

8-11-2007

Keep your friends close and your enemies closer: establishing the reliability and validity of the enemy impact inventory

Amanda Gail Smith

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td>

Recommended Citation

Smith, Amanda Gail, "Keep your friends close and your enemies closer: establishing the reliability and validity of the enemy impact inventory" (2007). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2896.
<https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td/2896>

This Graduate Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Scholars Junction. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholars Junction. For more information, please contact scholcomm@msstate.libanswers.com.

KEEP YOUR FRIENDS CLOSE AND YOUR ENEMIES CLOSER:
ESTABLISHING THE RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY
OF THE ENEMY IMPACT INVENTORY

By

Amanda Gail Smith

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of
Mississippi State University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Science
in Clinical Psychology
in the Department of Arts and Sciences

Mississippi State, Mississippi

August 2007

KEEP YOUR FRIENDS CLOSE AND YOUR ENEMIES CLOSER:
ESTABLISHING THE RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY
OF THE ENEMY IMPACT INVENTORY

By

Amanda Gail Smith

Approved:

H. Colleen Sinclair
Assistant Professor of Psychology
(Director of Thesis)

Virginia E. Fee
Associate Professor of Psychology
(Committee Member)

Philip Drumheller
Adjunct Professor of Psychology
(Committee Member)

Kevin J. Armstrong
Graduate Coordinator for
Department of Psychology

Gary L. Myers
Interim Dean of the
College of Arts & Sciences

Name: Amanda Gail Smith

Date of Degree: August 11, 2007

Institution: Mississippi State University

Major Field: Psychology (Clinical)

Major Professor: Dr. H. Colleen Sinclair

Title of Study: KEEP YOUR FRIENDS CLOSE AND YOUR ENEMIES CLOSER:
ESTABLISHING THE RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE
ENEMY IMPACT INVENTORY

Pages in Study: 105

Candidate for Degree of Master of Science

The present study focused on establishing the reliability and validity of the Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) and integrating basic needs theory in the development of the scale. The data supported that enemies can have both a negative *and* positive influences on: (a) our self-regard, (b) our relationships, (c) our ability to attain goals, (d) our ability to trust, and (e) our ability to feel in control of our lives. The overall reliability of the Enemy Impact Inventory (EII-R) was .87. The reliabilities for the individual negative and positive halves of the EII-R were .92 and .95 respectively. Also, all subscales within the EII-R yielded reliabilities above .82. Low to moderate correlations with existing measures confirmed the discriminant validity of the EII-R. Accordingly, the results of the present study contribute to the field by offering a sound, theory-grounded measure of the quality of enemyships unseen thus far in the literature.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this project in loving memory of my beloved great uncle, Paul David Smith, a man who spent his life looking for the good things in everyone, even those attempting to be his enemies. I also dedicate this project to my parents, Ron and Brenda Smith, my sister and brother in-law, Rhonda and Brad Kavan, the love of my life, Adam Mayatt, my dedicated cheerleader, Jacqueline Bell, and my grandparents. Without their enduring support, patience, and faith, I would not be the woman I am today let alone have been able to complete this project.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my sincerest gratitude to my thesis committee chair, Dr. Colleen Sinclair, for her guidance, dedication, and enduring patience as I slowly, but surely, found my way. I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation to my committee members, Dr. Virginia Fee and Dr. Philip Drumheller, for their valuable contributions of time and direction as well as their dedication to this project. In addition, I would like to express my gratitude to the 2006-2007 Mississippi State University Advanced Social Psychology Lab for their assistance with survey development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| DEDICATION | ii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iii |
| LIST OF TABLES | vii |
| CHAPTER | |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Mutual Antipathies and Enemies | 2 |
| Types of Impact | 4 |
| Basic Needs Theory | 5 |
| Impact Valence | 7 |
| Statement of Purpose..... | 8 |
| II. METHOD | 11 |
| Participants | 11 |
| Materials | 11 |
| Descriptive Measure | 11 |
| Enemy Demographics Questionnaire (EDQ) | 12 |
| New Measure: Determining Reliability and Factor Structure | 14 |
| Revision of Sinclair’s (2004) Enemy Impact Inventory (EII-R) | 14 |
| Existing Measures: Determining Validity | 16 |
| Peer Social Exclusion Scale – Revised (PSE-R) | 17 |
| Friendship Quality Questionnaire (FQQ) | 18 |
| Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) | 19 |
| Need to Belong Scale (NTB)..... | 20 |
| UCLA Loneliness Scale (UCLALS)..... | 20 |
| Paranoia Scale (FVPS) | 20 |
| Personal Style Inventory (PSI) – Hypersensitivity Subscale | 21 |
| Online Survey Procedure | 21 |
| Statistical Procedure | 23 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| | Determining Reliability of the EII-R..... | 23 |
| | Confirming the Basic Needs Structure of the EII-R..... | 23 |
| | Determining Validity of the EII-R..... | 24 |
| III. | RESULTS..... | 25 |
| | Antipathy Descriptive Statistics..... | 25 |
| | Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R): Reliability Analyses | 28 |
| | Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R): Factor Analysis of | |
| | Positive Subscales | 30 |
| | Purpose..... | 30 |
| | Elimination Protocol..... | 31 |
| | Analysis..... | 31 |
| | Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R): Factor Analysis of | |
| | Negative Subscales | 33 |
| | Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R): Factor Analysis of | |
| | Entire Inventory..... | 34 |
| | Correlations of Subscales | 35 |
| | EII-R Descriptive Statistics | 37 |
| | Correlations with Enemy Demographics Questionnaire (EDQ)..... | 37 |
| | Discriminant Validity of the Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised | |
| | (EII-R)..... | 39 |
| IV. | DISCUSSION..... | 43 |
| | Review of Hypotheses..... | 43 |
| | Review of Findings | 43 |
| | Caveats | 45 |
| | Types of Impact | 47 |
| | Impact Valence | 48 |
| | Individual Differences in Impact | 50 |
| | Utility of Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) | 52 |
| | Future Research..... | 53 |
| | REFERENCES..... | 55 |
| | NOTES..... | 58 |
| | APPENDIX | |
| | A. TABLES..... | 59 |
| | B. ONLINE SURVEY ANNOUNCEMENT | 70 |
| | C. INTRODUCTORY TEXT | 72 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| D. FRIENDS AND FOES QUESTIONNAIRE..... | 74 |
| E. ENEMY DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE (EDQ) | 76 |
| F. ENEMY IMPACT INVENTORY – REVISED (EII-R)..... | 79 |
| G. PEER SOCIAL EXCLUSION SCALE – REVISED (PSE-R)..... | 84 |
| H. FRIENDSHIP QUALITY QUESTIONNAIRE (FQQ)..... | 90 |
| I. MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALE OF PERCEIVED SOCIAL SUPPORT (MSPSS)..... | 92 |
| J. NEED TO BELONG SCALE (NTB) | 94 |
| K. UCLA LONELINESS SCALE (UCLALS)..... | 96 |
| L. PARANOIA SCALE (FVPS)..... | 98 |
| M. PERSONAL STYLE INVENTORY – HYPERSENSITIVITY SUBSCALE (PSI-H/S)..... | 100 |
| N. CLOSING TEXT..... | 102 |
| O. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER..... | 104 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE | | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| A1 | Reliabilities of Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) Subscales . | 60 |
| A2 | Factor Analysis of Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R)..... | 61 |
| A3 | Correlation of Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) Subscales .. | 66 |
| A4 | Descriptive Statistics for Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) Subscales..... | 67 |
| A5 | Correlations of Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) Subscales and Enemy Demographic Questionnaire (EDQ) Items | 68 |
| A6 | Correlations of Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) and Validity Measures..... | 69 |

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

*It is difficult to say who do you the most mischief:
enemies with the worst intentions or friends with the best.*

-- E. R. Bulwer-Lytton (Quotes, n.d.)

Although current research concerning the influence of friends is continually growing (e.g., Hartup & Stevens, 1997; Rose & Asher, 2000), research involving the impact of one's enemies remains limited (Pope, 2003; Witkow, Bellmore, Nishina, Juvonen, & Graham, 2005). Yet, as Bulwer-Lytton's quote suggests, one's enemies may be as great an influence to one's self as one's friends. In fact, according to Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finkenauer, and Vohs' (2001) review of the positive-negative asymmetry effect, enemy relationships may even have a greater impact on an individual's self-concept and emotional well-being than relationships with friends (see also Abecassis, 2003). To explore this, in the present study, we sought to establish the reliability and validity of a scale that will help measure the impact of enemies on one's ability to fulfill basic needs.

Mutual Antipathies and Enemies

First, it is important to clarify what we mean by “enemy.” An enemy relationship (or “enemyship” as coined by Wiseman & Duck, 1995) is a type of mutual antipathy. A mutual antipathy is defined as a relationship characterized by reciprocal dislike between two people (Abecassis, 2003; Hartup, 2003; Witkow et al., 2005). Due to the hatred, as opposed to a less severe dislike, often characteristic of an enemy relationship, enemies are considered the most extreme form of mutual antipathy (Abecassis, 2003).

Applying this definition of mutual antipathies, a number of researchers have found that having an antipathy is not an uncommon occurrence. Mutual antipathies, including enemy relationships, have been commonly observed within each population that has been studied thus far (Abecassis, 2003; Hodges & Card, 2003; Pope, 2003; Rodkin, Pearl, Farmer, & Van Acker, 2003). The majority of research focuses on a younger population, particularly elementary school children. Recent studies, for example, report that between 20% and 65% of elementary children are involved in an enemy relationship (Hodges & Card, 2003; Pope, 2003; Rodkin, et al., 2003). Also, Nishina and colleagues (2005) found that up to 75% of secondary school students report having participated in a mutual antipathy. Although studies involving enemies in an adult population have been conducted to a lesser extent, Abecassis (2003) found that an estimated 70% of adults report either current or past involvement in a relationship with an enemy.

Although it is evident that mutual antipathies are fairly common, it is important to note that not all inimical relationships are created equal. Mutual antipathies have been

found to vary on a number of dimensions. In fact, Wiseman and Duck (1995) identified a number of characteristics on which mutual antipathies differ. For example, as already noted, enemies differ from other antipathies with regard to the *degree of dislike or hatred* in the relationship. In an enemy relationship, the individuals involved feel more than a simple dislike for one another. Instead, enemies experience hatred for one another. However, enemies might also vary to the extent that they are aware of the degree of animosity their adversary feels. Some may know full well the extent of the hatred their foe feels, while others may remain relatively oblivious – thinking they are unique in their hatred for their foe. Wiseman and Duck (1995) identified this *level of awareness* as another important differentiation between types of mutual antipathies.

A third dimension Wiseman and Duck (1995) identified was the *degree of passivity* in the actions of the adversaries. Active enemies are those who purposefully seek out one another with the intent to cause harm. For example, an active enemy will take the time to directly confront his/her target. On the other hand, a passive enemy is one who does not purposefully seek out his/her target in order to cause harm, and may not put forth the effort to, for example, sabotage his/her foe. However, that does not mean that s/he would not take advantage of an opportunity should it arise or that s/he will not retaliate when confronted. Any enemy relationship can vary on any of these types of dimensions among others.

Perhaps one of the most discussed variations in mutual antipathies is the level of social exclusion experienced by members of the enemyship. It is important to note that enemyships are distinct from simply being socially excluded. Although previous studies

have shown that social rejection is linked to enemy relationships - as it is common for the socially rejected to have enemies - there are several ways in which the experience of being socially rejected is not the same as having an enemy (Pope, 2003). For instance, evidence suggests that many non-rejected individuals have enemies (Hartup, 2003; Pope, 2003). Also, certain types of excluded individuals – namely those neglected as opposed to actively rejected – may not warrant any attention be it positive or negative. Despite this distinction, most research fails to differentiate between those who feel hatred, those who feel simple dislike (e.g., experience antipathies that are not necessarily mutual enemyships), and those who are simply excluded. As such, a unique contribution of the present study was to attempt to attain new information on those who have experienced an enemyship while including both types of individuals: those who have been socially excluded and those who have been socially accepted.

Types of Impact

Another contribution of the current study is that we examined the type of impact enemies have. Generally, while friendships are frequently thought of as having a positive impact on the lives of those involved, enemyships are more often thought to have a negative impact (Pope, 2003; Witkow et al., 2005). It has been suggested that enemies have both an emotional and cognitive influence (Wiseman & Duck, 1995, Nishina et al., 2005). With regard to emotional impact, research suggests that enemyships may increase depressive symptoms, social anxiety, loneliness, and decrease self-worth (Nishina et al., 2005). Enemies are also argued to have a potential impact on cognitions about one's self,

such as shaping the extent to which one sees oneself as a competent person (Abecassis, 2003; Nishina et al., 2005). However, the research on the impact of enemies does not go much beyond speculation. The lack of concrete findings concerning the influence of enemies may be due to a lack of measures. Accordingly, in order to assess an enemy's impact, a scale is needed that examines the *degree* of influence enemies have on our lives as well as examines the *type* of impact.

Basic Needs Theory

The Enemy Impact Inventory (EII) was designed to do just that: assess not only the degree of enemy impact on one's life, but also the type of impact. To operationalize the types of impact enemies might have, we integrated basic needs theory (see Staub, 2004, for review of the origins of the basic needs perspective). From the existing research, a picture is beginning to form about who and what enemies are, but less is known about what they do. In this paper, we use basic needs theory to provide a framework for better understanding the nature and impact of enemy behavior. Staub (2004) has proposed that there are five fundamental human needs. Of the basic needs he outlines, we are arguing that three are relevant to the discussion of the type of impact enemy relationships might have: (a) need for control, (b) need for a positive identity, and (c) need for connection. Specifically, an enemy may take away one's feeling of control by teasing him/her about something s/he cannot change (e.g. such as his/her family's socioeconomic status). Also, it is generally thought that enemies will have a negative impact on self-esteem and positive identity (Nishina et al., 2005), as it is assumed that

many enemies will degrade their foes with verbal harassment. Further, our basic need for connection can be impacted if an enemy interferes with other relationships and causes a disconnection within those relationships. For example, an enemy may try to steal romantic partners or sabotage friendships by telling them negative rumors. In either scenario, the enemy has succeeded in disconnecting the individual from others.

