couples. *Personal Relationships, 3*, 257-277.
- Check, J. V. P., & Malamuth, N. M. (1983). Sex role stereotyping and reactions to depictions of stranger versus acquaintance rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*, 344-356.
- Ching, C. L., & Burke, S. (1999). An assessment of college students' attitudes and empathy toward rape. *College Student Journal, 33*, 573-584.
- Clark, K. B. (1980). Empathy: A neglected topic in psychological research. *American Psychologist, 35*, 187-190.
- Collins, N. L., & Feeney, B. C. (2000). A safe haven: An attachment theory perspective on support seeking and caregiving in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 1053-1073.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*, 113-126.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1994). Cognitive representations of attachment: The content and function of working models. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Advances in personal relationships: Vol. 5. Attachment processes in adulthood* (pp. 53-90). London: Jessica Kingsley.

- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 113-126.
- Davis, M. H. & Oathout, H. A. (1987). Maintenance of satisfaction in romantic relationships: Empathy and relational competence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 113-126.
- Davis, M. H., & Oathout, H. A. (1992). The effect of dispositional empathy on romantic relationship behaviors: Heterosocial anxiety as a moderating influence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 76-83.
- Deitz, S. R., Blackwell, K., Daley, P., & Bentley, B. (1982). Measurement of empathy toward rape victims and rapists. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 372-384.
- Denham, S. A. (1994). Mother-child emotional communication and preschoolers' security of attachment and dependency. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 155, 119-121.
- Elkin, L. E., & Peterson, C. (1993) Gender differences in best friendships. *Sex Roles*, 29, 497-508.
- Finkelhor, D. (1986). *A sourcebook on child sexual abuse*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hazen, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511-524.
- Hazen, C., & Shaver, P. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5, 1-22.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating to the self and affect.

Psychological Review, 3, 319-340.

Hildebran, D., & Pithers, W. (1992). Relapse prevention: Application and outcome.

In W. O'Donohue & J. Geer (Eds.), *The sexual abuse of children: Clinical issues*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.

Ickes, W. J., Wicklund, R., & Ferris, C. B. (1973). Objective self-awareness and self esteem. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 9, 202-219.

Joireman, J. A., Needham, T. L., & Cummings, A. L. (2001). Relationships between dimensions of attachment and empathy. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 3, 63-80.

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55, 162-170.

Koss, M. P., & Harvey, M. R. (1991). *The rape victim: Clinical and community interventions* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Main, M., & Solomon, J. (1986). Discovery of an insecure-disorganized/disoriented attachment pattern: Procedures, findings and implications for the classification of behavior. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50, 66-104.

Mikulincer, M., Gillath, O., Halevy, V., Avihou, N., Avidan, S., & Eshkoli, N. (2001).

- Attachment theory and reactions to others' needs: Evidence that activation of the sense of attachment security promotes empathetic responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 1205-1224.
- Pearson, J. L., Cohn, D. A., Cowan, P. A., & Cowan, C. P. (1994). Earned- and continuous-security in adult attachment: Relation to depressive symptomatology and parenting style. *Development and Psychopathology*, 6, 359-373.
- Rice, M. E., Chaplin, T. C., Harris, G., & Coutts, J. (1994). Empathy for the victim and sexual arousal among rapists and nonrapists. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 9, 435-449.
- Rholes, W. S., Simpson, J. A., & Stevens, J. G. (1998). Attachment orientations, social support, and conflict resolution in close relationships. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment Theory and Close Relationships* (pp. 166-188). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Robinson, P. R., Shaver, L. S., & Wrightsman, L. S. (Eds.). (1991). *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 121-123; 385-393). New York: Academic Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sheldon-Keller, A., Lloyd-McGarvey, E., West, M., & Canterbury, R. J. (1994). Attachment and assessment of blame in date rape scenarios. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 22, 313-318.
- Simonson, K., & Subich, L. M. (1999). Rape perceptions as a function of gender-role

- traditionality and victim-perpetrator association. *Sex Roles*, 40, 617-634.
- Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., & Nelligan, J. S. (1992). Support seeking and support giving within couples in an anxiety-provoking situation: The role of attachment styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 434-446.
- Ward, M. J., & Carlson, E. A. (1995). Associations among adult attachment representations, maternal sensitivity, and infant-mother attachment in a sample of adolescent mothers. *Child Development*, 66, 69-79.
- West, M., & Sheldon, A. E. R. (1988). The classification of pathological attachment patterns in adults. *Journal of Personality Disorder*, 2, 153-160.
- Westmass, J. L., & Silver, R. C. (2001). The role of attachment in responses to victims of life crises. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 425-438.
- Wrightsman, L. S. (1964). Measurement of philosophies of human nature. *Psychological Reports*, 14, 743-751.