



12-1-1993

Validation of the Victim Empathy Scale: A Measure of Emotional Empathy for Victims of Violent Crime

Martine M. Mizwa

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Mizwa, Martine M., "Validation of the Victim Empathy Scale: A Measure of Emotional Empathy for Victims of Violent Crime" (1993). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3237.
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/3237>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

VALIDATION OF THE VICTIM EMPATHY SCALE: A MEASURE
OF EMOTIONAL EMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF VIOLENT CRIME

by

Martine M. Mizwa

Master of Arts, University of North Dakota, 1989

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Grand Forks, North Dakota

December

1993

1993
1699

Copyright by
Martine Maxine Mizwa
1993

This Dissertation submitted by Martine M. Mizwa in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the University of North Dakota has been read by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done, and is hereby approved.

Chas. Robert Hentz
(Chairperson)
Douglas Peters
James R. Anter
Russ W. White
Edward C. Wiersch

This Dissertation meets the standards for appearance and conforms to the style and format requirements of the Graduate School of the University of North Dakota, and is hereby approved.

Danny Knud
Dean of the Graduate School
12-8-93

PERMISSION

Title VALIDATION OF THE VICTIM EMPATHY SCALE: A MEASURE
OF EMOTIONAL EMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF VIOLENT CRIME

Department Psychology

Degree Doctor of Philosophy

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my dissertation work or, in his absence, by the chairman of the department or the dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this dissertation or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation.

Signature Martine Mizawa
Date December 1, 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
ABSTRACT.....	viii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER II METHOD.....	22
CHAPTER III RESULTS.....	25
CHAPTER IV DISCUSSION.....	34
APPENDICES	
Appendix A. Consent Form.....	41
Appendix B. Victim Empathy Scale.....	44
Appendix C. Marlowe/Crowne Social Desirability Scale.....	56
Appendix D. Rape Empathy Scale.....	59
Appendix E. Emotional Response Questionnaire.	66
Appendix F. ANOVA Summaries.....	69
REFERENCES.....	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Correlation of Scales.....	26
Table 2	Reliability Analysis of the Emotional Response Questionnaire.....	28
Table 3	Means Illustrating A Main Effect of Sex and A Two-Way Interaction of Sex And Victimization in the Victim Empathy Scores.....	29
Table 4	Means Illustrating 3-Way Interaction of Age, Sex of Subject, and Type of Assault with Score on Emotional Response Questionnaire.....	31
Table 5	Means Illustrating 3-Way Interaction of Sex of Subject, Prior Victimization of Subject, and Type of Assault with Score on Emotional Response Questionnaire..	32
Table 6	Means Illustrating 3-Way Interaction of Age, Sex of Subject and Sex of Victim with Score on Emotional Response Questionnaire..	33

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation and gratitude to the members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Charles Honts, Dr. Doug Peters, Dr. James Antes, Dr. Richard Wilsnack, and Dr. Sharon Wilsnack for their guidance throughout the development of this project.

Very special thanks are given to Dr. Charles Honts, who graciously agreed to become my chair and advisor; and to Dr. Sheila Deitz, my former advisor, who provided the inspiration for this research.

My heartfelt gratitude and love to my sister, Lucy Bridgeford, whose generosity and support during this past year made this all possible and for her unshakable belief in me which has made our relationship so special.

I wish to acknowledge the impressive contributions of my nephew, Brian Wolfgram and Michelle Schutz, who gave memorable performances on the videotapes used in this study.

More thanks go to two very special friends and former classmates, Dr. Sue Russell and Dr. Barbara Vesley for their unflagging support throughout the years and for their valuable assistance in bringing this project to fruition.

Thanks everyone.

ABSTRACT

Much effort on the part of researchers from all social science disciplines has gone into studying the effect of crime on its victims, their treatment by the criminal justice system, and others who routinely come into contact with them. This research has shown a need for improved treatment of crime victims by service providers and other helpers. Because empathy plays such an important role in mediating an individual's response to another's victimization, reliable methods to evaluate and foster empathy are needed. Increased empathy for victims on the part of police officers, prosecutors, health care providers, friends and family, could help prevent revictimization caused by victim blaming and other aversive responses, as well as lessen the negative psychological consequences experienced by most victims.

The Victim Empathy Scale (VES) was developed by the author in a previous study as a measure of emotional empathy for victims of violent crime. The scale proved to have a high level of reliability, and factor analysis showed the scale was measuring one construct.

The present study focuses on assessing the validity of the VES. Subjects were 228 undergraduate university

students. Convergent validity was shown by a positive correlation with the Rape Empathy Scale, a measure of empathy for rape victims that has demonstrated validity. Discriminant validity was shown by an insignificant correlation with the Marlowe/Crowne Social Desirability Scale, a measure found useful for reducing the confounding effects of responses selected solely for their perceived social desirability. Predictive validity was shown in a study in which subjects viewed a videotaped therapy session with either a male or female crime victim (portrayed by actors). The "victim" discussed his/her response to either a robbery during which a physical assault occurred or a sexual assault. Subjects completed a 10-item Emotion Response Questionnaire developed for this study. Results indicated that women showed more empathy for the crime victim than did men, and that age, subject's prior victimization, type of assault, and gender of victim significantly affected the level of empathy reported by subjects. VES scores were positively correlated with those from the Emotional Response Questionnaire.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

One has only to pick up a newspaper or to turn on a radio or television set to hear or see the details of the very latest murder or assault, not only in one's local area but anywhere around the world. Violent crimes have become so widespread and commonplace that the harsh reality of such acts now touches each and every American community. According to statistics released by the Justice Department (U.S. Department of Justice 1992), not only were inner cities and suburban communities hit hard by crime but rural counties suffered as well. These previously peaceful locales now show an increasing crime rate, including increases in forcible rape cases, assaults with firearms, and murders. Over the country in general, violent crime was up 29% over the past four years, 6% in 1991 alone, the last year for which figures are available. These alarming statistics are perhaps a reflection of the growing trend toward youthful violence in America (a full 49% of those arrested for murder were under twenty-five years of age). The increasing popularity of gang membership among teenagers and the violence that is a result of their activities has now spread to smaller communities while continuing unabated

in large metropolitan areas. As drug use continues to be a problem in the United States, users turn to robbery, assault, and other violent crimes such as car jacking to support their habits.

In fact, it was not only violent crimes, but all categories of crime which showed an increase in 1991. One criminal offense occurred every two seconds, one violent crime was perpetrated every seventeen seconds. Robbery showed the greatest increase among the crimes of violence, up 8.5% overall, 11% in rural counties, 10% in suburban counties, and 7% in cities. (U.S. Department of Justice, 1991). Robbery ranks among the most serious and feared criminal offenses because it involves not only loss of property, but also threatened or actual violence. Fully one in three incidents where robbery was the primary motive involved injury to the victim (U.S. Department of Justice, 1987).

As if these figures were not shocking enough, experts estimate that fewer than 50% of violent crimes are reported to law enforcement (U.S. Department of Justice, 1992). Citizen apathy, distrust of the police, and lack of knowledge concerning how crime can be controlled have been cited as reasons crimes are under-reported. Many people avoid contacting law enforcement at all and simply call someone else for advice and assistance (Gottfredson, Reiser & Tsegaye-Spates, 1987).

As a society, we seem to be incapable of stopping the onslaught of criminal activity. Despite growing public awareness of the problem, proliferation of crime prevention programs, and treatment programs designed to reduce offender recidivism, the crime rate continues its upward trend. Even those who have not been victimized themselves, almost certainly know someone who has. In fact, five out of six of us will be the victim of a violent crime during our lifetime. Only one in a hundred of us will live out our lives without becoming the victim of theft (U.S. Department of Justice, 1987).

What is frequently forgotten in our preoccupation with crime and the criminal is the fact that, for each and every crime there are one or more victims. Trying to make sense of the chaos resulting from crime is an arduous task for victims, criminologists, sociologists, psychologists, and others who must deal with the aftermath of violence. The following paragraphs focus on the problems faced by those who are victimized by their fellow human beings.

Crime Takes Its Toll

Physically and Psychologically. The crime victim may suffer from symptoms associated with depression and severe stress reactions such as disturbed sleep, exaggerated startle response, nightmares, weight changes, extreme fatigue, chemical abuse, or other long-term physical problems associated with stress (Frieze, Hymer, & Greenberg,

1987). Add to this list the injuries received in the incident itself, which may range from minor to life threatening.

Research shows that bodily injury or loss of property, commonly thought to be the most disturbing aspects of victimization, may in fact have far less impact than the psychological trauma suffered by persons at the hands of a criminal (Task Force on the Victims of Crime and Violence, 1985). The most damaging injuries to the individual may come after the crime has occurred. Some feel that as a society, we tend to compound the victim's injuries by treating their criminal attackers with far more compassion and concern than we show for the victim (Reiff, 1979). The realization that victims of crime experience crisis reactions similar to those experienced by victims of war, natural disasters, and catastrophic illness has come about only recently (U.S. Department of Justice, 1987). A study by Kilpatrick et al. (1989) examined the development of Crime-Related Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (CR-PTSD) in victims of crime. Subjects were 391 adult female residents of Charleston County, South Carolina, 294 of whom were crime victims. The researchers found that each of three types of crime experienced--life threat, physical injury and/or completed rape--made significant individual contributions to explaining CR-PTSD. These factors had an additive effect in those victims who had experienced all three elements, who

were 8.5 times more likely to have developed CR-PTSD than victims with none of the three elements. Rape alone was found to be capable of producing CR-PTSD.