That enemies might affect these three basic needs is supported by Williams' (2001) research on a topic related to enemies: research on ostracism. In his research, Williams (2001) has defined four needs that are threatened by ostracism: need to belong, need to maintain self-esteem, need to have personal control over one's social environment, and need to have a meaningful existence (synonymous with the need for purpose and to feel effective). Williams (2007) then added the need for purpose to Staub's (2004) aforementioned list because he argues that ostracism, just like enemyships, can threaten one's ability to complete goal-oriented tasks such as homework. In fact, in the original pilot of the Enemy Impact Inventory (Sinclair, 2004), the factor analysis indicated that there was a sub-set of items that seemed to inquire about the extent to which enemies affected our ability to get work done and excel in school/career. Thus, it appears that there is preliminary support for Williams' assertion that the need for purpose is another fundamental need affected by experiencing rejecting relationships – be it ostracism or enemyships.

Recently, in an in press work, Williams amended his original list of the types of needs impacted by ostracism to accommodate Fiske's (2004) argument that the need for trust is a unique fundamental motivation. Fiske (2004) argued that in order for individuals

to be psychologically healthy, they need to feel they can trust the world and the people in it. Originally, Williams had included the need to trust under the need for connection, believing that lack of trust was primarily manifested in interpersonal interactions. However, his research has come to show that the need for trust in a safe world is separate from the need to belong. As such, he asserts that trust is also a basic need that ostracism threatens. For example, with regard to enemyships, consider the close friend who betrays you and becomes your enemy. Likely, this would impact your willingness to trust others in the future. Indeed, the need for trust appeared as a unique factor in the first pilot of the EII, where a subset of items, such as “Made me question who I could trust,” clustered together.

The other factors that emerged in the original EII included items that assessed how enemyships affected one’s relationships (i.e. need to belong) and one’s self-image (i.e. need for positive self-regard). The revision of the EII includes items to measure the need for control, as these were not originally included but are argued to be important by Williams (2001). With these new items, then, the revised EII was intended to address the possible effects of enemies on the five needs of trust, control, purpose, belonging, and positive self-regard. In addition, there was one further change that was implemented into the new EII. We believed that the *type* of impact enemies have may not only vary in what basic needs enemies affect, but they may also vary in *valence* of impact.

Impact Valence

To date research has focused on the negative impact of mutual antipathies. However, Abecassis (2003) presented the possibility of a positive impact of mutual

antipathies. Abecassis suggested that enemies could be both exciting and motivating and may facilitate other peer relationships. For example, two individuals who are targeted by the same enemy may form a friendship between them based on the foundation of the shared enemy. If “the enemy of my enemy becomes my friend” one’s need to belong would benefit, as opposed to suffer, due to the enemyship. Also, Abecassis pointed out that enemies may help individuals deal with unacceptable aspects of themselves thus aiding self-concept development. Individuals may externalize the negative aspects as themselves and project them onto their enemies. For example, an individual who does not do well in school may argue that their poor performance is not his/her fault, but rather that it is due to his/her enemy sabotaging him/her. Furthermore, enemies may motivate individuals to try harder, be better, and compete (Abecassis, 2003); thereby positively affecting one’s goal achievement and facilitating one satiating his/her need for purpose. Again, Abecassis’ arguments were largely speculative. Nonetheless, with Abecassis’ suggestions in mind, we investigated the possibility that enemies might have both a negative and positive impact.

Statement of Purpose

As can be ascertained, the primary focus of the present study was the further development of the Enemy Impact Inventory (EII). Abecassis (2003) suggested that there is a need for improvements in measuring enemies. Currently, the majority of research uses peer nomination to measure the quantity of one’s enemies. While peer nomination allows the subject to specifically name an individual, it lacks the ability to measure the

quality of the enemy and the type of existing antipathy. Further, it is limited in use to the K-12 population because most colleges do not have the same small classroom setting wherein everyone knows everyone else well enough to nominate them. In order to address the need for a more thorough measure, the Enemy Impact Inventory (EII) was designed with a pre-existing peer relationship quality scale in mind. Specifically, the original EII was developed to mirror Parker and Asher's (1993) Friendship Quality Questionnaire (FQQ). By measuring the level of reciprocal support behaviors exchanged between friends, the FQQ has been shown to be a robust and reliable measure of friendship quality. For example, the FQQ item "My friends were people who stuck up for me if people talked about me behind my back," speaks to the quality of a friend's dedication to the friendship. In contrast, the EII was developed to measure the quality of one's enemies. What was not known was whether the EII was as reliable or valid as the FQQ. The present study focused on establishing the reliability and validity of the EII-R while also integrating theory to facilitate the development of the scale and conducting the study of enemyships in an adult, as opposed to child, population.

In summary, we examined the type of impact, both positive and negative, that different enemies might have within the following categories: the influence enemies have on (a) how we think about ourselves (i.e., need for positive self-regard), (b) our relationships with others (i.e., need for belonging), (c) our ability to attain our goals and find purpose (i.e., need for purpose), (d) our ability to trust (i.e., need for trust), and (e) our ability to feel in control of our life (i.e., need for control). Our specific goals were as follows:

H1) We sought to verify each category as distinct and establish the reliability and validity of the EII-R.

H2) We expected the reliability of the EII-R to be consistent with the reliability of the original EII.

H3a) We also expected the factor analysis of the EII-R to confirm the basic needs framework of the items.

H3b) Further, we anticipated the positive and negative halves of the EII-R subscales to load separately, indicating that the positive items were not simply reversals of the negative items.

H4) Lastly, in order to establish the EII-R's discriminant validity, we expected the EII-R to be distinct from related scales such as Sinclair's (2004) Peer Social Exclusion Scale and Parker and Asher's (1993) Friendship Quality Questionnaire.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Participants

Three hundred undergraduate students attending Mississippi State University partook in the present study for credit in their Psychology courses. Of the 300 participants, four stated that they did not have an antipathy and were subsequently eliminated from the sample. The remaining 296 participants ranged in age from 17 – 38, with an average age of 19.76 ($SD = 2.40$). One participant did not report his/her age. The sample was 38.2% male and 61.8% female. The majority of the sample was Caucasian (72.6%) or African American (24.3%). The remaining participants were Asian or Pacific Islander (0.7%), Hispanic- or Latin-American (0.7%), multi- or bi-racial (0.3%), or Other (1.4%). Participants completed the survey titled “Keep Your Friends Close and Your Enemies Closer” online via the Sona-Systems experimental administration program. The average time to complete the online survey was approximately 58 minutes.

Materials

Descriptive Measures

The following measure was used to gain insight as to the demographics of one’s worst enemy.

Enemy Demographics Questionnaire (EDQ). The EDQ was created for this study. It asked participants to paint the picture of their most impactful antipathy. The participant was asked to specify the time frame in which this antipathy occurred (year of high school or year of college). Then questions followed asking about a variety of characteristics of that relationship which included the gender of one's enemy, the length of the enemyship, and the type of pre-existing relationship (e.g., friend, stranger, romantic partner). Additional criteria reported in this study were developed based, primarily, on Wiseman and Ducks' (1995) article (see Appendix E for a copy of the scale).

To review, Wiseman and Duck (1995) suggested a variety of ways in which antipathies differ: degree of dislike/hatred (i.e., feeling hatred toward one's enemy as opposed to dislike), level of awareness of the enemy (i.e., being fully aware of the reciprocal hatred from one's enemy as opposed to feeling unique in one's hatred toward the enemy), and degree of passivity (i.e., active enemy purposefully seeks out ways to harm his/her target as opposed to an enemy putting forth no effort to cause harm). Items were constructed for the Enemy Demographics Questionnaire to assess these criteria. The item used to assess degree of dislike/hatred was, "With regard to your enemy, what would you say is the level of dislike? How do you feel about your enemy?" responded to on a 7-point Likert scale (1=*Just Didn't/Don't Like*; 7=*Hate Strongly*). Level of awareness was assessed with an item stating, "How aware are you of how your enemy felt about you?" responded to on a 7-point Likert scale (1=*Knew Nothing*; 7=*Knew Full Well*).

Finally, degree of passivity of one's antipathy was assessed with the following item: "Sometimes an enemy can be obvious (=overt) about his/her dislike and will engage in behaviors that *directly* target you and are intended to make you feel bad or just convey that s/he doesn't like you to you and anyone who was watching (e.g. fight with you, yell at you, call you names to your face, challenge you). Other times an enemy will be more sneaky, less obvious (covert), and will do things behind your back, not confront you directly, and will generally engage in more *indirect* tactics intended to harm you (e.g. talk about you, give you the silent treatment, ruin relationships with others, get you in trouble). Thinking about the way your enemy behaved, did s/he use mostly *indirect* tactics or *direct* tactics?" The same question was then asked concerning the participant's tactics toward his/her antipathy. These items were responded to on a 7-point Likert scale (1=*Always Indirect*; 7=*Always Direct*).

The following item was also included to assess the level of mutuality of the relationships reported as an essential aspect of the definition of an enemy categorizes it as a *mutual* exchange relationship: "With regard to your enemy, was the feeling of dislike mutual? Or did you dislike them more than they disliked you? Or, for some reason, did they just dislike you more than you disliked them?" This item was responded to on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *I disliked them a lot more than they disliked me*; 4 = *It was completely mutual. We disliked each other equally*; 7 = *S/he disliked me a lot more than I disliked them*). In addition, an item was included to assess the gender of one's antipathy as Abecassis, Hartup, Haselager, Scholte, and Van Lieshout (2002) have shown that same-sex vs. opposite-sex enemies have different effects on psychosocial outcomes.

Lastly the following item was included to assess the type of pre-existing relationship prior to the formation of the enemyship: “Sometimes people in our lives betray us or relationships don’t work out. Friends and acquaintances can become enemies. Please choose the number of the relationship you had to your enemy prior to this person becoming an enemy.” This item was responded to using the following scale: 1 = *Romantic Partner*; 2 = *Best Friend*; 3 = *Had Close Relationship*; 4 = *Friend*; 5 = *Friendly Acquaintance*; 6 = *Stranger*; 7 = *Disliked Acquaintance*; 8 = *Always an Enemy*.

New Measure: Determining Reliability and Factor Structure. The focus of the current study was on the development of the Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R). As such, the EII-R was completed after participants described a specific antipathy in the EDQ.

Revision of Sinclair’s (2004) Enemy Impact Inventory (EII-R). The EII was originally developed by Sinclair (2004) and included 39 items, of which three were reversed, inquiring about the negative influence one’s high school enemy had on how one felt, thought, and acted. This scale was adapted for the present study to include 91 trial items to which participants responded with regard to the peer who caused them the most grief. Also the 6-point Likert scale (1=*Completely agree*, 6=*Completely disagree*) utilized for the EII was expanded to an 8-point rating scale (1=*Strongly agree*; 8=*Strongly disagree*). High scores on the EII-R indicate that participants’ agreed with statements such as, “My foes were people who tried to make other people dislike me,” and “My foes

were people who made me worry about what they'd do next" (see Appendix F for a copy of the scale). Thus, a high score on the EII-R indicates that enemies had a strong impact.

According to the results of the factor analysis, the original EII broke down into four factors: Internal Impact, Relational Impact, Academic Impact, and Trust Impact. The first subscale, Internal Impact, included 15 items and focused on how the enemy made the participant feel about him/herself. It had a reliability of $\alpha = .93$. The second factor, Relational Impact, included eight items and addressed enemies' influence on participants' relationships and had a reliability of $\alpha = .91$. Academic Impact, the third factor, had a reliability of $\alpha = .88$ and focused on how the participants' enemies were obstacles to the individual accomplishing their academic goals. The Academic Impact factor included nine items. The final factor of the original EII, Trust Impact, included eight items and concentrated on how enemies' impacted the participants' ability to trust and had a reliability of $\alpha = .80$. All items focused on the negative impact of enemyships. (All data from Sinclair, 2004.)

The revised edition of the EII strived to replicate the validity of the original factors with the following changes. First, as the trust factor included the fewest items, additional items were constructed to make the measure more robust. Second, additional items were developed to assess the impact on the need for control as these were not previously included. Third, all scales were doubled by the addition of items to assess the potential positive impact of enemies as well as the negative effects. For example, a negative item for the need for control was, "My foes were people who made me feel trapped," and a positive item for the need for control was, "My foes were people who

made me learn self-control.” It was our hypothesis that the categories of positive vs. negative impact were not mutually exclusive. In that, we believed that it was possible for an enemy to have both a positive and negative influence on the same person.

Accordingly, analyses were conducted for both the Positive Enemy Impact (PEII-R) and Negative Enemy Impact (NEII-R) separately, as well as combined.

Within each of the positive and negative halves of the EII-R, five factors were expected to emerge. The five factors were anticipated to clearly identify enemies’ impacts on one’s five basic needs. Like the original Relational Impact subscale, the newly revised Impact on Belonging subscale included items that centered on one’s need to seek and maintain affiliation with others. A second subscale, Impact on Trust, included items focused on the influence of enemies over one’s ability to trust others and the world. A third subscale, Impact on Positive Self-Regard, was created with the original Internal Impact subscale in mind. The Impact on Positive Self-Regard subscale focused on how enemies made the participant feel about him/herself. A fourth subscale, Impact on Purpose/Goals, was a more thorough version of the original Academic Impact subscale with the addition of items focused on attainment of goals in general rather than only academic goals. The final subscale we anticipated emerging, Impact on Control, was constructed to include items that focused on the ability of enemies to affect one’s ability to be in control of his/her life.

Existing Measures: Determining Validity. The following measures were used to establish the validity of the Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised. Establishing concurrent validity for the Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) was difficult as we found no

currently published measures focusing on qualities of mutual antipathies. Therefore, discriminant validity was established by making sure that, while the EII-R items may be related to some of the variables the subsequent scales measure, the EII-R was measuring a unique construct – enemy impact. The following scales were included to determine construct validity.

Peer Social Exclusion Scale - Revised (PSE-R). The PSE-R (Sinclair, 2004) was developed to help categorize individuals as either socially accepted or socially excluded. The PSE-R includes 40 items, 10 of which are reversed for acceptance, with an overall reliability of $\alpha = .94$. Participants indicate their degree of agreement on a 6-point Likert scale (1=*strongly disagree*, 6=*strongly agree*). A high score suggests a high level of social exclusion. Items include statements such as: “Few people notice me,” and “I feel isolated” (see Appendix G for copy of scale).

In the present study, participants answered each item twice: once with regard to their high school experience and once with regard to their current experience. By asking about both high school and current experiences, we aimed to gain insight to the participant’s history of social exclusion. As mentioned in the introduction, we wanted to explore the impact of enemyships on the lives of both types of individuals: socially accepted and socially excluded. We also wanted to establish that having an enemy was distinct from being socially excluded. As participants responded about an enemy either in college or high school, we asked about both time periods on the PSE-R so we could assess the degree of social exclusion at the time of the enemy relationship. Inclusion of the PSE-R allowed us to assess the degree of overlap between the constructs.

Friendship Quality Questionnaire (FQQ). The FQQ (Parker & Asher, 1993) includes 39 items, of which seven are reversed. The FQQ measures the quality of one's friends by assessing the behaviors of those friends. As with the EII-R, participants indicated their degree of agreement on an 8-point Likert scale (1=*completely agree*, 8=*completely disagree*). Participants completed the scale with regard to their best friend from the same time frame as the worst enemy they reported for the Enemy Demographics Questionnaire and EII-R. Accordingly, if they completed the EDQ and EII-R about a high school enemy, they also completed the FQQ with regard to their best friend in high school. A high score indicates that the participant's relationship with his/her best friend was strong and positive. Like the items included in the EII-R, the FQQ includes items such as, "My friends were people with whom I shared problems and vice versa," and "My friends were people who encouraged me to succeed" (see Appendix H for a copy of the scale).

According to the Parker and Asher (1993), six factors emerged as subscales when a principal-components factor analysis was used: Intimate Exchange ($\alpha = .86$), Conflict Resolution ($\alpha = .73$), Companionship and Recreation ($\alpha = .75$), Help and Guidance ($\alpha = .90$), Validation and Caring ($\alpha = .90$), and Conflict and Betrayal ($\alpha = .84$) (Parker & Asher, 1993). The Intimate Exchange subscale measures the extent of which the relationship is based on trust and personal disclosure. The Conflict Resolution subscale focuses on how well disagreements are resolved within the relationship. The Companionship and Recreation subscale focuses on the extent to which the individuals spend pleasurable time together. The Help and Guidance subscale measures the extent of

the individual's efforts to offer instrumental support to one another. While the Validation and Caring subscale focuses on the extent to which emotional support characterized the relationship, the Conflict and Betrayal subscale measures the extent to which disagreements and mistrust characterize the relationship. The Conflict and Betrayal items were reversed scored. Parker & Asher's (1993) original paper did not report the overall reliability. In Sinclair's (2004) study, the overall reliability of the FQQ was $\alpha = .95$. The FQQ was included in the present study as a validity measure to ensure that participants were not misconstruing a lack of quality friends as having antipathies. In particular, we focused on the Conflict and Betrayal subscale of the FQQ in order to show that having antipathies could be related to but was also distinct from having been betrayed by a friend.

Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS). As the MSPSS (Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley (1988)) is designed to measure the perceived adequacy of one's social support, it was used to test for those who feel they lack social support and who were misinterpreting this absence of support as the presence of antipathy (see Appendix I for a copy of the scale). The MSPSS includes 12 items which are broken down evenly (4 items each) into the following three subcategories relating to the three sources of social support: family ($\alpha = .87$), friends ($\alpha = .85$), and significant other ($\alpha = .91$). A 7-point Likert scale (1=*very strongly disagree*, 7=*very strongly agree*) is used in which a high score suggests a high level of perceived social support. The MSPSS has an overall reliability of $\alpha = .85$.

Need to Belong Scale (NTB). The NTB (Leary & Cottrell, 2001) assesses individual differences in the degree to which the individual feels that being accepted and fitting in is important. In using the NTB, we wanted to make sure that we were measuring the actual impact of enemyships instead of simply assessing one's perceived unfulfilled need to belong (see Appendix J for a copy of the scale). The NTB consists of 10 items, three of which are reversed, responded to on a 6-point Likert scale (1=*strongly disagree*, 6=*strongly agree*). A high score would indicate a stronger need to belong. As cited by Sinclair (2004), the NTB has a reliability of $\alpha = .83$.

UCLA Loneliness Scale (UCLALS). The UCLALS (Russell, 1996) was used to test for participants who were misinterpreting their lack of quality social interaction as having experienced antipathies (see Appendix K for a copy of the scale). The UCLALS is also used to assess the degree to which one's need for connection is unmet. The UCLALS assesses the participant's level of loneliness with 20 items, nine of which are reversed, on a 4-point Likert scale (1=*never*, 4=*always*). A high score indicates a high level of loneliness. The UCLALS has good reliability with reported internal consistencies ranging from .89 to .94.

Paranoia Scale (FVPS). The FVPS (Fenigstein & Venable, 1992) was used to test for the effect of paranoia on one's view of his/her enemy relationships (see Appendix L for a copy of the scale). It may have been that those who exhibited higher levels of paranoia over-perceived the presence of enemies; that is to say that perhaps they felt that everyone was out to get them. As such, if there was a high correlation between the FVPS

and EII-R it might indicate that enemy impact, or even the perception of enemies, would be a result of paranoia. The FVPS includes 20 items, none reversed, responded to on a 5-point Likert scale (1=*not at all applicable to me*, 5=*extremely applicable to me*). Thus, a high score indicates a high level of paranoia. The FVPS has an overall reliability of $\alpha = .84$.

Personal Style Inventory (PSI) – Hypersensitivity Subscale. The PSI (Sheriden, Radmacher, & Petren, 1997) is a measure of stress resiliency (see Appendix M for a copy of the scale). Of specific interest to us was the hypersensitivity subscale. In using this subscale of the PSI, we controlled for those who are hypersensitive to real or imagined criticism from others and self-criticism. In doing so, we were able to control for those who may have been misinterpreting criticism as an attack from an antipathy. Of the 19 yes/no items found in the subscale, three were reversed. A high score on the Hypersensitivity/Self-criticism subscale indicates a high degree of hypersensitivity. The Hypersensitivity/Self-criticism subscale has a reliability of $\alpha = .84$.

Online Survey Procedure

As the survey was administered online, it is important to consider the possible benefits and costs of administering the survey in this manner. Although research concerning the administration of surveys online is fairly new, available studies have shown that data from online surveys is similar to survey responses obtained in-person (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & John, 2004; Lehmler & Agnew, 2006). Further, online administration offers a number of benefits. Research suggests that false-responding does

not seem to be issue with online administration (Lehmiller & Agnew, 2006). For example, the anonymity of responding online may make participants feel more comfortable answering questions concerning their relationships. Also, online administration allowed us to administer the survey to a larger number of subjects in a shorter amount of time (Gosling et al., 2004). The oft-mentioned issue concerning online administration is the possibility that the same participant might respond to the survey multiple times (Kraut, R., Olson, J., Banaji, M., Bruckman, A., Cohen, J., & Couper, M., 2004; Lehmiller & Agnew, 2006). However, as participants had to log into the Sona-Systems website with a unique student net id, multiple participations by the same individual was improbable. While a student may have taken the same survey multiple times under different net ids should s/he have gotten a password and id from a friend, it was unlikely that a student would have committed to a lengthy survey more than once. Accordingly, we feel confident that administering the survey online was an efficient way of obtaining open and anonymous answers from a large subject pool.

We utilized Sona-Systems to run the entire survey online. In doing so, the online survey was set up so that the order of questionnaires was randomized to counterbalance the entire survey.¹ In addition, the order of the items within the questionnaires was also randomized. After the completion the survey, a debriefing screen appeared and the participant was thanked for their participation. Each participant was identified only by a unique code number. Participants signed up on a first come first serve basis. Once 300 participants completed the survey, the survey was taken down from the system.

Statistical Procedure

Determining Reliability of the EII-R. In order to determine the reliability of the EII-R, we ran an inter-item correlation reliability analysis for each of the ten subscales that yielded a Cronbach's alpha as an estimate of internal consistency. Criteria for selecting the best items included eliminating items for which the Cronbach's alpha would be higher if the item was deleted. Also, items having lower average inter-item correlations and lower item-total correlations were eliminated so that only the strongest items remained. We chose to eliminate items and keep only the best four to six items in order to create a scale that was shorter and more manageable to administer in future studies.

After the theoretical subscale reliability analyses were run, inter-item correlation reliability analyses were completed in order to look at the overall Negative EII-R and overall Positive EII-R inter-item correlations. Finally, a last reliability analysis was used to compute total scale reliability.

Confirming the Basic Needs Structure of the EII-R. With regard to the subscales of the EII-R (impact on needs for trust, control, purpose, belonging, and positive self-regard), we sought to verify the basic needs structure which provided the theory behind each subscale. In order to confirm the subscales' structure, we used a principal components analysis (eigenvalue: 1, varimax rotation). Items having a factor loading of greater than $\pm .40$ were considered to load well on a given factor. Elimination criteria included eliminating any factors that explained less than 3% of the variance and

eliminating factors that had only one or two items loading. Also excluded were items that did not load on any factor, items that loaded above $\pm.40$ on more than one factor, and items that loaded outside of our theoretical model (e.g. if an item conceived to be a belonging item loaded on the self-regard scale it was deleted).

In addition, factor analyses were ran with both the positive and negative halves of the EII-R in order to establish the basic needs structure of each subset of subscales as well as confirm that the positive EII-R items were not simply reversals of the negative EII-R items.

Determining Validity of the EII-R. To determine the discriminant validity of the EII-R we examined how the EII-R and its ten subscales correlated with existing measures. Specifically, we examined the EII-R's correlation with the following scales: Sinclair's (2004) Peer Social Exclusion Scale, Parker and Asher's (1993) Friendship Quality Questionnaire, Zimet and colleagues' (1998) Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS), Russell's UCLA (1996) Loneliness Scale (UCLALS), Fenigstein and Venable's (1992) Paranoia Scale (FVPS), Sheridan's (1997) Personal Style Inventory (PSI), and Leary and Cottrell's (2001) Need to Belong Scale (NTB). We anticipated small to moderate correlations with these scales, as it is not unreasonable to anticipate that they would be related to the EII-R. For example, having enemyships might enhance paranoia. However, we believed that the EII-R would be distinct from each of these scales, and so we hoped to not find the high correlations that would be indicative of a high degree of scale overlap, or, perhaps, of construct co-occurrence.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

To review, the primary foci of this study were to establish the reliability and validity of the Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) while also integrating theory to facilitate the development of the scale. In addition, we conducted the study of enemyships in a young adult, as opposed to a child population. We will start by providing sample descriptive statistics and move to the results of the statistical procedures used to establish the reliability and validity of the EII-R.

Antipathy Descriptive Statistics

According to the Enemy Demographics Questionnaire, the highest percentage of enemies reported fell within the participants' senior year of high school (33.1%). However, for other participants, enemies were reported as being from each of the following academic years: freshman year of high school (12.9%), sophomore year of high school (10.9%), junior year of high school (8.6%), freshman year of college (18.5%), sophomore year of college (8.6%), junior year of college (4%), and senior year of college (2.6%). On average, the length of the enemyship was 26.82 months or just over two

years. The length of the reported enemyships varied greatly with a range of less than a month to 228 months with a standard deviation of 37.13 months.

The majority of participants reported that their enemy was of the same gender as themselves (79.1%). Also, the highest percentage of participants reported in the EDQ that they previously considered their worst antipathy a friend (19.3%), a friendly acquaintance (17.9%), or their enemy was always an enemy (15.9%). Others reported that their enemy was previously a disliked acquaintance (14.5%), romantic partner (9.8%), a best friend (9.5%), or they had a close relationship otherwise unspecified (7.4%). In addition, 5.7% of participants reported that their worst enemy was first a stranger to them. Overall, fully 63.9% of participants told us that their most impactful enemy was someone with whom they had a previously positive acquaintanceship (e.g., friend, best friend).

With regard to the degree of dislike/hatred mentioned by Wiseman and Duck (1995), a combined total of hatred-based responses (i.e., “*Slightly Hate* (8.4%),” “*Somewhat Hate* (11.5%),” and “*Hate Strongly* (15.9%)”) accounted for 35.8% of responses. Responses indicating lesser levels of dislike included “*Just Didn’t/Don’t Like*” (13.5%), “*Slightly Dislike*” (6.4%), “*Somewhat Dislike*” (15.5%), and “*Dislike A Lot*” (28.7%). In summary, this degree of dislike/hatred item had a mean of 4.10 and a standard deviation of 1.90. The percentages might suggest that participants were more often reporting antipathies characterized by dislike rather than true hate-laden enemyships. However, the majority (64.5%) did indicate a *strong* dislike or some degree of hatred for their antipathy. Individuals selecting “dislike a lot” as opposed to hate, may

be due to a participant's possible aversion to agreeing with a statement that uses a word as strong as "hate."

Also important to understanding the type of antipathy participants reported, we introduced enemies as a subgroup of *mutual* antipathies, an item was included to address the level of mutuality: "With regard to your enemy, was the feeling of dislike mutual? Or did you dislike them more than they disliked you? Or, for some reason, did they just dislike you more than you disliked them?" This item was responded to on a 7-point Likert scale (1=*I disliked them a lot more than they disliked me*"; 4 = *It was completely mutual. We disliked each other equally*; 7=*S/he disliked me a lot more than I disliked them*"). Out of the seven responses available, the highest percentage of participants responded that they were indeed reporting about a *mutual* antipathy (35.8%). The mean was 3.54 with a standard deviation of 1.74 indicating most of the antipathies were mutual or only marginally unbalanced with one party – usually the participant – responding that s/he disliked his/her enemy more than vice versa.

A question concerning one's level of awareness concerning their foe, also discussed by Wiseman and Duck (1995), drew a large number of responses indicating that the participant was indeed aware of his/her enemy. Most participants (33%) reported feeling as if they knew full well about their enemy's feelings while only 4.7% reported feeling as if they knew nothing about their enemy's feelings. As the scale used to indicate one's level of awareness only labeled three responses (i.e., 1 = *Knew Nothing*, 4 = *Wasn't Sure*, and 7 = *Knew Full Well*), those who responded with a 5 or better – indicating their awareness of their enemy – offered a combined total of 68.5% ($M = 5.24$; $SD = 1.71$).

According to Wiseman and Duck (1995), a third manner in which antipathies differ is the degree of passivity of one's enemy. The degree of passivity item was responded to by the highest percentage of participants as an equal mix of covert/overt tactics (25.7%; $M = 3.69$; $SD = 1.75$). A combination of responses including indirect tactics (i.e., “*Always indirect* (12.2%),” “*Mostly indirect* (18.6%),” and “*Sometimes indirect* (12.8%)”) offered a somewhat higher percentage (43.6%) than the 30.7% of responses indicating direct tactics (“*Sometimes direct* (11.5%),” “*Mostly direct* (13.5%),” and “*Always direct* (5.7%)”).