Financially

Immediate out-of-pocket expenses incurred by the crime victim may include the cost of medical treatment, hospital costs, psychological counseling, and other injury-related costs. Victims who cannot return to work may suffer loss of income or even lose their jobs while recovering from physical and emotional injuries. The victim's lifestyle may change radically because of the crime, resulting in hidden costs such as dropping out of school, moving costs to escape painful memories or to move to a safer neighborhood or area, and loss of credit due to failure to pay bills on time, to name but a few. The total cost of crime to society is extremely difficult to measure, but is estimated by the National Crime Survey to be in the 10's of billions of dollars each year (U.S. Department of Justice, 1984).

The Victim and the Criminal Justice System

Once a crime has been reported to the police it is in the hands of the local, state, or federal criminal justice system. Police, prosecutors, and judges take over. Already robbed of their sense of control over their world by the criminal, victims now find they have little or no control over how the case is going to be handled by investigators, prosecutors and the courts (Task Force on the Victims of

Crime and Violence, 1985). In addition, there are a number of potentially negative consequences of being involved with the police and the criminal justice system in general (Knudten, et al., 1977). Victims often complain of the cost of transportation and parking as well as time and wages lost from work while in court or cooperating with the police. Investigators sometimes fail to provide follow-up information on the progress of the case and often show indifference to the plight of the victim (Frieze, Hymer, & Greenberg, 1986). Rape victims may feel angry, embarrassed, and frustrated with the criminal justice system, and may feel that they are the one being prosecuted rather than the rapist (Malvik, 1975).

In recent years, much attention has been focused on the problems of victims. The criminal justice system seems to be slowly changing in favor of more responsive and supportive treatment for victims of crime (U.S. Department of Justice, 1987). However, one should be reminded that until the victim's rights movement began in the mid-seventies, there were no "victims". Those who had been assaulted, raped, robbed and swindled were merely witnesses, or, worse yet, just pieces of evidence in the justice system (Bard & Sangrey, 1979). Even though prosecutors and judges today are seemingly more sensitive to victims, those affected by crime still have very limited rights in the judicial process. This lack of rights usually comes as an

outrageous shock to the victims who understandably feel that the system is working on "their" case. Although many states have passed legislation guaranteeing rights for victims, these rights are still limited and are often not extended to the injured party. Victims generally are excluded from criminal trials unless called as witnesses, and may not even be informed of plea bargains or hearing dates. The victim may fare no better with the police. Even though police officers tend to believe that their interactions with the public are satisfactory and that they show concern for victims, the victims themselves often report insensitivity on the part of responding officers, reluctance on the part of the police to discuss the progress of the case or investigation, and failure of the police to return property that has been used as evidence in a timely fashion (Sales, Rich, & Reich, 1987).

Victim Blaming

Our society as a whole seems to take a dim view of victims of any kind. Most people feel helpless and uncomfortable around victims because their presence violates assumptions generally held concerning their own vulnerability to crime. Janoff-Bulman and Frieze (1983) characterized these assumptions as a belief in personal invulnerability, the perception of the world as a meaningful and comprehensible place, and the holding of a positive self view. Psychologist Melvin Lerner (1970) developed the just-

world model to explain this sense of invulnerability. He argued that people want to believe that the world is a fair place where bad things do not happen to good people, and that bad things happen only to those who deserve them. People also do not want to believe that crime and violence can occur at random, since that would mean that they could also become a victim (Walser, 1966).

In order to defend against the possibilities of victimization, people may simply deny the evidence, trivialize the experience of victims, or, even worse, blame the victim for what happened to him/her (Frieze & McHugh, 1985). Attribution theory points out the almost universal need people have to identify reasons as to why things happen the way they do. Fritz Heider (1958) suggested that by identifying the cause of events and assigning responsibility for their outcomes, people are able to restore stability, predictability and control to one's environment.

The tendency of others to place the blame for the crime on the crime victim is so pervasive and so damaging that it has been called the "second wound", the first being the direct injury resulting from the crime itself. The second wound is the perceived rejection by, and lack of expected support from, the community, helping agencies, and society in general, as well as from family or friends (Symonds, 1980).

The Role of Empathy in Responses to Victims

Empathy, that ability to feel the pain and emotions of others, can act as a mediator for attributions of responsibility and enhance prosocial helping behavior on the part of non-victims. The following section explores the concept of empathy and discusses studies pointing to empathy as an important factor in determining how individuals perceive victims, whether they offer assistance, and to whom they assign responsibility for a criminal act. There are indications that empathy can be induced and strengthened in individuals. The development of valid measures of the construct is a critical factor to be considered in empathy research. This section also examines ways to measure empathy, including two questionnaires which have been specifically designed to measure empathy for victims of crime.

Empathy and Its Measurement

Alderman, Archer, and Harris (1975) defined empathy as a "vicarious emotional response to the perceived or anticipated emotional experience of another." Their study tested the effects of empathy on the attribution of responsibility. They found that certain subjects (scoring high on an empathy measure) reacted to short stories presented in the experiment from the standpoint of the victim and had placed responsibility for negative outcomes on others. Their findings suggest that the vicarious

experiencing of a victim's plight tends to override "Just World" considerations and may lead one to display compassion for the undeserved suffering of victims.

In a study designed to test the importance of observational set and observational setting upon compassion or rejection of an innocent victim, Alderman, Brehm, and Katz (1974) analyzed data from 108 undergraduate females who had been exposed to an experimental setting either alone or in small groups. Subjects received either empathy inducing or empathy inhibiting instructions. After watching a videotape showing a female victim apparently receiving electric shocks after making mistakes on a learning task, the subjects completed forms designed to measure victim derogation effect. Results demonstrated that whether observers react to an innocent victim with compassion or rejection may depend on empathic set. Those instructed to imagine themselves in the victim's place tended to rate the victims as more attractive than themselves, indicating compassion rather than derogation, while subjects receiving empathy-inhibiting instructions strongly derogated the victim in relation to themselves. Subjects tested singly expressed less relative derogation than did those subjects who were tested in groups.

Empathy is often expressed in helping and prosocial behavior. Barnett, Thompson, and Pfeifer (1985) found that if someone believes they are competent to help someone, they

are more likely to do so. Empathic response can also be enhanced by teaching an individual how to help someone, by suggesting ways they may help, or by simply convincing them that they already have the ability to help someone in need.

Barnett, Tetreault, and Esper (1986) examined reactions of rape victims and other women to a peer who was presented as a rape victim. Forty-seven female undergraduates participated in the study. They were shown a 5-minute videotape in which a rape victim (an actress) described her psychological and behavioral reactions to a rape that had taken place two months earlier. The subjects then completed a questionnaire designed to assess their emotional responses. The questionnaire consisted of a list of fourteen adjectives, six reflecting feelings of empathy, and eight reflecting feelings of distress. They later completed a rape-experience survey which revealed that eleven of the forty-seven subjects had been raped. These women reported more emphatic response to the rape victim on the videotape than did those subjects who had not been raped.

Barnett, Tetrault, Patricia, and Masbad (1987) examined the effect of similarity on empathy for rape victims. In a study of 312 undergraduate women, subjects viewed a victim presented on a videotape and then rated themselves on empathy for and similarity to the rape victim. Twenty-nine women who had been identified as having been raped rated themselves as more empathic and more similar to the victim

than did 29 controls who had been matched on a level of dispositional empathy. No difference was found between the groups in their response to the videotape victim whose personal problems were unrelated to rape.

Because emotional empathy plays such an important role in an individual's response to victimization, methods to foster and evaluate empathy levels are of special importance (Task Force on Victims of Crime and Violence, 1985). The following studies show that empathy training is not only possible, but has lasting effects in promoting prosocial and helping behavior.

Kallopuska and Tiitinen (1991) assessed empathy and prosociability of sixty-two 6-7 year old preschoolers before and after the presentation of an empathy training program. The children were divided into three groups, one of which was a control group. Empathy was assessed through the use of Feshbach and Roe's (1968) Empathy Slide Series and the Ikonen-Nylund Test on Sociability. Prosociability was evaluated on the Weir and Duvean scale (1981) and the Kalliopuska evaluation scale (1981). The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) Vocabulary Subscale which measures verbal activity was used as a control variable. Group 1 took part in a program of music, physical exercise with music, and drawing. Activities for Group 2 included role-playing, acting, and storytelling. Each empathy program focused the children's attention on the

feelings of others and how to console a classmate who was sad. The role playing in Group 2 involved acting the part of a teacher or a pupil on the first day of school. Over a period of four months the children received thirty-five hours of training. The results showed that empathy scores increased in the treatment groups, and prosociability seemed to increase along with empathy.

Kremer and Dietzen (1991) utilized two approaches for teaching empathy to undergraduates at the University of Indiana and Purdue University. Sixty students were assigned to either a self-directed training group, a teacher-intensive training group, or a non-training control group. Outcome was assessed after four weeks through the use of videotaped peer counseling sessions between the subjects and other students. Results indicated that both of the groups that had received training were more able to respond with accurate emotional equivalents and to recognize emotional segments. Follow-up showed that the empathy training was still effective 13-17 months later.