An item concerning one's own tactics toward his/her antipathy was also responded to by the highest percentage of participants as an equal mix of covert/overt tactics (32.1%; $M = 3.65$; $SD = 1.63$). A combination of responses including indirect tactics (i.e., “*Always indirect* (10.5%),” “*Mostly indirect* (19.3%),” and “*Sometimes indirect* (11.8%)”) offered a much higher percentage (41.6%) than the 26.4% of responses indicating direct tactics (“*Sometimes direct* (9.5%),” “*Mostly direct* (13.5%),” and “*Always direct* (3.4%)”). As we now know what the average antipathy reported was like, we turn to how reliable the EII-R was at measuring the various impacts of those antipathies.

Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R): Reliability Analyses

In order to assess the internal consistency of the ten EII-R subscales, an inter-item correlation reliability analysis was run including all of the items designed to fit within a specific subscale². To review, we sought to keep the best four to six items in order to create a shorter and more manageable scale. The criteria for selecting the best items

included eliminating items for which the Cronbach's alpha would be higher if the item was deleted. Also, items having low average inter-item correlations and low item-total correlations were eliminated so that only the strongest items remain. As seen in Table A1, all ten subscales had a Cronbach's alpha of .82 or above. Most were strongest with six items, but some were stronger with four or five. Using this criteria, the shortened scale included 58 items.

In addition to the 58-item short form of the scale, longer forms are available for each subscale as reliability analyses only recommended the deletion of 11 items (i.e. items that, if deleted, yielded a higher Cronbach's alpha). Specifically those recommended for deletion by the reliability analyses included: one Negative Impact on Positive Self-Regard item (neii03sr), three Positive Impact on Positive Self-Regard items (peii01sr, peii02sr, and peii03sr), three Negative Impact on Belonging items (neii01b, neii10b, neii11b), one Positive Impact on Belonging item (peii10b), two Positive Impact on Purpose items (peii01pg, peii02pg), and one Negative Impact on Control item (neii05c). Hence, the majority of item deletions were based on choosing those 4-6 items that had the best item-total correlation. Nonetheless, even with these items deleted, reliabilities for each subscale were still good, if not very good.

We hypothesized that the reliabilities for the EII-R subscales would be as good as the original Enemy Impact Inventory's (EII) subscales. To review, the original factor analysis of the EII yielded four subscales: Internal Impact ($\alpha = .93$), Relational Impact ($\alpha = .91$), Academic Impact ($\alpha = .88$), and Trust Impact ($\alpha = .80$). As can be seen in Table A1, the new EII-R subscales that were further developed from these original subscales

had comparable reliabilities. The Internal Impact subscale became the NEIISR subscale. The NEIISR had a comparable reliability of .90. The Relational Impact subscale became the NEIIB subscale with a reliability of .89. The Academic Impact subscale was the basis of the NEIIPG subscale which had a reliability of .82. Finally, the Trust Impact subscale became the NEIIT subscale with a reliability of .84. As all of the EII-R subscales' reliabilities were above .82, we have been able to achieve comparable reliabilities to those of the original EII. This is notable, in particular, because the new EII-R subscales include a fraction of the items included in the original EII. Yet, reliabilities were still acceptable.

Next, separate inter-item correlation reliability analyses were completed in order to look at the total Negative EII-R and total Positive EII-R internal consistencies. These analyses included only the best items of the NEII-R and PEII-R subscales yielded by the preceding reliability analyses. The overall Negative EII-R had a reliability of $\alpha = .92$. The overall Positive EII-R had a reliability of $\alpha = .95$. A final reliability analysis was computed to find the total scale reliability, combining PEII-R and NEII-R items, and yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .87. As such, while a reliability of .87 is still quite good, it appears that the PEII-R and NEII-R work best as separate scales.

Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R): Factor Analysis of Positive Subscales

Purpose

As we asserted that enemies could have both negative and positive impacts on the lives of their targets, factor analyses were initially conducted separately on the PEII-R

and NEII-R to confirm the theoretical factor structure within each half of the questionnaire. As such, we expected that a principal components factor analysis would yield five separate factors involving the positive impact on one's five basic needs: belonging, positive self-regard, purpose, control, and trust.

Elimination Protocol

To review, deletion criteria for all factor analyses included eliminating any factors that explained less than 3% of the variance, and eliminating factors that had only one or two items loading. Also excluded were items that did not load on any factor, items that loaded above .40 on more than one factor, and items that loaded outside of our theoretical model (e.g. if an item conceived to be a belonging item loaded on the self-regard scale it was deleted).

Analysis

First, a principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation and eigenvalue of 1 was conducted with the remaining 30 Positive EII-R items to verify subscales. This initial analysis yielded five factors. Generally, this five factor model fit our theoretical construction. So rather than purpose and control items, for example, merging to create a new scale, the items clearly loaded separately in the subscales anticipated. There was one exception. The elimination protocol described above was applied. Thus, for the first factor analysis of the PEII-R, one Impact on Trust item was deleted because it double-loaded on Trust and Purpose factors. An additional inter-item correlation reliability analysis was run with the remaining Positive Impact on Trust items yielding a reliability of $\alpha = .83$.

Following this item elimination, a second factor analysis was run. It also yielded five factors. The resulting five factors accounted for 64.44% of the variance. The first factor accounted for 14.66% of the variance and included six items that centered around the positive effect of one's enemy on one's ability to have purpose and achieve goals (e.g., "My foes were people who made me strive to do better" and "My foes were people who gave me a greater sense of accomplishment when I got things done despite them"). The second factor, explaining 14.50% of the variance, included six items that focused on the positive effect of one's enemy on one's positive self-regard (e.g., "My foes were people who made me a stronger person" and "My foes were people who showed me the importance of being myself, no matter what"). Accounting for 13.31% of the variance, the third factor included six items regarding the positive effect of one's enemy on one's need to belong (e.g., "My foes were people who led to me finding allies" and "My foes were people who helped me earn the respect of my peers"). The fourth factor, including five items, explained 11.66% of the variance and centered around the positive effect of one's enemy on one's ability to trust (e.g., "My foes were people who helped me learn to really value honesty in people" and "My foes were people who showed me what kind of people I should trust"). The fifth and final factor, accounting for 10.31% of the variance, included four items that focused on the positive effect of one's enemy on one's need for control (e.g., "My foes were people who gave me a little extra drive to be in control of the direction my life was taking" and "My foes were people who helped me take control rather than be overwhelmed by obstacles"). As expected, the Positive EII-R items

conformed to the theoretical model, and the five separate factors contained items specific to the five basic needs anticipated.

Enemy Impact Inventory - Revised (EII-R): Factor Analysis of Negative Subscales

As with the PEII-R, we believed the negative subscales would form five separate factors centering on one's five basic needs: belonging, positive self-regard, purpose, control, and trust. Accordingly, repeating the procedure employed with the PEII-R, a principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation and eigenvalue of 1 was conducted with the negative EII-R items. The initial factor analysis yielded five factors that accounted for 62.41% of the variance. The first factor, explaining 14.60% of the variance, included six items that centered around the negative impact of one's enemy on one's need to belong (e.g., "My foes were people who said bad things about me to other people" and "My foes were people who told others not to associate with me"). Explaining 12.47% of the variance, factor two included four items that focused on the negative impact of one's enemy on one's positive self-regard (e.g., "My foes were people who negatively influenced how I thought about myself" and "My foes were people who made me feel bad about myself"). The third factor, accounting for 12.23% of the variance, included six items that focused on the negative impact of one's enemy on one's need for control (e.g., "My foes were people who made me feel like I wasn't in control" and "My foes were people who made me feel trapped"). Accounting for 12.00% of the variance, the fourth factor included six items that centered around the negative impact of one's

enemy on one's ability to trust (e.g., "My foes were people who generally made me question who I should trust" and "My foes were people who couldn't be trusted with my secrets"). The fifth and final factor, explaining 11.11% of the variance, included six factors that focused on the negative impact of one's enemy on one's ability to have purpose and goals (e.g., "My foes were people who affected my productivity at work/school" and "My foes were people who forced me to give up on some of my ambitions").

As can be seen, the factor analysis of the NEII-R yielded the anticipated factors. Further, none of the items met any of the elimination criteria. Rather, all items fell cleanly into the theoretical structure for the scale.

Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R): Factor Analysis of Entire Inventory

To confirm that the PEII-R and NEII-R were separate factors, as opposed to the PEII-R items being reversed items on the NEII-R subscales, a factor analysis with a varimax rotation and eigenvalue of 1 was conducted including the remaining 57 EII-R items yielded by the preceding analyses. The factor analysis provided 10 factors accounting for 64.48% of the variance. As can be seen in Table A2, the ten separate factors conformed to our theoretical model. As hypothesized, the factors clearly formed subscales assessing both the positive and negative impact of one's enemies on one's belonging, positive self-regard, purpose, control, and trust.

In addition, we hypothesized that five positive subscales and five negative subscales would be independent of one another rather than the positive subscales being reversed items from the negative subscales. Indeed, positive and negative items did load

on separate factors. As we suggested, this indicates that for each person an enemy can have both positive and negative impacts not just positive *or* negative impacts.

Correlations of Subscales

Also signifying that enemies can have both a negative and positive impact are the results of a correlational analysis. As can be seen in Table A3, the positive and negative subscales positively correlated with one another. If the scales had been mutually exclusive, one would have expected to see negative correlations between the scales. This was not the case. Therefore, there is evidence that enemies can either have a lot of impact – in both positive and negative ways – or little impact. The correlations also show that while some scales are highly inter-related, other scales are only moderately, if at all, correlated with one another. This result further yields support to the subscales being separate, but related, constructs.

Also seen in Table A3, many subscales are very inter-related while others are more independent. For example, the Negative Impact on Belonging subscale is correlated with every other subscale. This particular correlation suggests that when an enemy negatively influences one's need for affiliation, s/he also impacts the individuals other needs (control, purpose, self-regard, and trust) in both negative *and* positive ways. This could be due to the centrality of the need to belong, and the consequences lacking belongingness carries for an array of different outcomes (Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

By the same token, other scales that are relational in nature, i.e. both the Negative Impact on Trust and Positive Impact on Belonging subscales, correlated with all other subscales. This indicates that whether an enemy is negatively influencing one's ability to

trust or having a positive impact on one's ability to have relationships, the enemy is also impacting all of the other needs at the same time (control, purpose, and self-regard).

Other subscales that are highly inter-related with one another are the Negative Impact on Purpose/Goals, Negative Impact on Control, Positive Impact on Purpose/Goals, and Positive Impact on Trust subscales. These subscales may be related to one another due to a common thread concerning self-efficacy. For example, someone who feels that they lack control over their life will be less able to accomplish goals. On the other hand, if someone is motivated to pursue their goals in a positive way, s/he will be more likely to feel as if s/he has control over his/her life.

Scales that seem to stand alone more, though, were the Positive Impact on Self-Regard and Positive Impact on Control subscales. Also, the Negative Impact on Self-Regard subscale was the most independent EII-R subscale as it only significantly correlated with half the other subscales. Yet, one may think that if any enemy makes one feel bad about him/herself this would negatively impact an array of other basic needs (e.g., belonging, purpose, and control). Perhaps it depends on the individual's resiliency as to whether the negative impact his/her antipathy has on his/her self-regard takes over other aspects of his/her life. For example, someone high in resiliency may respond by either ignoring the negative influence or using the negativity as motivation while someone low in resiliency may allow the negativity to take over several aspects of his/her life (e.g., ability to attain goals or have control).

EII-R Descriptive Statistics

Means and standard deviations for each of the subscales are reported in Table A4. Descriptive statistics indicate that the highest impact reported was a negative impact on trust ($M = 5.41$) followed by a negative impact on belonging ($M = 5.04$) and a positive impact on trust ($M = 5.01$). The top three highest impact types suggest that the primary effects of enemies are largely relational. For example, a negative impact on one's ability to trust paired with a negative impact on one's ability to affiliate with others greatly diminishes the chances that one will be currently able to maintain relationships. In addition, one may have difficulty attaining new relationships in the future due to a decreased ability to trust others.

The areas of enemy influence with the least amount of impact were the negative impacts on purpose ($M = 3.96$) and control ($M = 4.02$). These areas of least impact may indicate that participants see enemies as primarily having positive impacts in these domains instead of negative. This is evidenced by higher means on corresponding positive subscales of purpose ($M = 4.74$) and control ($M = 4.81$). As the subscales were not inversely related however, there is still evidence that enemies have some negative impact on purpose and control. Perhaps, however, enemies have this negative impact initially, but then individuals learn to be more resilient and take control of their future. Temporal differences in type of impact are worth investigating further.

Correlations with Enemy Demographic Questionnaire (EDQ)

An examination of the correlations between the EII-R subscales and the EDQ items indicated that while the tactics of both the participant and the antipathy were not of

significance for the majority of EII-R subscales, the remaining EDQ items were moderately correlated with several EII-R subscales.³ As can be seen in Table A5, the degree of dislike a participant felt for an antipathy positively correlated with the Negative Impact on Belonging, Control, Self, and Trust subscales. This correlation may indicate the more an enemy made one lose his/her friends and threatened his/her sense of self and self-control, the more one came to hate his/her antipathy.

The level of mutuality in the relationship was positively correlated with the Negative Impact on Belonging subscale as well as the Positive Impact on Belonging, Purpose, Self, and Trust subscales. Note the high end of the response scale used with the mutuality item indicated that the antipathy disliked the participant more. Thus, as the antipathy disliked the participant more, creating asymmetrical dislike, the majority of the antipathy's influence was positive (e.g., Positive Impact on Belonging, Purpose, Self, and Trust). There was one exception, however. As the antipathy disliked the participant more, the antipathy's positive influence on one's ability to control his/her life became less evident.

In addition, positive correlations between degree of awareness of one's antipathy and the Positive Impact subscales (Belonging, Purpose, Self-Regard, and Trust) suggest that as one becomes more aware of his/her antipathy, the more one can benefit from the relationship. However, positive correlations between degree of awareness and the Negative Impact on Belonging and Trust subscales suggest that the more the antipathy negatively impacts what one values the most – his/her relationships – the more s/he becomes aware of how much his/her enemy must hate him/her. One becoming more

aware of his/her enemy may be due to one's friends relaying the negative information his/her enemy is telling them.

The type of tactics employed did not seem to have much in the way of a significant relationship with any of the impact subscales – with few exceptions – and thus may not be as useful of a dimension as Wiseman and Duck conceived. However, further research is needed.

Discriminant Validity of the Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R)

It was difficult to find scales to check the concurrent validity of the EII-R as, to our knowledge, there has never been a scale published to measure the quality of one's enemyships. However, we were able to use scales that were related to ensure that the EII-R was not only measuring social exclusion, lack of quality friends, hypersensitivity, loneliness, a high need to belong, low perceived social support, or paranoia, but rather measuring enemy impact.

The following measures were entered to assess their correlation with the ten subscales of the EII-R: Sinclair's (2004) Peer Social Exclusion Scale – Revised (PSE-R), Parker and Asher's (1993) Friendship Quality Questionnaire (FQQ), Zimet and colleagues' (1988) Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS), Fenigstein and Venable's Paranoia Scale (FVPS), Sheridan's (1997) Personal Style Inventory (PSI) – Hypersensitivity Subscale, Leary and Cottrell's (2001) Need to Belong Scale (NTB), and the Russell's UCLA (1996) Loneliness Scale (UCLALS). Note we first used all six of the FQQ's subscales. However, all five of the positive FQQ subscales (Intimate Exchange, Conflict Resolution, Companionship and Recreation, Help and

Guidance, and Validation and Caring) exhibited the same pattern of correlations with the EII-R subscales. Thus, we combined the positive FQQ subscales into one variable (FQQ Positive) and maintained the Conflict and Betrayal subscale as separate.

Of particular interest, the correlation analysis indicated that having an enemy is not the same as being socially excluded or betrayed by a friend. For example, the Negative Impact on Belonging, Positive Impact on Purpose/Goals, and Positive Impact on Control subscales did not relate to the Conflict and Betrayal subscale. The Conflict and Betrayal subscale was of significance as we considered this FQQ subscale to be the factor most likely related to our enemy impact construct. The items in the Conflict and Betrayal subscale focus on types of behaviors usually associated with certain types of antipathies, particularly those that arise from former friendships (i.e., “My friends were people who didn’t listen to me” and “My friends were people I fought with a lot”). However, what we found was that although seven of the ten subscales slightly or moderately correlated with the Conflict and Betrayal subscale of the Friendship Quality Questionnaire, no correlations were above .23.

Note the Conflict and Betrayal subscale was reversed scored, meaning that high scores on the Conflict and Betrayal subscale describe friendships low in conflict. This is important to be aware of as we see that the Conflict and Betrayal subscale positively correlated with the Negative Impact on Self-Regard, Positive Impact on Belonging, Negative Impact on Purpose, and Negative Impact on Control subscales. These results indicate that as antipathies have more negative influence on one’s self-regard, purpose, and control, the less conflict and betrayal is seen in one’s friendships. Furthermore, as an

antipathy positively impacts one's need to belong, the less conflict and betrayal is seen in one's friendships. Perhaps as an enemy negatively affects an individual, s/he turns to his/her friends which may, in turn, cause more cohesion within existing friendships.

Ultimately, positive aspects of the friendship quality were more strongly related to the EII-R subscales than was the Conflict and Betrayal subscale. As seen in Table A6, the only correlation above .40 was found between the Friendship Quality Questionnaire Positive Scales means and the Negative Impact on Trust means (.43). The FQQ Positive subscales also positively correlated with the Negative Impact on Belonging, Positive Impact on Self-Regard, Positive Impact on Purpose, Positive Impact on Control, and Negative and Positive Impact on Trust subscales. These results indicated that as an antipathy negatively influences one's belonging or ability to trust or positively influences one's self-regard, purpose, control, or ability to trust, one's friendships have a more positive quality. Perhaps as an antipathy begins to affect one's life in general, one's friendships become more important. It may also be that enemies make one appreciate one's true friends more and thus, have better friendships.

Individuals who have friendships are often not studied with regard to enemyships. The correlations between the EII-R subscales and the PSE-R are especially important considering that the current literature has focused on enemyships within the socially excluded while neglecting to assess enemyships among the socially accepted. As all the correlations between the EII-R and PSE-R are below .35, we have evidence that having an influential enemy is distinct from being socially excluded. However, the PSE-R, at both the high school and college levels, was related to the Negative and Positive Impacts

on Self-Regard, Purpose/Goals, and Control subscales. Specifically, the PSE-R was positively related to the Negative subscales and negatively related to the Positive subscales. This suggests that socially excluded vs. accepted people may respond differently to the presence of an antipathy. Accepted students may have more resources, after all, to help them cope with an inimical relationship. Accordingly, popularity could serve as a buffer from the negative impact of enemies, and, potentially one could glean more positive outcomes from having an enemy. This is not inconsistent with the research of others [e.g., Abecassis et al. (2002)] who found that for some, especially boys, having enemies yielded more social rewards than costs.

Three subscales were not related to the PSE-R: both the Negative and Positive Impacts on Belonging and the Negative Impact on Trust subscales. One may expect that if an enemy is negatively affecting one's relationships s/he may become socially excluded. However, the positive influence of the enemy on one's ability to attain relationships may negate the negative impact and keep the individual from becoming socially excluded.

With regard to the other measures, no additional correlations greater than .40 were found. The majority of the EII-R's subscales modestly correlated with the MSPSS, and UCLA, suggesting that the constructs of perceived social support and loneliness are somewhat related. However, only four of the ten EII-R subscales related to the following measures – with no correlations above .35: PSE-R Current, PSI, NTB, and FVPS. These low correlations further indicated that the EII-R was indeed measuring a separate construct.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Review of Hypotheses

To review, we sought to establish the reliability and validity of the Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R). We expected the reliability of the EII-R to be consistent with the reliability of the original EII and for the reliabilities of the new subscales to be acceptable. We also anticipated that the factor analysis of the EII-R would confirm the basic needs framework of the items. In addition, we expected the factor analysis of the EII-R to confirm five Negative Enemy Impact Inventory (NEII) and five Positive Enemy Impact Inventory (PEII) subscales in which the PEII items were not simply reversed NEII items. Lastly, in order to establish the EII-R's discriminant validity, we predicted that the EII-R would be distinct from related scales such as Parker and Asher's (1993) Friendship Quality Questionnaire and Sinclair's (2004) Peer Social Exclusion Scale. All of these hypotheses were confirmed. Dealing with each hypothesis, in turn, we will begin by summarizing the results related to our hypotheses and then turn to the implications of our findings. Lastly, we will conclude with a discussion of future research.

Review of Findings

The items for the expanded EII-R were constructed based on basic needs theory. As such, we expected that they would form subscales conforming to the basic needs

theoretical framework. The original four subscales (Internal Impact, Relational Impact, Academic Impact, and Trust Impact) were successfully expanded to ten subscales: Negative Impact on Belonging, Negative Impact on Control, Negative Impact on Purpose/Goals, Negative Impact on Self-Regard, Negative Impact on Trust, Positive Impact on Belonging, Positive Impact on Control, Positive Impact on Purpose/Goals, Positive Impact on Self-Regard, and Positive Impact on Trust. A factor analysis confirmed these subscales as distinct – but related – as the EII-R broke clearly into these ten individual subscales.

The items loading in each distinct factor did not group together in unexpected ways. For example, all six of the items created for the Positive Impact on Trust subscale stayed together to form factor 10 in the factor analysis of the total EII-R. Also the reliabilities of these established ten subscales' were comparable to those of the original EII. Accordingly, the revised structure maintained the internal consistency of the unrevised EII.

In establishing the factor structure of the EII-R, it may seem as if we biased results by eliminating items in the reliability analyses of individual subscales in order to choose only those that loaded the best. However, running the reliability analyses first did not preclude overlapping scales from forming a single construct during the factor analysis if they were indeed measuring the same construct. It could have turned out that purpose and control scales were, in fact, measuring a broader construct of self-efficacy, for example, but this did not seem to be so.

Also, it could have been that the positive items on, for example, the Belonging subscale were merely reversed items on the Negative Impact Inventory – Belonging subscale. However, this also proved not to be the case. Across subscales, the positive subscales were not merely reversals of negative items. Rather, as anticipated, the positive subscales were unique in measuring independent enemy impact constructs.

After establishing the factor structure and reliability of the EII-R, we focused on establishing the EII-R's validity. The validity of the EII-R was confirmed by comparing the EII-R subscales to existing measures of related constructs. For instance, the results of the correlational analysis between the EII-R and the PSE-R confirmed Pope's (2003) suggestion that the experience of being socially rejected is not the same as having an enemy. While there were moderate correlations with some measures and EII-R subscales, no correlations were high enough to render the EII-R invalid by suggesting that it was not measuring a unique construct.

Caveats

Before we move to discussing the implications of these findings it is important to note the limitations of the present research, as they qualify the interpretations of the data that will follow. First and foremost, it should be noted that although the title of our measure is the *Enemy* Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R), it turns out that we were mostly assessing the quality of mutual antipathies. Recall that a mutual antipathy is defined as a relationship characterized by reciprocal dislike between two people (Abecassis, 2003; Hartup, 2003; Witkow et al., 2005). As our results indicated, the highest percentage of participants responded that they felt some degree of dislike for their

antipathy rather than the hatred characteristic of an actual enemy. However, the highest percentage of participants also responded that they were indeed reporting about a *mutual* antipathy as evidenced by the responses to the mutuality item. The mean of 3.54 indicates that, on average, relationships were symmetrical, with respondents disliking their antipathy as much as their antipathy disliked them. Only a minority of participants felt their enemy disliked him/her significantly more than the participant disliked his/her enemy.

Also of importance, the present study was a retrospective account of one's enemyships. Thus, although participants may now be able to report the positive influences of their antipathies, they may have been able to only see the negative aspects when participating in an inimical relationship. The antipathy's positive impacts may be inflated for those who are not currently involved in an inimical relationship. In addition, the exploration of the potential differences in one's view of a past antipathy versus a current antipathy is an interesting direction for future research.

Other limitations to the present study include the following: first, the survey was long and, as such, the relationships, or lack thereof, between variables should be replicated in additional samples. It is important to note, however, that the factor structure of the EII-R itself essentially replicates the original EII and was also replicated in a pilot of the EII in the fall semester of 2006. Accordingly, the factor structure of the EII-R appears sound and consistent. Lastly, as is always the case when interpreting correlations, bidirectional relationships should be kept in mind. For although we may discuss the implications of relationships between variables in directional terms, this discussion is

simply intended as post-hoc exploratory explanations of these correlations. We do not presume that this is the only interpretation of the results.

Types of Impact

Ultimately, the results of the EII-R enabled us to examine the types of impact these reported antipathies had on the participants. In addition, the results offered validation of the hypothesis that antipathies can impact all five of one's basic needs in both negative *and* positive ways.

First, we examine the basic needs theoretical framework of the EII-R. As previously mentioned, the EII-R did break down into ten unique factors. These ten factors included five positive and five negative subscales focused on one's five basic needs. To review, Williams (2007) suggested that there were five basic needs that were affected by the experience of ostracism (need for belonging, need for control, need for purpose, need for positive self-regard, and need for trust). As the EII-R did confirm this factor structure, these results offer validation of the work of Staub (2001), Fiske (2004), and Williams (2007) in that 1) it verifies that these needs are distinct, and 2) it provides empirical data to support Williams' assertions that these are domains in which rejection experiences can be threatening. Heretofore, his model of the needs that ostracism impacts has been largely untested. As enemies bear similarities to ostracism – essentially it is like being ostracized by a particular individual – this work lends support to his arguments that interpersonal rejection does impact basic needs and these five basic needs in particular.

Impact Valence

Our results also suggest that antipathies are capable of having a simultaneous negative *and* positive impact on: (a) how we think about ourselves (i.e., need for positive self-regard), (b) our relationships with others (i.e., need for belonging), (c) our ability to attain our goals and find purpose (i.e., need for purpose), (d) our ability to trust (i.e., need for trust), and (e) our ability to feel in control of our life and outcomes (i.e., need for control). First, we turn to the downside of these inimical relationships.

The primary negative effect of antipathies seems to be on one's relationships with others. This relational effect does not only apply to current relationships but may also affect the development of future relationships. Antipathies can degrade one's ability to trust others and break one's existing affiliations with others. These particular effects may cause one's current relationships to suffer. Perhaps even worse, however, is the idea that an enemy's influence on one's current relationships may hinder one's ability to form new relationships. As trust is generally an essential component in relationships, someone with difficulty trusting others is less likely to build new quality relationships.

However, this interpretation of the enemy's negative impact on one's ability to trust may not be completely accurate. As we saw with the validity correlations, there were positive correlations between the Negative Impact on Trust and both friendship quality and social support. Perhaps as one's ability to trust is negatively affected by antipathies, one looks to his/her friends and others within his/her social network to sustain trust. Although one may continue to trust his/her current social network, s/he may

allow the negative influence of his/her antipathy to inhibit him/her from being able to trust new strangers; thus, inhibiting the development of new relationships.

Thus, not all of the news is dire. Indeed, the results of the present study also indicated that Abecassis (2003) was on target with her suggestion that antipathies may have positive influences. For instance, Abecassis thought that antipathies may help facilitate other peer relationships. At first glance, the primacy of the negative impact on antipathies on one's sense of belonging might seem to indicate that Abecassis was wrong. However, with scores on the Positive Enemy Impact on Belonging being high, we have evidence that enemies may indeed facilitate one's affiliation with others, maybe those who share the same enemy.

The shared enemy may become the common thread that binds individuals together; thus, allowing one to create new affiliations rather than become socially excluded. The idea that enemies help relationships in addition to hurting them is also supported by the positive correlation between the Negative and Positive subscales of the EII-R (Positive Impact on Self-Regard, Purpose, Trust, and Control subscales; Negative Impact on Belonging and Trust subscales) and both Parker and Asher's (1993) Friendship Quality Questionnaire and Zimet and colleagues' (1988) Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS). When antipathies impact an individual's relationships, regardless of whether that impact is positive or negative, both one's friendship quality and perceived social support seem to increase.

When antipathies attempt to ruin one's relationships, individuals may choose to do one of two things. Individuals may become more reliant on their current relationships.

Thus, they may perceive their relationships as better (especially when compared to their relationships with their antipathies) and potentially put more effort into keeping those relationships. Alternatively, individuals may allow antipathies to eliminate their social network – forcing them to become socially excluded. This raises potentially interesting questions about what predicts how a given individual might react to an enemy that could be pursued in future research.