Other studies have shown that empathy for psychiatric patients can be stimulated among nursing staff (Cosgray, Davidhizar, Grostefon, & Powell, 1990), that empathy can be taught to students in the health professions (Kautzmann, 1992; Kramer, Ber, & Moore, 1989), and that empathy training can be a useful adjunct to therapy (Snyder, 1992).

Use of the Questionnaire as a Measurement of Empathy

Mehrabian and Epstein (1972) were among the first to develop a questionnaire to measure emotional empathy. It consisted of thirty-three single statement items, scored on a Likert scale from +4 to -4. Positive responses indicated agreement and negative responses indicated disagreement with the statement with the magnitude of the response indicating the strength of agreement. The items were first selected from a pool of items on the basis of their internal reliability and content validity. They were tested and found to show a nonsignificant correlation with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, indicating that the subjects had not tried to make themselves look significantly better or worse by selecting responses that did not reflect their true beliefs. The split half reliability of the final empathy scale was computed at 0.84. Two experiments were conducted to test the validity of the scale and to relate helping behavior to aggression through the concept of empathy. These experiments showed that aggression toward a student-victim was inhibited in highly empathic subjects but not in less empathic subjects. The researchers concluded that empathic tendency is the major personality determinant of helping behavior.

Two empathy measurements have been developed that are specific to the measurement of emotional empathy for victims of violent crimes. Deitz, Blackwell, Daley, and Bentley

(1982) developed the Rape Empathy Scale to measure empathy toward female rape victims and male rapists. The crime was assumed to be heterosexual assault. The paired question format reflected the adversarial process by which information is presented to jurors serving in rape trials. Both the perspective of the victim and that of the defendant are presented. The scale was based on attitudes held by society, as well as myths and false beliefs commonly associated with the crime of sexual assault. The Rape Empathy Scale consists of nineteen paired statements representing extremes in empathy for either the rape victim or the assailant.

Deitz et al. administered the Rape Empathy Scale to 809 subjects, including 170 prospective jurors. Reliability of the scale was calculated separately for each of the subject groups and for males and females within each group. Internal consistency proved to be acceptable and not dependent on group or sex differences as a source of item homogeneity.

A second study using the same subjects tested the validity of the scale. Results supported the hypotheses that females would show greater empathy for rape victims than would males, and that women who were rape victims themselves would show greater empathy for rape victims than would women who had not been raped.

The Attitudes Toward Women Scale (ATW) (Spence et al.,

1973), the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe (MCSDS), 1964) and the Rape Responsibility Questionnaire (RRQ) (Deitz & Byrnes, 1981), were administered to test the convergent, discriminant and predictive validity of the Rape Empathy Scale (RES). Results of correlation between the RES and the ATW supported the prediction that less stereotypical and less conservative attitudes toward women would be associated with greater empathy for rape victims. The significant correlation these scales demonstrated convergent validity. Lack of significant correlation with the MCSDS demonstrated the discriminant validity of the RES. Predictive validity of the RES was shown by a significant correlation with the RES. Subjects indicating high empathy with the victim displayed more positive attitudes toward the victim and more negative attitudes toward the defendant.

Mizwa (1989) designed a survey instrument to measure emotional empathy for victims of violent crime. The Victim Empathy Scale was developed as an empirically-based measure using Fritz Heider's (1958) five levels of attribution as its theoretical base. The scale was designed to assess empathy for victims in three separate crime categories: rape, robbery, and assault. Crimes used in the empathy scale were selected from the National Crime Survey which is conducted yearly in the United States. The questionnaire consisted of forty-five paired statements, three from each

of Heider's five attribution levels for each of the crimes. The paired statements represent either extreme empathy for the victim or the perpetrator.

One hundred and ninety-six men and three hundred and seventy-six women completed the questionnaire. Subjects, with the exception of twenty medical students, were undergraduate psychology students who ranged in age from eighteen to over thirty-five years of age. Subjects were instructed to select the one statement from each pair that most accurately reflected their belief, and then to indicate the degree of their agreement with the statement of choice using a Likert-type scale.

Factor analysis of the data produced both a one factor and a two factor model. Evidence pointed to a single factor solution. The high degree of correlation between the items, along with the consistency of measurement across crimes and across attribution levels, and an alpha reliability of .85, all provided support for the premise that the scale was measuring only one construct, that of empathy.

Separate factor analyses were done for male subjects and for female subjects. These produced statistics and factor matrices similar to the original factor analysis, except for the item content of the factors. Alpha based reliability for the 45-item scale was .85 for females, .83 for males. Reliability assessment for each of the three crimes included in the scale resulted in an alpha

coefficient of .69 for rape, .65 for assault, and .71 for robbery.

The Present Study

The focus of this study was the assessment of the validity of the Victim Empathy Scale, a 45-item instrument designed to measure emotional empathy for victims of violent crime. In a previous study (Mizwa, 1989) reliability of the scale was found to meet or exceed suggested minimum levels. Results of a factor analysis indicated that the instrument was measuring one construct, and a single factor model was found to fit the data most closely and to provide the most satisfactory solution. However, for any measuring instrument to be scientifically useful, it must yield results that are not only reliable, but also relatively valid. Validity, like reliability, is a matter of degree. One cannot attain a perfectly valid instrument--one that measures the intended, and only the intended, concept. However, a measure is considered to be valid to the degree that it measures what it is supposed to measure.

Validity

Any measurement of an abstract concept, such as empathy, is valid to the extent that it measures what it claims to measure. Validity concerns the nature and extent of the relationship between theory and construct and the actual measurement of the trait. No measure can be perfectly valid due to the presence of non-random error in

the measurement procedure. Non-random error is the term assigned to any systematic biasing effect inherent in the measuring instrument. This may be a result of the presence of more than one underlying construct, factor, or other unmeasured variable. This type of error may also affect the measurement process itself. Validity must therefore be considered a matter of degree, not an all-or-none property (Carmines & Zeller, 1979).

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity refers to the extent to which different measures of the same trait produce similar results. In this study, convergent validity was assessed by predicting a positive correlation between scores obtained from the administration of the Victim Empathy Scale and from the Rape Empathy Scale, a measure of emotional empathy for rape victims. Respondents scoring high on the Rape Empathy Scale, indicating a high level of emotional empathy for a rape victim, should also score in the upper ranges on the Victim Empathy Scale, indicating a high level of empathy for other crime victims. A positive correlation between the scores could indicate that both scales were measuring the same trait, implying a degree of convergent validity.

Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity refers to the extent to which similar methods measuring different traits lead to different results. In this study, discriminant validity was assessed

by predicting a lack of significant correlation between scores obtained from the administration of the Victim Empathy Scale and from the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale has been found useful for reducing the confounding effects of responses selected solely for their perceived social desirability. This measure was selected because of its wide acceptance and reliability (Wiggins, 1973) along with its ease of scoring and its lack of pathological content.

Predictive Validity

Predictive validity was assessed through the use of a ten-item Emotional Response Questionnaire (ERQ) and four videotaped scenarios detailing accounts of sexual or physical assaults. The intense emotional content of the tapes provided the stimulus for the subject's response to the ERQ. Both the videos and the questionnaire were developed by the researchers specifically for this study. Factors which have been shown to be involved in shaping one's response to another's victimization were used to form the rationale for the content of the questions. These factors included similarity to the victim, the victim's credibility, attributions of responsibility for the crime, self-reported empathy felt for the victim, blame assessed to the victim, willingness to help the victim, and perceived personal vulnerability. Results from this measure were

correlated with the scores from the Victim Empathy Scale. A positive correlation would result in an inference of validity for the criterion variable (the Victim Empathy Scale).

This study investigated the level of empathy people show for crime victims as measured by their score on the Victim Empathy Scale. It was hypothesized that gender differences would exist, with women showing more empathy (indicated by a higher score) than men. It was also hypothesized that subjects would indicate more empathy for a rape victim than for a victim of physical assault, and that subjects who reported having been victims of crime would show more empathy for another victim than would subjects with no prior victimization. It was also predicted that the Victim Empathy Scale would correlate positively with the Rape Empathy Scale and the Emotional Response Questionnaire, and would show no correlation with the Marlowe/Crowne Social Desirability Scale.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

Two hundred and thirty students at the University of North Dakota participated in the study. All were undergraduate students enrolled in psychology courses and received extra course credit for completion of the research project. The sample consisted of one hundred and fifty-two females and seventy-eight males, age eighteen to over thirty-five years of age. One hundred-fifty six subjects were age 18-21, 47 age 22-25 years, 8 age 26-30 years, eight age 31-35 years, and 9 were over 35 years of age. Due to small numbers of subjects in the older age categories, data was collapsed into two age levels, 18-21 and 22 and over. Two subjects failed to correctly complete the questionnaires and their data were excluded from the study.

Procedure

Subjects were recruited for the study at the end of their class period and were given the research materials. They were instructed to complete the items and to bring them to a scheduled videotape showing. They received a consent form (Appendix A) which informed them of their rights and responsibilities as a participant in the study, a copy of

the Victim Empathy Scale, the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, and the Rape Empathy Scale. They were instructed to record their responses on the standard National Computer Systems (NCS) computer answer sheet which was also included. Instructions for completion of each instrument were attached. To ensure the subject's anonymity they were instructed not to write their names on the answer sheet, nor to mark the questionnaire in any way, but to sign the consent form which would be separated from the other materials at the time they turned them into the researcher.