In addition to positive impacts on relationships, Abecassis (2003) suggested that antipathies may act as a motivational force, particularly with regard to the attainment of one's goals. Antipathies may serve as competition, pushing an individual to reach for his/her goals and find purpose in his/her life. As the EII-R item, "My foes were people who made me fight for what I wanted," suggests, antipathies may inspire their targets to try harder. Individuals may believe that if they are able to attain their goals, they can prove their foes wrong. For example, consider a high school bully and his/her target. The targeted individual may consider that the best revenge would be to become a success and years later attend a high school reunion in order to show the bully that he/she did not beat him/her down. How an individual reacts to an antipathy challenging his/her ability to attain goals raises potentially interesting questions about who feels defeated and who rises to the challenge.

Individual Differences in Impact

In particular, individual differences concerning degrees of social exclusion are of importance. Our results indicate that the two constructs of social exclusion and enemyships are not mutually exclusive. Our results clearly indicate that both the socially

excluded and socially accepted can have adversarial relations with peers. In particular, it was interesting to see that negative enemy influences were associated with positive scores on the PSE-R, indicating that the greater the negative enemy impact the greater the experience of social exclusion. In contrast, positive enemy impact indices were negatively correlated with measures of social exclusion. Thus, the socially accepted gleaned more positive experiences from their interactions with an enemy.

These findings suggest that individual differences in social acceptance may predict for whom the effects of antipathies are negative and for whom they are positive. Keeping in mind that the data is correlational and thus bidirectional, one may hypothesize that as an antipathy negatively influences one's self-regard, control, and ability to attain goals, the more socially excluded one became. Thus, an antipathy may create social exclusion. In fact, by setting out to ruin one's relationships, reputations, and self-esteem, ostracizing the individual may be the enemy's goal. On the other hand, it may be that individuals who were already socially excluded prior to the development of the antipathy simply react more negatively due to a sensitivity toward antipathies and further social isolation. Therefore, they only see enemies as negative relations, as would be consistent with their past experiences.

However, perhaps if the socially excluded were able to glean benefits from their experiences, they would not see the situation as completely negative. Having antipathies may increase one's popularity as one could build one's reputation by standing up to an enemy. This interpretation would not be inconsistent with the findings of other researchers, such as Abecassis and colleagues (2002). Alternatively, the negative

correlations between social exclusion and positive enemy influences may simply be due to socially accepted individuals having a social network that aids in their coping with antipathies. Socially accepted individuals, then, would be less vulnerable to negative influences and giving them the ability to partake of the possible benefits of having an antipathy instead. Various interpretations of the results of the present study offer many directions for future research.

Utility of Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R)

Our hope is that others may use the present study as confirmation of the reliability and validity of the EII-R and, as such, confidently administer the EII-R in a variety of settings. For instance, a clinician may use the EII-R to assess the influence of a client's antipathy that is currently causing the client distress. In using the EII-R, the clinician may be able to illustrate possible areas of positive impact in order to facilitate the gaining of benefits from the client's current inimical relationship. In addition, the EII-R can potentially be used to study different types of relationships. By utilizing the EII-R with different relationships, researchers may gain insight to the possible positive and negative aspects of those relations. For example, a researcher may use the EII-R to assess whether romantic relationships offer both positive *and* negative impacts. Furthermore, no measure of the quality of inimical relationships exists to date, and yet we know from research on friendships that quality is just as important, if not more so, than quantity of peer relationships (Hartup & Stevens, 1997; Rose & Asher, 2000). As such, the EII-R not only fills the gap of being able to assess the quality of antipathies, but has created a

manageable measure that could be administered in settings where peer nomination methods are not viable.

Future Research

As enemy research is in its infancy, there are many directions that enemy research can go beyond the present study. The involvement of three of Wiseman and Duck's (1995) variations of mutual antipathies offered insight on the average degree of dislike/hatred, level of awareness of one's enemy, and degree of passivity of one's enemy. Additional variations in mutual antipathies, however, warrant more exploration. For example, participants most commonly reported that their antipathy was once their friend or other positive relationship. Future research could explore the process by which an ally becomes an adversary, and examine whether ex-friends hurt more than enemies with whom the individual had no prior relation.

An investigation concerning how different types of relationships impact one's five basic needs is another direction for future research. For example, we have established that ostracism and enemyships are related, as we have seen that ostracism and enemyships have similar types of impact. However, these five domains of impact on basic needs might reflect the five domains in which any relationships, negative or positive, have impact. What might be unique about enemyships is their ability to have both strong positive and negative impacts, whereas friendships might be predominantly positive and the experience of social exclusion predominantly negative. A future administration of the scale could be used to see whether the Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised can be applied

to other types of relationships, thereby measuring the positive and negative aspects of those other relationships on one's five basic needs.

In addition, researchers can take the present study a step farther by utilizing the Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) to explore correlations between the EII-R and psychosocial outcomes. For example, a researcher can investigate whether the presence of an antipathy necessarily decreases one's self-esteem. With our findings concerning the positive effects of antipathies there is a possibility that antipathies may increase self-esteem (e.g., Positive Impact on Self-Regard). Furthermore, researchers could investigate whether personality characteristics such as resiliency mediate the effects of antipathies.

The results of the current study are only the first step in gaining more knowledge concerning mutual antipathies. In particular, more research concerning the complex facets of enemyships is warranted. As research on enemyships grows to meet the quality and quantity of research currently available on friendships, our ability to acknowledge both the negative and positive influences of our enemies is sure to also become more expansive. Enemies are not as bad as they seem to be. In fact, enemies may be important motivators who push us to reach for those things most fundamental to our existence.

REFERENCES

- Abecassis, M. (2003). I hate you just the way you are: Exploring the formation, maintenance and need for enemies. Enemies and the darker side of peer relations [Special issue]. *New directions for child and adolescent development*, 102, 5-22.
- Abecassis, M., Hartup, W. W., Haselager, G. J. T., Scholte, R. H. J., & Van Lieshout, C. F. M. (2002). Mutual antipathies and their significance in middle childhood and adolescence. *Child Development*, 73(5), 1543-1556.
- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, 54, 323-370.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
- Fenigstein, A., & Venable, P. A. (1992). Paranoia and Self-Consciousness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(1), 129-138.
- Fiske, S. (2004). *Social Beings: Core Motives in Social Psychology*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Gosling, S., Vazire, S., Srivastava, S., & John, O. (2004). Should we trust web-based studies?: A comparative analysis of six preconceptions about internet questionnaires. *American Psychologist*, 59(2), 93-104.
- Hartup, W. W. (2003). Toward understanding mutual antipathies in childhood and adolescence. Enemies and the darker side of peer relations [Special issue]. *New directions for child and adolescent development*, 102, 163-180.
- Hartup, W. W., & Stevens, N. (1997). Friendships and adaptation in the life course. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121, 355-370.
- Hodges, E. V. E., & Card, N. A. (Eds.) (2003). Enemies and the darker side of peer relations [Special issue]. *New directions for child and adolescent development*, 102.

- Kraut, R., Olson, J., Banaji, M., Bruckman, A., Cohen, J., & Couper, M. (2004). Psychological research online: Report on Board of Scientific Affairs' Advisory Group on the conduct of research on the Internet. *American Psychologist*, *59*(2), 105-177.
- Leary, M. R., & Cottrell, C. A. (2001, February). *Individual differences in need to belong*. Paper presented at the Belongingness and Rejection Symposium conducted for the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, San Antonio, TX.
- Lehmiller, J. J., & Agnew, C. R. (2006). Marginalized relationships: The impact of social disapproval on romantic relationship commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *32*, 40-51.
- Nishina, A., Juvonen, J., & Witkow, M. R. (2005). Sticks and stones may break my bones, but names will make me feel sick: The psychosocial, somatic, and scholastic consequences of peer harassment. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *34*(1), 37-48.
- Parker, J. G., & Asher, S. R. (1993). Friendship and friendship quality in middle childhood: Links with peer group acceptance and feelings of loneliness and social dissatisfaction. *Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 611-621.
- Pope, A. W. (2003). Developmental risk associated with mutual dislike in elementary school children. Enemies and the darker side of peer relations [Special issue]. *New directions for child and adolescent development*, *102*, 89-110.
- Quotes by E.R. Bulwer-Lytton*. (n.d.). Retrieved April 21, 2006, from http://www.quoteworld.org/authors/e__r__bulwer_lytton/
- Rodkin, P. C., Pearl, R., Farmer, T. W., & Van Acker, R. (2003). Enemies in the gendered societies of middle childhood: Prevalence, stability, associations with social status and aggression. Enemies and the darker side of peer relations [Special issue]. *New directions for child and adolescent development*, *102*, 73-88.
- Rose, A. J., & Asher, S. R. (2000). Children's friendships. In C. Hendrick & S. S. Hendrick (Eds.) *Close relationships: A sourcebook*. (pp. 47-58) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Russell, D. W. (1996). UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): Reliability, validity, and factor structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *66*(1), 20-40.

- Sheridan, C. L., Radmacher, S. A., & Petren, S. (1997). *Validation of a measure of stress resiliency*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Missouri-Kansas City.
- Sinclair, H. C. (2004). Is necessity or ability the mother of invention?: Examining individual, relational, and contextual influences on the nature of self-reinvention. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 65(5-B), 2697.
- Staub, E. (2004). Basic Human Needs, Altruism, and Aggression. In A. Miller (Ed.), *The Social Psychology of Good and Evil* (pp. 51-84). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Williams, K. (2007). Ostracism. *The Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 425-452.
- Williams, K. (2001). *Ostracism: The Power of Silence*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Wiseman, J. P., & Duck, S. (1995). Having and managing enemies: A very challenging relationship. In S. Duck, & J. T. Wood (Eds.) *Confronting relationship challenges*. Part of the *Understanding relationship processes* series, vol. 5. (pp. 43-72). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Witkow, M. R., Bellmore, A. D., Nishina, A., Juvonen, J., & Graham, S. (2005). Mutual antipathies during early adolescence: More than just rejection. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 29(3), 209-218.
- Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52(1), 30-41.

NOTES

1. The order of questionnaires was randomized save for the Enemy Demographics Questionnaire always preceding the Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised.
2. As our study was theory-guided as opposed to exploratory, we chose the approach of running the reliability analyses first to determine the strongest items. We then proceeded to the factor analysis to verify the existence of those subscales. It is important to note, however, that running the factor analyses first and then reliability analyses did not yield substantially different outcomes. The only difference is that the repeated factor analyses eliminated fewer items. The results of this alternative procedure are available from the authors.
3. Gender of the participant or antipathy did not appear to affect scores. Specifically, the gender of the participant only mattered on the Negative Impact on Trust subscale. No significant differences were found involving gender of one's enemy and no interactions between gender of enemy and participant (i.e., cross-sex vs. same-sex enemies) were found.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

Table A1

Reliabilities of Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) Subscales

| Subscale | Cronbach's Alpha | <i>n</i> of Total Items | <i>n</i> of Items Remaining |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Negative Impact on Belonging | .89 | 9 | 6 |
| Negative Impact on Control | .85 | 8 | 6 |
| Negative Impact on Purpose | .82 | 8 | 6 |
| Negative Impact on Self-Regard | .90 | 8 | 4 |
| Negative Impact on Trust | .84 | 12 | 6 |
| Positive Impact on Belonging | .84 | 8 | 6 |
| Positive Impact on Control | .88 | 10 | 6 |
| Positive Impact on Purpose | .89 | 12 | 6 |
| Positive Impact on Self-Regard | .90 | 10 | 6 |
| Positive Impact on Trust* | .85 | 6 | 6 |
| Overall NEII-R | .92 | 45 | 28 |
| Overall PEII-R | .95 | 46 | 30 |
| Overall EII-R | .87 | 91 | 58 |

**Note.* After running a factor analysis with the overall PEII-R, one Positive Impact on Trust item was deleted. This subscale has a new reliability of $\alpha = .83$ with five items. Best Cronbach's alpha found with the following number of items per subscale indicated: Negative Impact on Control ($\alpha = .86$ with 8 items); Negative Impact on Purpose ($\alpha = .84$ with 8 items); Negative Impact on Trust ($\alpha = .86$ with 9 items); Positive Impact on Belonging ($\alpha = .85$ with 8 items); Positive Impact on Control ($\alpha = .90$ with 10 items); Positive Impact on Purpose ($\alpha = .92$ with 11 items).

Table A2

Factor Analysis of Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R)

| Item | Factors | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|-------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| | NEIIB | PEIIC | PEIISR | PEIIPG | NEIIT | NEIISR | PEIIB | NEIIC | NEIIPG | PEIIT |
| 8. My foes were people who tried to make other people dislike me. | .78 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. My foes were people who tried to make me look bad in front of others. | .77 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. My foes were people who started rumors about me. | .77 | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. My foes were people who said bad things about me to other people. | .76 | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. My foes were people who told others not to associate with me. | .74 | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. My foes were people who tried to ruin my reputation. | .68 | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. My foes were people who helped me take control rather than be overwhelmed by obstacles. | | .72 | | | | | | | | |
| 4. My foes were people who taught me how to gain control over my own outcomes. | | .72 | | | | | | | | |
| 7. My foes were people who helped me learn how to stand up for myself. | | .67 | | | | | | | | |
| 3. My foes were people who made me learn self-control. | | .65 | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 8. My foes were people who helped me learn how to get the upper hand in an adverse situation. | .60 |
| 10. My foes were people from whom I gained a greater understanding of how I could make things happen in my life. | .58 |
| 8. My foes were people who helped me learn to be more confident in myself. | .74 |
| 7. My foes were people who showed me the importance of being myself, no matter what. | .73 |
| 9. My foes were people who helped me learn to be more self-assured. | .72 |
| 6. My foes were people who, in the end, helped make me into a better person. | .67 |
| 5. My foes were people who made me glad to be who I am/was. | .66 |
| 4. My foes were people who made me a stronger person. | .49 |
| 8. My foes were people who made me strive to do better. | .74 |
| 6. My foes were people who made me fight for what I wanted. | .71 |
| 10. My foes were people who made me want to achieve more, even if just for spite. | .69 |
| 9. My foes were people who made me try harder. | .63 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 12. My foes were people who motivated me. | .63 |
| 7. My foes were people who made me more ambitious. | .62 |
| 5. My foes were people who sometimes pretended to be my friend. | .75 |
| 11. My foes were people who were betrayers. | .70 |
| 6. My foes were people who couldn't be trusted with my secrets. | .69 |
| 10. My foes were people who were two-faced. | .63 |
| 4. My foes were people who purposefully did not tell me the truth. | .62 |
| 2. My foes were people who generally made me question who I should trust. | .59 |
| 6. My foes were people who negatively influenced how I thought about myself. | .82 |
| 7. My foes were people who made me feel bad about myself. | .81 |
| 9. My foes were people who made me feel like I wasn't good enough (e.g. not smart, not liked). | .80 |
| 8. My foes were people who made me feel depressed, generally. | .75 |
| 7. My foes were people who ultimately got me included by other groups of people. | .71 |
| 4. My foes were people who got me noticed. | .70 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 5. My foes were people who helped me earn the respect of my peers. | .69 |
| 3. My foes were people who led to me finding allies. | .68 |
| 1. My foes were people who helped me build a reputation (e.g. as someone who'd stand up for myself). | .59 |
| 2. My foes were people who assisted me in figuring out where I belonged. | .58 |
| 3. My foes were people who made me feel trapped. | .79 |
| 2. My foes were people who made me feel like I wasn't in control. | .70 |
| 1. My foes were people who made me worry about what they'd do next. | .68 |
| 11. My foes were people who I felt I couldn't stop. | .63 |
| 4. My foes were people who made fun of me for things I had no control over. | .61 |
| 6. My foes were people whose interference affected my ability to make my own choices. | .46 |
| 10. My foes were people who prevented me from accomplishing things often just because I had to stop and deal with them. | .72 |
| 7. My foes were people who proved to be obstacles to me obtaining my goals. | .70 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 4. My foes were people who forced me to give up on some of my ambitions. | .62 |
| 3. My foes were people who affected my productivity at work/school. | .56 |
| 8. My foes were people who simply got in the way of me getting things done. | .54 |
| 6. My foes were people who made me feel like I couldn't achieve anything. | .41 |
| 3. My foes were people who taught me a lot of valuable life lessons about the nature of people. | .65 |
| 5. My foes were people who taught me what unconditional acceptance really meant. | .61 |
| 2. My foes were people who showed me what kind of people I should trust. | .60 |
| 4. My foes were people who taught me the value of being genuine. | .58 |
| 1. My foes were people who helped me learn to really value honesty in people. | .49 |

Note. The items were randomized in order in their presentation in the online survey. The numbers associated with the items were just the order in which they were created in the scale construction stage. NEII = Negative Enemy Impact Inventory scale; PEII = Positive Enemy Impact Inventory scale; B = Impact on Belonging; C = Impact on Control; PG = Impact on Purpose/Goals; SR = Impact on Self-Regard; T = Impact on Trust.

Table A3

Correlation of Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) Subscales

| EII-R Subscale | NEIB | NEIC | NEIPG | NEISR | NEIT | PEIB | PEIC | PEIPG | PEISR | PEIT |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| NEIB | --- | .34** | .33** | .30** | .50** | .19** | .28** | .34** | .29** | .33** |
| NEIC | | --- | .65** | .61** | .25** | .18** | NS | .16** | NS | .15* |
| NEIPG | | | --- | .58** | .17** | .18** | NS | .12* | NS | .12* |
| NEISR | | | | --- | .16** | .14* | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| NEIT | | | | | --- | .18** | .37** | .42** | .38** | .56** |
| PEIB | | | | | | --- | .55** | .53** | .59** | .42** |
| PEIC | | | | | | | --- | .68** | .66** | .63** |
| PEIPG | | | | | | | | --- | .66** | .57** |
| PEISR | | | | | | | | | --- | .53** |
| PEIT | | | | | | | | | | --- |

Note. NEII = Negative Enemy Impact Inventory scale; PEII = Positive Enemy Impact Inventory scale; B = Impact on Belonging; C = Impact on Control; PG = Impact on Purpose/Goals; SR = Impact on Self-Regard; T = Impact on Trust.

Table A4

Descriptive Statistics for Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) Subscales

| Subscale | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|--------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| Negative Impact on Belonging | 5.04 | 1.61 |
| Negative Impact on Control | 4.02 | 1.63 |
| Negative Impact on Purpose | 3.96 | 1.55 |
| Negative Impact on Self-Regard | 4.27 | 1.96 |
| Negative Impact on Trust | 5.41 | 1.53 |
| Positive Impact on Belonging | 4.13 | 1.51 |
| Positive Impact on Control | 4.81 | 1.59 |
| Positive Impact on Purpose | 4.74 | 1.66 |
| Positive Impact on Self-Regard | 4.90 | 1.80 |
| Positive Impact on Trust | 5.01 | 1.60 |

Table A5

Correlations of Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) Subscales and Enemy Demographic Questionnaire (EDQ) Items

| EII-R Subscale | Degree of dislike | Level of Mutuality | Degree of Awareness | Participant's Tactics | Enemy's Tactics |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| NEIIB | .16** | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| NEIIC | NS | .18** | .24** | NS | NS |
| NEIIPG | .16** | .24** | .25** | NS | NS |
| NEIISR | NS | .17** | .19** | NS | NS |
| NEIIT | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| PEIIB | NS | .20** | .20** | NS | NS |
| PEIIC | .16** | NS | .19** | NS | NS |
| PEIIPG | NS | .13* | .19** | NS | NS |
| PEIISR | .16** | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| PEIIT | NS | -.14* | -.23** | -.15** | NS |

Note. NEII = Negative Enemy Impact Inventory scale; PEII = Positive Enemy Impact Inventory scale; B = Impact on Belonging; C = Impact on Control; PG = Impact on Purpose/Goals; SR = Impact on Self-Regard; T = Impact on Trust.

Table A6

Correlations of Enemy Impact Inventory – Revised (EII-R) and Validity Measures

| EII-R Subscale | PSER H | PSER C | FQQ Pos | FQQ C&B* | PSI | UCLALS | NTB | MSPSS | FVPS |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|------------|---------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| NEIIB | NS | NS | .26** | NS | NS | NS | NS | .23** | .16** |
| NEIIC | .32** | .26** | NS | -.17** | .33** | .23** | .33* | NS | .25** |
| NEIIPG | .37** | .34** | NS | -.22** | .25** | .24** | .15* | -.13* | .28** |
| NEIISR | .33** | .23** | NS | -.22** | .28** | .18** | .22** | NS | .25** |
| NEIIT | NS | NS | .43** | .23** | NS | -.12* | .22** | .38** | NS |
| PEIIB | NS | NS | NS | -.12* | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| PEIIC | -.19** | NS | .19** | NS | -.13* | -.22** | NS | .23** | NS |
| PEIIPG | -.17** | NS | .16** | NS | NS | -.14* | NS | .17** | NS |
| PEIISR | -.18** | -.13* | .20** | .12* | NS | -.14* | NS | .19** | NS |
| PEIIT | -.14* | NS | .28** | .14* | NS | NS | NS | .24** | NS |

Note. The items for the Conflict/Betrayal subscale of the FQQ were reversed scored, meaning that a high score on the C&B scale actually indicates that the relationship was low in conflict and betrayal.

APPENDIX B
ONLINE SURVEY ANNOUNCEMENT

Title of Online Study: Keep Your Friends Close and Your Enemies Closer

Abstract: Survey about your experiences with peers

Description: Keep Your Friends Close and Your Enemies Closer: We want to hear about your best friends, your worst enemies, and everything inbetween. Complete our survey about good friends, bad influences, betrayers, and rivals.

Web Study: This study is an online survey administered by the system. Participants are only identified to researchers with a unique numeric ID code.

Duration: 55 minutes

Credits: 1 Credit

Researcher: Amanda Smith
Email: ags33@msstate.edu

Principal Investigator: Colleen Sinclair

APPENDIX C
INTRODUCTORY TEXT

Introductory Text:

This study consists of an online survey, which you may now participate in.

THIS IS A LENGTHY SURVEY AND MUST BE COMPLETED IN ONE SITTING. PLEASE DO NOT BEGIN THIS SURVEY UNLESS YOU HAVE ENOUGH TIME TO COMPLETE ALL 20 SECTIONS.

You will receive credit immediately upon completion of the survey. The survey consists of a number of multiple-choice and/or free-answer questions, and will be divided into a number of sections. You must complete all sections in one sitting, as you are not allowed to resume at another time from where you left off. While you are participating, your responses will be stored in a temporarily holding area as you move through the sections, but they will not be permanently saved until you complete all sections and you are given a chance to review your responses.

APPENDIX D
FRIENDS AND FOES QUESTIONNAIRE

FRIENDS AND FOES QUESTIONNAIRE

We are interested in how many friends and enemies you either currently have or have had in the past, who they were, and how they've impacted your life. This study involves completing a survey asking you about your prior (high school) and current relationships with friends and enemies. We will be asking you a series of questions to help us understand who your friends and enemies were/are and how you see their impact on your life. Sometimes friends can have a negative impact on your life, such as when they betray us or let us down. And sometimes, conversely, our enemies can have a positive impact on our life, such as driving us to excel or making us stronger. Answer the questions with a current enemy in mind. If you do not have a current enemy, answer them with regard to the most recent period in time when you had both an enemy and a friend.

D1. Respondent Gender: a.) Male b.) Female

D2. Respondent Age: _____

D3. Race:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| a.) White | b.) Black or African-American |
| c.) Asian or Pacific Islander | d.) Hispanic or Latino |
| e.) Native American | f.) Middle Eastern or Arabic |
| g.) Biracial or Mixed Race | h.) Other |

APPENDIX E
ENEMY DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE (EDQ)

ENEMY DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

Answer the following questions with regard to **one** particular enemy.
Before answering, consider your relationship with this person including
the past and current status of the relationship.

**I AM GOING TO BE ANSWERING THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS
REGARDING MY:** (please check one option below)

HIGH SCHOOL:

FRESHMAN YEAR
SOPHOMORE YEAR
JUNIOR YEAR
SENIOR YEAR

COLLEGE:

FRESHMAN YEAR
SOPHOMORE YEAR
JUNIOR YEAR
SENIOR YEAR
GRADUATE SCHOOL

FIRST NAME OF MY ENEMY: _____

1. **Gender of enemy:** Please circle the number next to the gender of your enemy.

1 Female
2 Male

2a. **Length of relationship:**

3. **Type of pre-existing relationship:** Sometimes people in our lives betray us or relationships don't work out. Friends and acquaintances can become enemies. Please circle the number of the relationship you had to your enemy prior to this person becoming an enemy.

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------|--------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Best Friend | Had Close Relationship | Friend | Friendly Acquaintance | Stranger | Disliked Acquaintance | Always an Enemy |

4. **Degree of dislike:** With regard to your enemy, what would you say is the level of dislike? How do you feel about your enemy?

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Just Didn't/Don't Like | Slightly Dislike | Somewhat Dislike | Dislike A Lot | Slightly Hate | Somewhat Hate | Hate Strongly |

5. Level of mutuality: With regard to your enemy, was the feeling of dislike mutual? Or did you dislike them more than they disliked you? Or, for some reason, did they just dislike you more than you disliked them?

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| I disliked them A LOT more than they disliked me | I disliked them somewhat more than they disliked me | I disliked them slightly more than they disliked me | It was completely mutual. We disliked each other equally | S/he disliked me slightly more than I disliked them | S/he disliked me somewhat more than I disliked them | S/he disliked me A LOT more than I disliked them |

6. Level of awareness: How aware are you of how your enemy felt about you?

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Knew Nothing | | | Wasn't Sure | | | Knew Full Well |

7. YOUR Type of Tactics: Sometimes when you act, you can be obvious (=overt) about your dislike and will engage in behaviors that DIRECTLY deal with your enemy, and are intended to either make them feel bad or just convey clearly that we don't like them (e.g. fight with them, yell at them, call them names to their face, challenge them). Other times we will be less obvious (covert), and will do things that do not directly confront our enemy but rather will be more INDIRECT tactics intended to harm them (e.g. talk about them to others, ignore them, exclude them, harm relationships with others, get them in trouble). Thinking about the way you behaved toward your enemy, did you use mostly INDIRECT tactics or DIRECT tactics.

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Always Indirect | Mostly Indirect | Sometimes Indirect | Equal Mix of Covert/Overt Tactics | Sometimes Direct | Mostly Direct | Always Direct |

8. Type of ENEMY Tactics: Sometimes an enemy can be obvious (=overt) about his/her dislike and will engage in behaviors that DIRECTLY target you and are intended to make you feel bad or just convey that s/he doesn't like you to you and anyone who was watching (e.g. fight with you, yell at you, call you names to your face, challenge you). Other times an enemy will be more sneaky, less obvious (covert), and will do things behind your back, not confront you directly, and will generally engage in more INDIRECT tactics intended to harm you (e.g. talk about you, give you the silent treatment, ruin relationships with others, get you in trouble). Thinking about the way your enemy behaved, did s/he use mostly INDIRECT tactics or DIRECT tactics.

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Always Indirect | Mostly Indirect | Sometimes Indirect | Equal Mix of Covert/Overt Tactics | Sometimes Direct | Mostly Direct | Always Direct |

APPENDIX F

ENEMY IMPACT INVENTORY – REVISED (EII-R)

WORST ENEMIES: Now, think of the peer(s) who gave you the most grief in the last year (an enemy, an ex-friend, a person who picked on you or made your life difficult, person you didn't get along with, a person you strongly dislike, a competitive rival). Now, please use the scale provided and indicate the degree to which you feel any of the following statements describe your experience with this person/these people. Note, be sure to think of both the positive things you might have gotten out of the experience (e.g. learned how to be a stronger person, had a drive to work harder) in addition to the negative.