Subjects were self-scheduled to view one of four videotapes which are described in the next section. Viewing groups ranged from one to eight participants. Immediately following the showing of the videotape, subjects completed the 10-item Emotional Response Questionnaire. Subjects were asked to circle their answer on a five-point Likert scale. The direction of all items was manipulated so higher scores reflected higher empathy for the victim.

Videotapes

Each videotape, produced by the researcher for this study, featured a crime victim, portrayed by an actor, discussing his/her experience in a simulated therapy session. The "therapist" neither spoke nor appeared in the scenario. The videotapes were five minutes in length and had been taped in color. Two actors were used, one male,

one female, each depicting both a sexual assault victim and a physical assault victim. Both were in their early thirties and were selected because each had been a victim of a crime, offering the realism of first-hand experience. The actors recounted the details of their assault and discussed their feelings and problems following each of two crimes -- a completed rape or a physical assault with robbery, classified by the National Crime Survey as personal crimes of violence (U.S. Department of Justice, 1987).

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Data Analysis Strategy

Correlations between the Victim Empathy Scale (VES), the Rape Empathy Scale (RES) and the Emotional Response Questionnaire (ERQ) were conducted to test convergent validity. Correlation between the Victim Empathy Scale and the Marlowe/Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M/CSDS) was conducted to test discriminant validity. Finally, correlation between the Victim Empathy Scale and the Emotional Response Questionnaire was conducted to test predictive validity. Analysis of Variance was then used to examine the effects of five independent variables (Sex of Subject, Prior Victimization of Subject, Sex of Victim, Age of Subject, and Type of Assault) on the subject's empathy for crime victims (VES), empathy for rape victims (RES), subject's response to a videotaped victim (ERQ) and tendency to select socially desirable responses (M/CSDS). Several 2 (Sex of Subject) x 2 (Prior Victimization) x 2 (Sex of Victim) x 2 (Type of Assault) x 2 (Subject's Age) ANOVA's were conducted.

Correlational Analyses

Intercorrelations of the scales, shown in Table 1,

confirmed the predictions made concerning the relationships between these instruments. The Victim Empathy Scale showed a positive correlation with the Rape Empathy Scale, $r = +0.6732$, $p < .001$. The Victim Empathy Scale was positively correlated with the Emotion Response Questionnaire, $r = +0.4372$, $p < .001$. Results also revealed a small positive correlation of the Victim Empathy Scale with the Marlowe/Crowne Social Desirability Scale of $r = +0.1502$, $p < .05$.

Table 1

Correlation of Scales

Scale	VES	RES	ERQ	M/CSDS)
Victim Empathy Scale	--			
Rape Empathy Scale	.6732	---		
Emotional Response Questionnaire	.4372	.5112	--	
Marlowe/Crowne Social Desirability Scale	.1502	.1058	.0064	--

Analyses of Variance

Five-way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA's) were performed on data from each of the four questionnaires using the Sex of Subject (2), Age of Subject (2 levels), Prior Victimization (2), Sex of Victim (2), and Type of Assault (2) as independent variables.

The Victim Empathy Scale

Supplemental data requested in the Victim Empathy Scale (Item 91, Appendix B) asked respondents whether they had or had not been a victim of crime. Type of crime was not specified.

Females scored higher than did males as was indicated by a significant main effect of sex, $F(1, 220) = 24.28, p < .001$. In a significant 2-way interaction, females who reported prior victimization scored higher than did females reporting no prior victimization. Males reporting prior victimization scored lower than did males reporting no prior victimization, $F(1, 220) = 4.74, p < .05$. This result indicates that differences exist between the empathy shown for crime victims by subjects who have been victimized that cannot be attributed to gender. These significant effects with the Victim Empathy Scale are illustrated in Table 2.

Rape Empathy Scale

Females scored higher ($M = 103.73, SD = 7.14, n = 151$) than did males ($M = 92.30, SD = 11.17, n = 77$) as was indicated by a significant main effect of Sex, $F(1, 220) = 84.86, p < .001$. Subjects reporting prior victimization scored higher ($M = 101.04, SD = 11.13, n = 89$) than did subjects reporting no prior victimization ($M = 99.12, SD = 95.9, n = 139$) resulting in a significant main effect of Prior Victimization, $F(1, 220) = 5.24, p < .05$.

Table 2

Means Illustrating A Main Effect of Sex and A Two-Way Interaction of Sex and Victimization in the Victim Empathy Scores

	Sex of Subject	
	Male	Female
Overall Mean Score on Victim Empathy Scale	212.91 (SD=26.29, $n=77$)	228.11 (SD=18.74, $n=151$)
Prior Victimization Reported by Subject	207.97 (SD=28.40, $n=33$)	231.46 (SD=19.32, $n=56$)
No Prior Victimization Reported by Subject	216.61 (SD=24.25, $n=44$)	226.13 (SD=18.20, $n=95$)

Analyses of Variance on this measure of the subject's level of empathy for a videotaped crime victim showed 3 main effects and 3 three-way interactions which are described below.

Females scored higher ($M = 42.71$, $SD = 4.06$, $n = 151$) than did males ($M = 38.30$, $SD = 5.18$, $n = 77$) resulting in a significant main effect of Sex, $F(1, 196) = 55.72$, $p < .001$. Subjects scored higher, i.e., showed more empathy for, a victim of sexual assault ($M = 42.29$, $SD = 4.63$, $n = 114$) than they did for a victim of physical assault, ($M = 40.15$, $SD = 4.99$, $n = 114$) resulting in a significant main effect of Type of Assault, $F(1, 196) = 14.48$, $p < .001$. Subjects scored higher on empathy for female victims

($M = 41.93$, $SD = 4.62$, $n = 111$) than they did for males ($M = 40.55$, $SD = 5.12$, $n = 117$) as indicated by a significant main effect of Sex of Victim, $F(1, 196) = 6.98$, $p < .05$.

The Emotional Response Questionnaire

The reliability of the ERQ was examined and the results of that analysis are shown in Table 3. The reliability of the ERQ was shown to be acceptable.

Table 3

Reliability Analysis of the Emotional Response Questionnaire

Item-Total Statistics:

Item	Item-Total Correlation	If Item Deleted
01	.2497	.7327
02	.3868	.7036
03	.5616	.6779
04	.4066	.7013
05	.3066	.7146
06	.3932	.7021
07	.4998	.6851
08	.4305	.6956
09	.2912	.7254
10	.4528	.6957

Cronbach's $\alpha = .7251$ for the 10 item scale

A significant 3-way interaction, $F(1, 196) = 5.49$, $p < .05$, between Sex of Subject, their Age, and Type of Assault is illustrated in Table 4. This effect indicates that young women, age 18 through 21, showed more empathy for sexual

assault victims than they did for victims of physical assault. This was not true for women age 22 and over, who showed the same level of empathy for both physical and sexual assault victims. Men in the 18 through 21 age range showed empathy equally for physical and sexual assault victims, while men 22 years of age and older showed significantly more empathy for sexual assault victims than they did for physical assault victims.

A second significant 3-way interaction, $F(1, 196) = 10.46$, $p = .05$, was an effect of Prior Victimization, Sex of Subject and Type of Assault. Results, shown in Table 5, indicate that women who reported prior personal victimization scored higher on measures indicating empathy for physical assault, than did women who reported no victimization. Prior female victims showed more empathy for sexual assault victims than did females reporting no prior victimization. Males who reported prior personal victimization showed more empathy for victims of physical assault than did males with no prior victimization. Male non-victims showed more empathy for sexual assault victims than they did for victims of physical assault.

The third significant 3-way interaction, $F(1, 196) = 438$, $p < .05$, compared the Age of the Subject, the Sex of the Subject, and the Sex of the Victim on the videotape. It showed that in the 18 through 21 year age group women scored higher on empathy measures for a female victim than they did

for a male victim. Men in this age group scored higher on empathy for female victims than they did for male victims. In the 22 and over age group, women showed more empathy for

Table 4

Means Illustrating 3-Way Interaction of Age, Sex of Subject, and Type of Assault with Score on Emotional Response Questionnaire

	Sex of Subject	
	Male	Female
Age of Subject: 18-21 years		
Physical Assault of Victim	38.25 (SD=5.40, <u>n</u> =20)	41.16 (SD=4.20, <u>n</u> =58)
Sexual Assault of Victim	38.87 (SD=4.86, <u>n</u> =23)	44.25 (SD=3.12, <u>n</u> =55)
Age of Subject: > 22 years		
Physical Assault of Victim	36.44 (SD=5.33, <u>n</u> =18)	42.72 (SD=4.01, <u>n</u> =18)
Sexual Assault of Victim	39.63 (SD=5.07, <u>n</u> =16)	42.95 (SD=4.55, <u>n</u> =20)

the female victim than they did for the male victim. Male subjects in the older age range showed more empathy for the male victim portrayed on the videotape than they did for the female victim. Results are summarized in Table 6.

Marlowe/Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS)

Analysis of variance of the MCSDS yielded no significant results. This lends credence to the assumption

that a measure of social desirability would show no effects of the independent variables used in this study.

Table 5

Means Illustrating 3-Way Interaction of Sex of Subject, Prior Victimization of Subject, and Type of Assault with Score on Emotional Response Questionnaire

	Sex of Subject	
	Male	Female
Subjects Reporting Prior Victimization		
Physical Assault to Victim	39.00 (SD=5.10, <u>n</u> =16)	42.21 (SD=3.65, <u>n</u> =24)
Sexual Assault to Victim	37.65 (SD=5.73, <u>n</u> =17)	44.97 (SD=2.51, <u>n</u> =32)
Subjects Reporting No Victimization		
Physical Assault to Victim	36.23 (SD=5.37, <u>n</u> =22)	41.21 (SD=4.40, <u>n</u> =52)
Sexual Assault to Victim	40.36 (SD=3.87, <u>n</u> =22)	43.12 (SD=4.04, <u>n</u> =43)

Table 6

Means Illustrating 3-Way Interaction of Age, Sex of Subject
and Sex of Victim with Score on Emotion Response
Questionnaire

	Sex of Subject	
	Male	Female
Age of Subjects, 18-21 years		
Male Victim	37.95 (SD=5.77, <u>n</u> =22)	42.19 (SD=4.45, <u>n</u> =58)
Female Victim	39.24 (SD=4.25, <u>n</u> =21)	43.16 (SD=3.47, <u>n</u> =55)
Age of Subjects > 22 years		
Male Victim	38.06 (SD=5.83, <u>n</u> =17)	40.75 (SD=3.73, <u>n</u> =20)
Female Victim	37.82 (SD=5.06, <u>n</u> =17)	45.17 (SD=3.59, <u>n</u> =18)

Chapter IV

DISCUSSION

This study centered around the concept of empathy and its role in regulating our responses to others. The development of the Victim Empathy Scale (Mizwa, 1989) came about as a direct response to the conclusions reached by the American Psychological Association Task Force on the Victims of Crime and Violence (1985). The Task Force found that a measure of an individual's emotional empathy specifically for crime victims was needed and could prove useful in the training and evaluation of mental health professionals and criminal justice personnel. The results of the present study offer evidence that the Victim Empathy Scale is not only a reliable, but also a valid instrument for assessing empathy for victims of violent crime.

The significant positive correlation of the Victim Empathy Scale (VES) with the Rape Empathy Scale (RES) is a critical finding, one which demonstrates a degree of convergent validity. Other studies could examine correlations of the VES with future empathy measures, which may yield further evidence of convergent validity.

The magnitude of the small correlation of the VES with the Marlowe/Crown Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS) seems to

indicate that, for the most part, respondents did not answer items in a way that they perceived to be socially desirable. Thus, it could be said that the VES can discriminate between measures of different constructs.

The correlation of the VES with the Emotional Response Questionnaire (ERQ) was both positive and significant, allowing the inference of predictive validity of the VES. The amount of material presented along with the similarity of content between the VES and the RES may have had an adverse effect on the results. Further studies should feature only the VES, along with the video stimulus provided by the tape of crime victims. One could also control for possible group effect by presenting materials to one subject at a time.

A closer look at the results reveals several interesting findings that are supported by the literature. The significant sex difference in empathy shown for crime victims, with women attaining higher scores, appeared as a main effect on all empathy measures, and is consistent with other studies measuring empathy (Deitz et al., 1982; Barnett, Feighny, & Esper, 1983; Connors & Heaven, 1990; Barnett, Frierstein, Jaet, & Saunders, 1992; Wollman, Griggs & Stouder, 1989-1990).

Prior victimization of the subject also resulted in significant effects, indicating that those who reported being victims scored higher on empathy measures. Studies by

Barnett, Tetreault, and Esper (1986) and Barnett, Tetreault, Patricia, & Masbad (1987) found similar results.

The interaction effect of sex and victimization found in the analysis of the Victim Empathy Scale is a very interesting finding. It shows that while females reporting prior victimization scored higher on the empathy measure, males reporting prior victimization scored lower on the measure than non-victims. A 1990 study by Eisenberg and Fahes at the University of Arizona may shed some light on this phenomenon. Their findings suggest that low levels of helping (an empathy-related reaction), are related to personal distress reactions and increased physical arousal. Another study by Connors and Heaven (1990) showed that males and females had different patterns of association with just world beliefs and attitudes toward AIDS patients, with males exhibiting greater social distance, greater victimization, and less empathy toward sufferers. One could postulate that victimization is considered a feminine phenomenon, totally incongruent with male identity. Therefore it may be more difficult for males than for females to identify with, and consequently show empathy for, other victims. Males may seek to retain control of their emotions, denying the humiliation, pain and fear often associated with the aftermath of violent crime. Further studies should be done in this area which may have implications for mental health professionals and victim/witness programs.

Examination of the main effect of type of assault on response to videotaped victims suggests that subjects responded with more empathy for a rape victim than for a victim who had suffered physical assault. This finding may be associated with causal attribution, with more responsibility assigned to the victim of physical assault. Thakker and Kanekar (1989) examined the effects of dispositional empathy and causal attribution on willingness to help. They found that in males with low empathy, causal attribution made a difference in their willingness to help. They expressed more willingness to help an obviously ill victim (an uncontrollable cause) than a drunk victim (a controllable cause). Causal attribution made no difference to high empathy males.

The effect of sex of the victim on expressed empathy is consistent with sex role effect, for women. For men, societal expectations may predispose males to avoid evidence of vulnerability and to see females as more likely victims.

Although this study showed the Victim Empathy Scale to be a valid measure of emotional empathy for crime victims, further research needs to be done, especially with more heterogeneous populations. Its use in forensic settings may show its usefulness as an indicator of change in the offender's attitudes toward others. Educational programs designed to increase empathy for crime victims may find the scale valuable as a pre- and post-test measure. The

shortened version (20 items) of the questionnaire described in the original research (Mizwa, 1989) should be tested for validity as well.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM

You are invited to participate in this research project which is designed to assess the level of emotional empathy people feel toward the victims or the perpetrators of crime.

You have been selected because you are representative of the normal adult population.

PROCEDURES AND TIME COMMITMENT: You and all other participants will be given an attitude questionnaire. All questionnaires are identical and will take approximately 30 to 60 minutes to complete. There is no time limit, however, you are expected to complete the questionnaire at one sitting.

RISKS: As with most test environments, there can be some apprehension regarding the appropriateness of one's responses. However, it must be noted that there are no right or wrong answers. Emotional stress or possible embarrassment may also result if responses are matched to specific individuals. Every effort will be made to provide you with maximum anonymity. Therefore, I ask that you do not identify yourself by name on either the questionnaire or the supplemental computer answer sheet.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Your responses to the questionnaire will be treated in a strictly confidential manner. No attempt will be made to identify anyone taking this survey. Therefore, this consent form and associated demographic data will be handled separately from the questionnaire. This will preclude any association with the individual and his or her particular questionnaire or answer sheet. Additionally, the questionnaire will be administered only to groups of at least three participants to provide greater anonymity. Once the data are collected, the answer sheets will be destroyed. Any use of the data will be for statistical purposes only without individual identification possible.

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE: If you decide to participate, you are free to discontinue participation at any time and for any reason without any questions asked. Your signature indicates that you have read this information, have had any questions about it answered to your satisfaction and now understand what your participation involves. A copy of this consent form will be provided upon request. Thank you for your participation.

I hereby agree to participate in this study.

SIGNATURE _____

DATE _____

Please answer the following questions about yourself to help define the total sample more accurately (optional).

Thank you!

1. Age: _____ 2. Education (# of years) _____
3. Race _____ 4. Sex circle one: Female Male

APPENDIX B

V E S

Martine M. Mizwa
Project Director

For the purpose of this study please consider the following definition based on National Crime Survey criteria:

SEXUAL ASSAULT - Carnal knowledge through the use of force or the threat of force, including attempts. Includes both heterosexual and homosexual rape.

ROBBERY - Completed or attempted theft, directly from a person, of property or cash, by force or threat of force, with or without a weapon.

ASSAULT - An unlawful physical attack, whether simple or aggravated, upon a person. Includes attempted assaults with or without a weapon. Severity may range from minor threats to incidents that bring the victim near death.

DIRECTIONS:

To assure your anonymity and the confidentiality of your responses, do not write your name on either the questionnaire or the answer sheet. Do not write in or make any marks on the questionnaire.

To complete the questionnaire, first select the statement, A or B, that you most agree with. Next, indicate your level of agreement with the statement.

Blacken the space on the answer sheet corresponding to the answer you select for each numbered item.

Remember, there are no right or wrong answers and there is no time limit. Thank you for your participation.

1. a. I feel that people who have been raped probably deserved what they got.
b. I don't feel that anyone deserved to be raped.
2. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
3. a. One should resist a sexual assault regardless of the consequences.
b. I can see why someone would submit to a rapist when his/her life is threatened.
4. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
5. a. I can't really empathize with victims who are forced to engage in sexual acts against their will.
b. I really don't believe that it is possible to commit sexual assault against someone's will.
6. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
7. a. I don't think that it is always possible for anyone to know beforehand that someone will act violently toward him/her.
b. I think that assault victims could have avoided being hurt if they had stayed away from their assailants in the first place.
8. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
9. a. When I read about assaults in the newspaper I wonder how badly the victim was injured.
b. When I read in the newspaper about people who have been assaulted, I wonder what the victim did to cause their injuries.
10. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree

11. a. Even a man who is well known to a woman can be a potential rapist.
b. Women who go out with men they don't know well shouldn't be surprised if they are sexually assaulted.
12. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
13. a. Most rape victims who are assaulted in their homes have been careless about security.
b. Rapists can secure entry to homes even if people are careful about locking doors and windows.
14. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
15. a. I can't empathize with people who go to someone's aid and end up getting hit themselves.
b. I can really empathize with people who are assaulted when trying to help someone else.
16. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
17. a. I think that most people are careless about locking their car doors and their homes and should expect to be robbed.
b. I think that most people take normal precautions and that it is impossible to foresee a robbery.
18. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
19. a. I believe that it is possible for anyone to become the innocent victim of assault at any time.
b. I think that if people mind their own business they won't become victims of assault.
20. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree

21. a. Women should know that if they walk alone at night they stand a good chance of being raped.
- b. Women should be able to walk anywhere alone, no matter what time of day it is, without being concerned about rape.
22. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
23. a. I believe that a person can avoid physical assault by being careful and alert.
- b. I believe that no matter how careful and alert a person is, he/she can become an assault victim.
24. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
25. a. I think that even though people sometimes choose to travel through a high crime area, this does not mean that they are asking to be robbed.
- b. I think that when people deliberately go into a high crime area they are just asking to be robbed.
26. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
27. a. Robbery victims are never really innocent because you can always find something they could have done to avoid their victimization.
- b. Robbery is a criminal act that is the fault of the robber, not the victim.
28. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
29. a. I don't believe that victims of rape can in any way be held responsible for the crime.
- b. I really believe that rape victims are responsible for what happens to them.
30. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree

31. a. I cannot understand why more robbery victims don't try to resist a robber's demands, especially if they might be able to do so.
- b. I can understand why most people would not resist a robber's demands even if they were able to do so.
32. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
33. a. Reasonable people can voice disagreement without resorting to violence.
- b. People who voice their disagreement with others must realize that they may be assaulted.
34. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
35. a. I think that most people who say they have been raped are just victims of rough sex.
- b. I think that rape is an act of violence, not sex.
36. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
37. a. In general, I feel that even if people stay alert while walking on the street, they can be robbed.
- b. In general, I feel that people who don't pay attention to those around them while walking on the street are easy marks for robbers.
38. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
39. a. I feel that someone who is threatened with a knife or a gun can avoid being hurt by doing just as the assailant tells him/her to do.
- b. I don't think that people have any control over what happens to them if someone threatens them with a knife or a gun.
40. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c. Strongly agree

41. a. When you really look at it closely, robbery victims did something wrong or they would not have been victimized.
- b. I think that, in general, victims of robbery did nothing wrong but were victimized anyway.
42. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
43. a. I do not believe that innocent people get themselves into situations where assault occurs.
- b. I believe that people, regardless of who they are or what they do, can become victims of assault.
44. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
45. a. Even when victims of rape are able to remain calm, they may not be able to fight off their assailant.
- b. If only victims could conquer their fear, they could successfully fight off a rapist.
46. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
47. a. No one asks to be raped regardless of his/her behavior.
- b. Anyone who drinks too much is just asking to be raped.
48. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
49. a. I can really empathize with the shame and humiliation that someone might feel if he/she were raped.
- b. I don't think that rapists really intend to cause shame and humiliation to anyone.
50. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree

51. a. I don't think that people are assaulted unless they have it coming.
- b. I don't think that anyone deserves to be assaulted.
52. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
53. a. People who try to break up fights are only being helpful and I feel that it's a shame if they are assaulted too.
- b. I feel that people who try to break up fights must realize that they will be assaulted too if they try to interfere.
54. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
55. a. I feel that police officers who are assaulted in the line of duty deserve our respect and gratitude.
- b. I don't feel sorry for a police officer who is assaulted in the line of duty because that's part of the job.
56. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
57. a. A person can choose to work in a convenience store despite any risk of robbery.
- b. People who work on convenience stores should expect to be robbed sooner or later.
58. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree

59. a. I can really understand how a person can be so frightened that he/she is unable to resist a rapist.
- b. I cannot understand how someone can be so afraid that he/she wouldn't be capable of resisting a rapist.
60. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
61. a. I think that anyone, regardless of his or her behavior, can be sexually assaulted.
- b. I think that anyone who has been raped was probably behaving seductively.
62. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
63. a. I don't think that people can defend themselves against robbery no matter what time of day it is.
- b. I think that people who are unable to defend themselves against robbers should not go out walking at night.
64. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
65. a. People who wear expensive clothes and drive fancy cars are just issuing an invitation to robbers.
- b. People are not inviting robbery by wearing expensive clothes and driving luxury cars.
66. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
67. a. I think that people are too trusting of strangers and are easy marks for robbers.
- b. I think that people can become the victims of robbery whether they trust strangers or not.
68. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree

69. a. Seductive behavior is not a factor in sexual assault.
- b. Anyone who behaves seductively is inviting a sexual attack.
70. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
71. a. I feel that if a person lives a good life they don't have to worry about being robbed.
- b. I feel that anyone can be robbed regardless of the life that he/she lives.
72. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
73. a. I think that if a person is confronted by an armed robber he/she hasn't any choice but to turn over his/her valuables.
- b. I think that even if a person is confronted by someone with a knife or a gun, there are ways he/she can avoid being robbed.
74. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
75. a. I don't think that people deserve to be assaulted even if they do irritate others.
- b. In general, I think that people who are assaulted did something to aggravate their assailant.
76. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree

77. a. I can see why a victim who is overwhelmed by fear might give a robber his/her valuables before being asked for them.
- b. I can't see why a victim, even if very frightened, would give his/her valuables to a robber before being asked for them.
78. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
79. a. I can't empathize with a person who turns over his/her belongings to a robber.
- b. I can really empathize with a victim who surrenders his/her belongings to a robber.
80. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
81. a. Doing someone a favor by giving his/her a lift is not inviting sexual assault.
- b. People who pick up hitchhikers are really inviting sexual assault.
82. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
83. a. I don't have any empathy for assault victims because they should have avoided the situation but obviously didn't.
- b. I can feel empathy for assault victims because one never knows when something like that can happen.
84. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
85. a. People can't judge their risk of assault by the appearance of the neighborhood they are in.
- b. People should know that they might be assaulted if they go into rough looking neighborhoods.
86. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree

87. a. I think that it is sometimes necessary to carry large sums of money and that people can't foresee that they may be robbed.
- b. I think that people who carry large sums of money must realize that they are setting themselves up as targets for robbery.
88. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
89. a. I believe that assault is an act of violence that is provoked by the victim.
- b. I believe that assault is an act of violence that is not provoked by the victim.
90. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
91. a. I have been a victim of crime.
- b. I have not been a victim of crime.
92. a. The incident was reported to law enforcement officials.
- b. The incident was not reported to law enforcement officials.
- c. Not applicable.
93. a. I am a female.
b. I am a male.
94. My age group is:
- a. 18-21
b. 22-25
c. 26-30
d. 31-35
e. over 35

APPENDIX C

MARLOWE/CROWNE SCALE

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item carefully and then decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally. On your answer sheet blacken the #1 space if the statement is TRUE, and the #2 space if the statement is FALSE.

95. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.
96. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone.
97. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
98. I have never intensely disliked anyone.
99. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.
100. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
101. I am always careful about my manner of dress.
102. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
103. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.
104. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
105. I like to gossip at times.
106. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
107. No matter who I'm talking, to, I'm always a good listener.
108. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
109. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
110. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
111. I always try to practice what I preach.

112. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouthed, obnoxious people.
113. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.
114. When I don't know something, I don't at all mind admitting it.
115. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
116. At times I have really insisted on having my own way.
117. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
118. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrong doings.
119. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
120. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
121. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.
122. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
123. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
124. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
125. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.
126. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.
127. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

RES SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS

This is a questionnaire designed to find out how different people feel about certain aspects of a rape situation. For the purposes of THIS QUESTIONNAIRE, rape is defined as an act in which one adult person (a male) compels another adult person (a female) to submit to penile-vaginal sexual intercourse against her will.

Each question consists of a pair of alternative statements lettered a or b. Select the one statement of each pair which you more strongly BELIEVE to be the case as far as you are concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually BELIEVE to be true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief: thus, there are NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS. Once you have decided which statement you more strongly believe to be the case, mark your answer sheet a or b. The next numbered question refers to how strongly you agree with the statement you have selected. Mark your answer sheet a, b, or c.

PLEASE PUT ALL ANSWERS ON THE ANSWER SHEET PROVIDED, TAKING CARE THAT YOUR ANSWERS CORRESPOND WITH THE NUMBERS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

128. a. I feel that the situation in which a man compels a woman to submit to sexual intercourse against her will is an unjustifiable act under any circumstance.
- b. I feel that the situation in which a man compels a woman to submit to sexual intercourse against her will is a justifiable act under certain circumstances.
129. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
130. a. In deciding the matter of guilt or innocence in a rape case, it is more important to know about the past sexual activity of the alleged rape victim than the past sexual activity of the alleged rapist.
- b. It is more important to know about the past sexual activity of the alleged rapist than the past sexual activity of the alleged rape victim in deciding the matter of guilt or innocence in a rape case.
131. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
132. a. In general, I feel that rape is an act that is provoked by the rape victim.
- b. In general, I feel that rape is an act that is not provoked by the rape victim.
133. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
134. a. I would find it easier to imagine how a rapist might feel during an actual rape than how a rape victim might feel.
- b. I would find it easier to imagine how a rape victim might feel during an actual rape than how a rapist might feel.
135. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree

136. a. Under certain circumstances, I can understand why a man would use force to obtain sexual relations with a woman.
- b. I cannot understand why a man would use force to obtain sexual relations with a woman under any circumstance.
137. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
138. a. In a court of law, I feel that the rapist must be held accountable for his behavior during the rape.
- b. In a court of law, I feel that the rape victim must be held accountable for her behavior during the rape.
139. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
140. a. When a woman dresses in a sexually attractive way, she must be willing to accept the consequences of her behavior, whatever they are, since she is signaling her interest in having sexual relations.
- b. A woman has the right to dress in a sexually attractive way whether she is really interested in having sexual relations or not.
141. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
142. a. I would find it easier to empathize with the shame and humiliation a rapist might feel during a trial for rape than with the feelings a rape victim might have during the trial.
- b. I would find it easier to emphasize with the shame and humiliation a rape victim might feel during a trial to prove rape than with the feelings a rapist might have during the trial.
143. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree

144. a. If a man rapes a sexually active woman, he would probably be justified in his actions by the fact that she chooses to have sexual relations with other men.
- b. If a man rapes a sexually active woman, his actions would not be justified by the fact that she chooses to have sexual relations with other men.
145. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
146. a. I believe that all women secretly want to be raped.
- b. I don't believe that any women want to be raped.
147. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
148. a. In deciding whether a rape has occurred or not, the burden of proof should rest with the woman, who must prove that a rape has actually occurred.
- b. In deciding whether a rape has occurred or not, the burden of proof should rest with the man, who must prove that a rape has not actually occurred.
149. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
150. a. I believe that it is impossible for a rape victim to enjoy being raped.
- b. I believe that it is possible for a rape victim to enjoy the experience of being raped, whether she admits it or not.
151. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree

152. a. I can really empathize with the helplessness a rapist might feel during a rape, since he's at the mercy of forces beyond his control.
- b. I can really empathize with the helplessness a rape victim might feel during a rape if all of her attempts to resist the rape have failed.
153. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
154. a. After a rape has occurred, I think the woman would suffer more emotional torment in dealing with the people than the man would.
- b. After a rape has occurred, I think the man would suffer more emotional torment in dealing with the police than the woman would.
155. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
156. a. I feel it is impossible for a man to rape a woman unless she is willing.
- b. I feel it is possible for a man to rape a woman against her will.
157. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
158. a. If a rape trial were publicized in the press, I feel the rape victim would suffer more emotional trauma from the publicity than the rapist.
- b. If a rape trial were publicized in the press, I feel the rapist would suffer more emotional trauma from the publicity than the rape victim.
159. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree

160. a. Once a couple has had sexual intercourse, then that issue is resolved and it is no longer possible for that man to rape that woman.
- b. Even if a couple has had sexual intercourse before, if the man forces the woman to have sexual intercourse with him against her will, this should be considered rape.
161. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
162. a. I can understand a wife's humiliation and anger if her husband forced her to have sexual relations with him.
- b. A husband has every right to determine when sexual relations with his wife occur, even if it means forcing her to have sex with him.
163. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree
164. a. If I were a member of the jury in a rape trial, I would probably be more likely to believe the woman's testimony than the man's, since it takes a lot of courage on the woman's part to accuse the man of rape.
- b. If I were a member of the jury in a rape trial, I would probably be more likely to believe the man's testimony than the woman's, since rape is a charge that is difficult to defend against, even if the man is innocent.
165. a) Somewhat agree
b) Agree
c) Strongly agree

THANK YOU, YOU HAVE FINISHED! BE SURE TO BRING THE COMPLETED MATERIALS -- THE THREE QUESTIONNAIRES, YOUR ANSWER SHEET, AND YOUR SIGNED CONSENT FORM TO THE VIDEOTAPE SESSION THAT YOU HAVE SIGNED UP FOR TO COMPLETE YOUR PARTICIPATION AND RECEIVE YOUR RESEARCH CREDIT.

E R QUESTIONNAIRE

Circle your answer:

1. How much do you identify with Bill?
(not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very much)
2. How accurate was Bill's account of what had happened to him?
(not at all accurate) 1 2 3 4 5 (very accurate)
3. How easy is it for you to empathize with Bill?
(not at all easy) 1 2 3 4 5 (very easy)
4. To what extent do you feel that Bill may have been responsible for what happened to him?
(not at all responsible) 1 2 3 4 5 (very responsible)
5. If there was a way for you to be of assistance, would you help Bill?
(highly unlikely) 1 2 3 4 5 (highly likely)
6. Do you feel that Bill in any way provoked the attack?
(highly unlikely) 1 2 3 4 5 (highly likely)
7. Do you feel angry or upset over what happened to Bill?
(not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very much)
8. How likely was it that Bill could have done something to avoid the attack?
(highly unlikely) 1 2 3 4 5 (highly likely)
9. Do you feel that anything like this could happen to you?
not possible) 1 2 3 4 5 (very possible)
10. How do you feel personally about Bill?
(very negative) 1 2 3 4 5 (very positive)

E R QUESTIONNAIRE

Circle your answer:

1. How much do you identify with Sara?
(not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very much)
2. How accurate was Sara's account of what had happened to her?
(not at all accurate) 1 2 3 4 5 (very accurate)
3. How easy is it for you to empathize with Sara?
(not at all easy) 1 2 3 4 5 (very easy)
4. To what extent do you feel that Sara may have been responsible for what happened to her?
(not at all responsible) 1 2 3 4 5 (very responsible)
5. If there was a way for you to be of assistance, would you help Sara?
(highly unlikely) 1 2 3 4 5 (highly likely)
6. Do you feel that Sara in any way provoked the attack?
(highly unlikely) 1 2 3 4 5 (highly likely)
7. Do you feel angry or upset over what happened to Sara?
(not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very much)
8. How likely was it that Sara could have done something to avoid the attack?
(highly unlikely) 1 2 3 4 5 (highly likely)
9. Do you feel that anything like this could happen to you?
(not possible) 1 2 3 4 5 (very possible)
10. How do you feel personally about Sara?
(very negative) 1 2 3 4 5 (very positive)

ANOVA SUMMARIES

Guide to abbreviations

ASSAULT	refers to type, physical or sexual
GVIC	refers to sex (gender) of victim
SEX	refers to sex of subject
AGE	refers to age of subject
VIC	refers to prior victimization of subject

*** ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ***

RES
BY SEX
AGE
VIC

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
Main Effects	7090.600	3	2363.533	31.770	.000
SEX	6313.311	1	6313.311	84.861	.000
AGE	74.679	1	74.679	1.004	.317
VIC	389.849	1	389.849	5.240	.023
2-way Interactions	301.895	3	100.632	1.353	.258
SEX . AGE	106.441	1	106.441	1.431	.233
SEX VIC	171.610	1	171.610	2.307	.130
AGE VIC	.007	1	.007	.000	.992
3-way Interactions	30.549	1	30.549	.411	.522
SEX AGE VIC	30.549	1	30.549	.411	.522
Explained	7423.044	7	1060.435	14.254	.000
Residual	16367.009	220	74.395		
Total	23790.053	227	104.802		

228 Cases were processed.

0 Cases (.0 PCT) were missing.

*** ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ***

MC
BY SEX
AGE
VIC

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
Main Effects	40.724	3	13.575	.452	.716
SEX	4.137	1	4.137	.138	.711
AGE	28.095	1	28.095	.936	.334
VIC	.838	1	.838	.028	.867
2-way Interactions	51.798	3	17.266	.575	.632
SEX AGE	41.106	1	41.106	1.370	.243
SEX VIC	12.888	1	12.888	.430	.513
AGE VIC	3.292	1	3.292	.110	.741
3-way Interactions	.761	1	.761	.025	.874
SEX AGE VIC	.761	1	.761	.025	.874
Explained	93.282	7	13.326	.444	.873
Residual	6601.227	220	30.006		
Total	6694.509	227	29.491		

228 Cases were processed.

0 Cases (.0 PCT) were missing.

*** ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ***

VES
 BY SEX
 AGE
 VIC

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
Main Effects	11790.878	3	3930.293	8.439	.000
SEX	11308.736	1	11308.736	24.282	.000
AGE	2.088	1	2.088	.004	.947
VIC	12.690	1	12.690	.027	.869
2-way Interactions	2571.747	3	857.249	1.841	.141
SEX AGE	57.740	1	57.740	.124	.725
SEX VIC	2205.942	1	2205.942	4.737	.031
AGE VIC	78.355	1	78.355	.157	.698
3-way Interactions	137.223	1	137.223	.295	.588
SEX AGE VIC	137.223	1	137.223	.295	.588
Explained	14499.847	7	2071.407	4.448	.000
Residual	102459.995	220	465.727		
Total	116959.842	227	515.242		

228 Cases were processed.

0 Cases (.0 PCT) were missing.

*** ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ***

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
BY					
ERQ					
ASSAULT					
GVIC					
SEX					
AGE					
VIC					
Main Effects	1435.621	5	287.124	16.467	.000
ASSAULT	252.608	1	252.608	14.487	.000
GVIC	121.814	1	121.814	6.986	.009
SEX	971.656	1	971.656	55.724	.000
AGE	3.549	1	3.549	.204	.652
VIC	54.162	1	54.162	3.106	.080
2-way Interactions	129.069	10	12.907	.740	.686
ASSAULT GVIC	.093	1	.093	.005	.942
ASSAULT SEX	1.843	1	1.843	.106	.745
ASSAULT AGE	1.159	1	1.159	.066	.797
ASSAULT VIC	24.721	1	24.721	1.418	.235
GVIC SEX	23.444	1	23.444	1.344	.248
GVIC AGE	8.699	1	8.699	.499	.481
GVIC VIC	27.787	1	27.787	1.594	.208
SEX AGE	.042	1	.042	.002	.961
SEX VIC	27.233	1	27.233	1.562	.213
AGE VIC	.879	1	.879	.050	.823
3-way Interactions	413.241	10	41.324	2.370	.011
ASSAULT GVIC SEX	10.005	1	10.005	.574	.450
ASSAULT GVIC AGE	18.343	1	18.343	1.052	.306
ASSAULT GVIC VIC	3.522	1	3.522	.202	.654
ASSAULT SEX AGE	95.831	1	95.831	5.496	.020
ASSAULT SEX VIC	182.477	1	182.477	10.465	.001
ASSAULT AGE VIC	6.385	1	6.385	.366	.546
GVIC SEX AGE	76.510	1	76.510	4.388	.037
GVIC SEX VIC	60.907	1	60.907	3.493	.063
GVIC AGE VIC	.414	1	.414	.024	.878
SEX AGE VIC	23.565	1	23.565	1.351	.246
4-way Interactions	87.035	5	17.407	.998	.420
ASSAULT GVIC SEX AGE	10.289	1	10.289	.590	.443
ASSAULT GVIC SEX VIC	10.293	1	10.293	.590	.443
ASSAULT GVIC AGE VIC	3.433	1	3.433	.197	.658
ASSAULT SEX AGE VIC	54.992	1	54.992	3.154	.077
GVIC SEX AGE VIC	6.300	1	6.300	.361	.548
5-way Interactions	18.452	1	18.452	1.058	.305
ASSAULT GVIC SEX AGE VIC	18.452	1	18.452	1.058	.305
Explained	2083.418	31	67.207	3.854	.000
Residual	3417.617	196	17.437		
Total	5501.035	227	24.234		

228 Cases were processed.

0 Cases (.0 PCT) were missing.

REFERENCES

- Aderman, D., Brehm, S. S., & Katz, L. B. (1974). Empathic observation of an innocent victim: The just world revisited. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 29(3), 342-347.
- Aderman, D., Archer, R. L., & Harris, J. L. (1975). Effect of emotional empathy on attribution of responsibility. Journal of Personality, 43, 156-167.
- Bard, M., & Sangrey, D. (1979). The crime victims' book. New York: Basic books.
- Barnett, M. A., Feierstein, M. D., Jaet, B. P., & Saunders, L. C. (1992). Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7(1), 44-56.
- Barnett, M. A., Feighny, K. M., & Esper, J. A. (1983). Effects of anticipated victim responsiveness and empathy upon volunteering. Journal of Social Psychology, 119, 211-218.
- Barnett, M. A., Tetreault, P. A., & Esper, J. A. (1986). Similarity and empathy: The experience of rape. Journal of Social Psychology, 126(1), 47-49.
- Barnett, M. A., Tetreault, P. A., & Masbad, I. (1987). Empathy with a rape victim: The role of similarity of experience. Violence and Victims, 2(4), 255-262.

- Barnett, M. A., Thompson, M. A., & Pfeifer, J. R. (1985). Perceived competence to help and the arousal of empathy. The Journal of Social Psychology, 125(5), 679-680.
- Carmines, E. G., & Zeller, R. A. (1979). Reliability and validity assessment. Beverly Hills, London: Sage Publications.
- Connors, J., & Heaven, P. C. (1990). Belief in a just world and attitudes toward AIDS sufferers. Journal of Social Psychology, 130(4), 559-560.
- Cosgray, R. E., Davidhizar, R. E., Grostefon, J. D. & Powell, M. (1990). A day in the life of an inpatient: An experiential game to promote empathy for individuals in a psychiatric hospital. Archives of Psychiatric Nursing, 4(6), 354-359.
- Crowne, D., & Marlowe, D. (1964). The approval motive. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Deitz, S. R., Blackwell, K. T., Daley, P. C., & Bentley, B. B. (1982). Measurement of empathy toward rape victim and rapists. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43(2), 372-384.
- Deitz, S. R., & Byrnes, L. E. (1981). Attribution of responsibility for sexual assault: The influence of observer empathy, defendant occupation, and defendant attractiveness. Journal of Psychology, 108, 17-29.

- Dillard, J. P., & Hunter, J. E. (1989). On the use and interpretation of the emotional scale, the self-consciousness scales, and the self-monitoring scale. Communication Research, 16(1), 104-129.
- Eisenberg, N., & Fahees, R. A. (1990). Empathy: Conceptualization, measurement, and relation to prosocial behavior. Motivation and Emotion, 14(2), 131-149.
- Feshbach, N. D., & Roe, K. V. (1968). Empathy in six- and seven-year-olds. Child Development, 34, 133-145.
- Frieze, I., Hymer, S., & Greenberg, M. S. (1987). Describing the crime victim: Psychological reactions to victimization. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18(4), 299-315.
- Frieze, I. H., & McHugh, M. C. (1985). The psychology of victimization. In Carol Tauris (Ed.), Every woman's guide to well-being, New York: Nelson Doubleday Books.
- Gottfredson, G. D., & Reiser, M., Tsegaye-Spates, C. R. (1987). Psychological Help for Victims of Crime. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18(4), 316-325.
- Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1977). Sex differences in empathy and related behaviors. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 712-722.

- Janoff-Bulman, R., & Frieze, I. H. (1983). A theoretical perspective for understanding reactions to victimization. Journal of Social Issues, 39(2), 1-17.
- Kalliopuska, M. (1981). Prosociality rating scale. (Unpublished manuscript, University of Helsinki).
- Kalliopuska, M., & Tiitinen, U. (1991). Influence of two developmental programmes on the empathy and prosociality of preschool children. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 72(1), 323-328.
- Kautzmann, L. N. (1992). Using literature to educate students: Images of caregivers in poetry and prose. Educational Gerontology, 18(1), 17-26.
- Kilpatrick, D. G., Saunders, B. E., Amick-McMullan, A., Best, C. L., Veronen, L. J., & Resnick, H. S. (1989). Victim and crime factors associated with the development of crime-related post-traumatic stress disorder. Behavior Therapy, 20, 199-214.
- Knudten, R. D., Meade, A. C., Knudten, M. S., & Doener, W. G. (1977). Victims and witnesses: Their experience with crime and the criminal justice system (Executive Summary). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Kramer, D., Ber, R., & Moore, M. (1989). Increasing empathy among medical students. Medical Education, 23(2), 168-173.

- Kremer, J. F., & Dietzen, L. L. (1991). Two approaches to teaching accurate empathy to undergraduates: Teacher-intensive and self-directed. Journal of College Student Development, 32(1), 69-75.
- Lerner, M. (1970). The desire for justice and reactions to victims. In J. Macaulay & L. Berkowitz (Eds.), Altruism and helping behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Malvik, E. (1975). Society blames the victim of the crime. Science Digest, 77, 64-69.
- Mehrabian, A., & Epstein, N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. Journal of Personality, 40, 525-543.
- Mizwa, M. M. (1989). The victim empathy scale: A measure of emotional empathy for victims of violent crime. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND.
- Reiff, R. (1979). The invisible victim: The criminal justice system's forgotten responsibility. New York: Basic Books.
- Sales, B., Rich, R. F., & Reich, J. (1987). Victimization policy research. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18(4), 326-337.
- Snyder, M. (1992). A gender-informed model of couple and family therapy: Relationship enhancement therapy. Contemporary Family Therapy - An International Journal, 14(1), 15-31.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the attitudes toward women scale (AWS).

Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 2, 219-220.

Symonds, M. (1980). The second injury. In L. Kivens (Ed.), Evaluation and change: Services for survivors (pp. 36-38). Minneapolis, MN: Minneapolis Medical Research Foundation.

Task Force on the Victims of Crime and Violence (1985). Executive summary: Final report of the APA task force on the victims of crime and violence. American Psychologist, 40(1), 107-112.

Thakkar, B. M., & Kamekar, S. (1989). Dispositional empathy and causal attribution as determinants of estimated willingness to help. Irish Journal of Psychology, 10(3), 381-387.

U. S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1984). The economic cost of crime to victims. (Report NCJ-93450). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1986). Uniform Crime Reports for 1986. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1992). Criminal Victimization 1991. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

- U. S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (1987). Criminal Victimization. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice (1987). Helping crime victims. (Report 203). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Weir, K. & Duveen, G. (1981). Further development and validation of the Prosocial Behavior Questionnaire for use by teachers Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 22, 357-374.
- Walser, E. (1966). Assignment of responsibility for an accident. Journal of Personal & Social Psychology, 3, 73-79.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1973). Personality and prediction: Principles of personality assessment. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Wollman, N., Griggs, G., & Stouder, R. (1989-1990). The effects of bystander sex and visibility of victim on intended helping. Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 9(2), 141-146.