**Worst enemy's first name: _____

| 1 Completely Disagree | 2 Strongly Disagree | 3 Moderately Disagree | 4 Slightly Disagree | 5 Slightly Agree | 6 Moderately Agree | 7 Strongly Agree | 8 Completely Agree |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|

My foes were people who _____

OR My foe was someone who _____

**CIRCLE APPROPRIATE
NUMBER:**

- | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Purposefully tried to hurt my feelings. (neii03sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2. Tried to make/made me think something was wrong with me. (neii04sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 3. Picked on me (e.g. said negative things to me). (neii05sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 4. Negatively influenced how I thought about myself. (neii06sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 5. Made me feel bad about myself. (neii07sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 6. Who made me feel depressed, generally. (neii08sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 7. Made me feel like I wasn't good enough (e.g. not smart, not liked). (neii09sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 8. Tried to make me feel I was an unimportant person. (neii10sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 9. Helped me come to accept myself. (peii01sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 10. Helped me understand who I really was. (peii02sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 11. I tried not to let affect my sense of self. (peii03sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 12. Made me a stronger person. (peii04sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 13. Made me glad to be who I am/was. (peii05sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 14. In the end, helped make me into a better person. (peii06sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 15. Showed me the importance of being myself, no matter what. (peii07sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 16. Helped me learn to be more confident in myself. (peii08sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 17. Helped me learn to be more self-assured. (peii09sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 18. Made me look/feel better in comparison. (peii10sr) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 19. Got other people to pick on me. (neii01b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 20. Tried to make me look bad in front of others. (neii02b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21. Said bad things about me to other people. (neii05b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 22. Started rumors about me. (neii06b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 23. Told others not to associate with me. (neii07b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 24. Tried to make other people dislike me. (neii08b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 25. Tried to ruin my reputation. (neii09b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 26. Would intentionally exclude me from things. (neii10b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 27. Negatively affected my relationships. (neii11b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 28. Helped me build a reputation (e.g. as someone who'd stand up for myself) (peii01b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 29. Assisted me in figuring out where I belonged. (peii02b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 30. Led to me finding allies. (peii03b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 31. Got me noticed. (peii04b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 32. Helped me earn the respect of my peers. (peii05b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 33. Ultimately got me included by other groups of people. (peii07b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 34. Whose enemies became my friends (e.g. "the enemy of my enemy was my friend"). (peii08b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 35. Helped me discover who my real friends were/are. (peii10b) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 36. Tried to make me fail at my work/tasks. (neii01pg) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 37. Affected my productivity at work/school. (neii03pg) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 38. Forced me to give up on some of my ambitions. (neii04pg) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 39. Tried to get me into trouble with authorities/teachers/bosses. (neii05pg) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 40. Made me feel like I couldn't achieve anything. (neii06pg) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 41. Proved to be obstacles to me obtaining my goals. (neii07pg) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 42. Simply got in the way of me getting things done. (neii08pg) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 43. Prevented me from accomplishing things often just because I had to stop and deal with them. (neii10pg) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 44. I competed with. (peii01pg) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 45. I had a rivalry with. (peii02pg) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 46. Gave me a greater sense of accomplishment when I got things done despite them. (peii03pg) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 47. Gave me the extra incentive to just work that much more. (peii04pg) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 48. Made me fight for what I wanted. (peii06pg) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| 49. Made me more ambitious. (peii07pg) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 50. Made me strive to do better. (peii08pg) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 51. Made me try harder. (peii09pg) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 52. Made me want to achieve more, even if just for spite. (peii10pg) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 53. Pushed me to find new activities to get involved in. (peii11pg) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 54. Motivated me. (peii12pg) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 55. Made me think "I'll show them." (peii13pg) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 56. Generally made me question who I should trust. (neii02t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 57. Misled me. (neii03t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 58. Purposefully did not tell me the truth. (neii04t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 59. Sometimes pretended to be my friend. (neii05t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 60. Couldn't be trusted with my secrets. (neii06t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 61. Made me doubt whether I could rely on my own judgment (neii07t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 62. Made me question whether the world was really a safe place. (neii08t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 63. Were two-faced. (neii10t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 64. Were betrayers. (neii11t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 65. Made me suspect that people were being false when they were being "nice" to me. (neii12t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 66. Made me think that the "unintentional" behavior of certain people was actually intentional. (neii13t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 67. Made me cautious about trusting people in the future. (neii14t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 68. Helped me learn to really value honesty in people. (peii01t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 69. Showed me what kind of people I should trust. (peii02t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 70. Taught me a lot of valuable life lessons about the nature of people. (peii03t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 71. Taught me the value of being genuine. (peii04t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 72. Taught me what unconditional acceptance really meant. (peii05t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 73. Taught me to say what you mean and mean what you say. (peii06t) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 74. Made me worry about what they'd do next. (neii01c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 75. Made me feel like I wasn't in control. (neii02c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 76. Made me feel trapped. (neii03c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 77. Made fun of me for things I had no control over. (neii04c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| 78. Rejected me/picked me out for no obvious reason. (neii05c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 79. Whose interference affected my ability to make my own choices. (neii06c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 80. Tried to make me feel powerless. (neii07c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 81. I felt I couldn't stop. (neii11c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 82. Gave me a little extra drive to be in control of the direction my life was taking. (peii01c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 83. Helped me learn what it meant to rise above the influence of others. (peii02c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 84. Made me learn self-control. (peii03c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 85. Taught me how to gain control over my own outcomes. (peii04c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 86. Helped me take control rather than be overwhelmed by obstacles. (peii05c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 87. I felt I knew how to deal with. (peii06c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 88. Helped me learn how to stand up for myself. (peii07c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 89. Helped me learn how to get the upper hand in an adverse situation. (peii08c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 90. I learned to outwit. (peii09c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |
| 91. From whom I gained a greater understanding of how I could make things happen in ... (peii10c) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 |

APPENDIX G

PEER SOCIAL EXCLUSION SCALE – REVISED (PSE-R)

Please use the following scale to indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement as it characterizes **your high school experience AND your current experience**. Be sure to think of both the positive things you have gotten out of the experience in addition to the negative.

| 1 Strongly Disagree | 2 Moderately Disagree | 3 Slightly Disagree | 4 Slightly Agree | 5 Moderately Agree | 6 Strongly Agree |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. I have trouble with other students/my peers. | | | | | | |
| High | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| School | | | | | | |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. People are unfriendly to me. | | | | | | |
| High | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| School | | | | | | |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3. I feel isolated. | | | | | | |
| High | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| School | | | | | | |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4. I am popular. | | | | | | |
| High | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| School | | | | | | |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5. I feel a part of my school. | | | | | | |
| High | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| School | | | | | | |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6. I am happy at my school. | | | | | | |
| High | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| School | | | | | | |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7. I often feel lonely. | | | | | | |
| High | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| School | | | | | | |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 8. People are intentionally mean to me. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9. I feel people dislike me. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10. I feel socially accepted. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11. I feel loved and wanted. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12. If someone makes trouble for me, I make trouble for them. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 13. I know that if there is a party, event or activity I'd likely be invited by someone. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 14. I don't often get invited to do things with others. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 15. No matter the consequences, I'm not afraid to stand up for myself. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 16. I have a hard time finding true friends. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 17. Few people notice me. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 18. I feel there is no one I can turn to. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 19. I generally try to withdraw from social involvement. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 20. I feel invisible. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 21. I don't really care if I "fit in." | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 22. Seems the only attention I get from classmates is negative. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 23. I am often singled out for mistreatment (e.g. picked on, fought with, talked about). | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 24. I am simply overlooked. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 25. Sometimes I wish I were invisible. | | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

26. I get along with most everyone.

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

27. I have difficulty making as many friends as I really want.

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

28. Many people want to be my friend.

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

29. When I feel lonely, there are several people I can really talk to.

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

30. I am pretty tough/aggressive (physically and/or verbally).

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

31. I am a known "troublemaker."

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

32. My friendships with people are unconditional (e.g. I can express how I feel, do whatever I want, wear what I like, talk to whomever I want to and know they will always be my friend(s).)

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

33. I find the best way for me to deal with my peers is to avoid them.

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

34. I end up just taking a lot of abuse from people.

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | 35. There are a lot of people I don't get along with. | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | 36. I would like to know how to fit in better. | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | 37. I don't think people are genuine when they are nice to me. | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | 38. I am pretty much ignored. | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | 39. I want a different set of friends (i.e. my friends aren't the type of people I want to hang with). | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| | 40. I strive to not fit-in. | | | | | |
| High School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Currently | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

APPENDIX H
FRIENDSHIP QUALITY QUESTIONNAIRE (FQQ)

BEST FRIEND: Think of your **BEST FRIEND:** Think of the **ONE** person you consider as your best friend **within the last year**. Please use the scale provided and indicate the degree to which you feel any of the following statements describe your experience with your best friend.

**Best Friend's first name: _____

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Completely Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Moderately Agree | Strongly Agree | Completely Agree |

My BEST FRIEND is someone

CIRCLE APPROPRIATE NUMBER:

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. With whom, if given the option, I'd always sit with at lunch. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2. I got mad at a lot | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 3. Who told me I was good at things. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 4. Who stuck up for me if people talked about me behind my back. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 5. Who made me feel important and special. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 6. I always liked to do things with. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 7. Who said "I'm sorry" if they hurt my feelings. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 8. Who sometimes said bad things about me to other people. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 9. Who had good ideas about things to do. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 10. Who liked me even if/when others didn't. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 11. Who told me I am pretty smart. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 12. With whom I shared problems and vice versa. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 13. Who made me feel good about my ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 14. Who would help me with chores, errands, homework or tasks. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 15. I talked to when I was mad about something that happened | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 16. I'd do special favors for and vice versa. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 17. I'd do fun things with a lot. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 18. I'd argue with a lot. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 19. I could count on to keep promises. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 20. I'd visit at their apartment, home, room, etc. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 21. I always chose to spend my free time with. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 22. Who gave advice with figuring things out. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 23. With whom I could talk about the things that make me sad. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 24. With whom I made up easily when we had a fight. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 25. I fought with a lot. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 26. I shared secrets with. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 27. Who accepted me no matter what. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 28. Who did not tell my secrets. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 29. Who bugged me a lot. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 30. Who came up with good ideas of how to fix things. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 31. Who loaned me things all the time and vice versa. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 32. Who helped me so I could get done quicker. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 33. Who got over our arguments really quickly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 34. I could count on to come when I need them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 35. Who didn't listen to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 36. Who told me private things. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 37. Who encouraged me to succeed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 38. Who helped defend me against my enemies. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

APPENDIX I

MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALE OF PERCEIVED SOCIAL SUPPORT (MSPSS)

| 1 Very Strongly Disagree | 2 Strongly Disagree | 3 Slightly Disagree | 4 Neutral | 5 Slightly Agree | 6 Strongly Agree | 7 Very Strongly Agree |
|---|--|--|----------------------------|---|---|--|
|---|--|--|----------------------------|---|---|--|

1. There is a special person who is around when I am in need. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. There is a special person with whom I can share joys and sorrows. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. My family really tries to help me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. I get the emotional help and support I need from my family. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. I have a special person who is a real source of comfort to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. My friends really try to help me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I can count on my friends when things go wrong. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. I can talk about my problems with my family. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. My family is willing to help me make decisions. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. I can talk about my problems with my friends. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPENDIX J
NEED TO BELONG SCALE (NTB)

After reading each statement, use the following scale to indicate your opinion of each statement by placing the corresponding scale number in the blank next to each statement.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Moderately Agree | Strongly Agree |

1. _____ If other people don't seem to accept me, I don't let it bother me.
2. _____ I try hard not to do things that will make other people avoid or reject me.
3. _____ I seldom worry about whether other people care about me.
4. _____ I need to feel that there are people I can turn to in times of need.
5. _____ I want other people to accept me.
6. _____ I do not like being alone.
7. _____ Being apart from my friends for long periods of time does not bother me.
8. _____ I have a strong "need to belong."
9. _____ It bothers me a great deal when I am not included in other people's plans.
10. _____ My feelings are easily hurt when I feel that others do not accept me.

APPENDIX K

UCLA LONELINESS SCALE (UCLALS)

The following statements describe how people sometimes feel. For each statement, please indicate how often you feel the way described.

Never
1

Rarely
2

Sometimes
3

Always
4

- ___ 1. How often do you feel that you are “in tune” with the people around you?
- ___ 2. How often do you feel that you lack companionship?
- ___ 3. How often do you feel that there is no one you can turn to?
- ___ 4. How often do you feel alone?
- ___ 5. How often do you feel part of a group of friends?
- ___ 6. How often do you feel that you have a lot in common with the people around you?
- ___ 7. How often do you feel that you are no longer close to anyone?
- ___ 8. How often do you feel that your interests and ideas are not shared by those around you?
- ___ 9. How often do you feel outgoing and friendly?
- ___ 10. How often do you feel close to people?
- ___ 11. How often do you feel left out?
- ___ 12. How often do you feel that your relationships with others are not meaningful?
- ___ 13. How often do you feel that no one really knows you well?
- ___ 14. How often do you feel isolated from others?
- ___ 15. How often do you feel you can find companionship when you want it?
- ___ 16. How often do you feel that you there are people who really understand you?
- ___ 17. How often do you feel shy?
- ___ 18. How often do you feel that people are around you but not with you?
- ___ 19. How often do you feel that there are people you can talk to?
- ___ 20. How often do you feel that there are people you can turn to?

APPENDIX L
PARANOIA SCALE (FVPS)

Please use the scale provided and indicate the degree to which you feel each statement applies to you

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Not at all applicable to me | | Somewhat applicable to me | | Extremely applicable to me |

1. ___ Someone has it in for me.
2. ___ I sometimes feel as if I'm being followed.
3. ___ I believe that I have often been punished without cause.
4. ___ Some people have tried to steal my ideas and take credit for them.
5. ___ My parents and family find more fault with me than they should.
6. ___ No one really cares much what happens to you.
7. ___ I am sure I get a raw deal from life.
8. ___ Most people will use somewhat unfair means to gain profit or an
 advantage, rather than lose it.
9. ___ I often wonder what hidden reason another person may have for doing
 something nice for you.
10. ___ It is safer to trust no one.
11. ___ I have often felt that strangers were looking at me critically.
12. ___ Most people make friends because friends are likely to be useful to them.
13. ___ Someone has been trying to influence my mind.
14. ___ I am sure I have been talked about behind my back.
15. ___ Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people.
16. ___ I tend to be on my guard with people who are somewhat more friendly
 than I expected.
17. ___ People have said insulting and unkind things about me.
18. ___ People often disappoint me.
19. ___ I am bothered by people outside, in cars, in stores, etc., watching me.
20. ___ I have often found people jealous of my good ideas just because they had
 not thought of them first.

APPENDIX M

PERSONAL STYLE INVENTORY – HYPERSENSITIVITY SUBSCALE (PSI-H/S)

If the items below apply to you **as you are now**, choose Yes. If they do not apply, choose No. If you have trouble deciding whether an item applies, just make your best judgment considering how you are *most of the time*.

YES NO

1. I am pretty critical of myself.
2. I generally put other people's needs ahead of my own.
3. When something bad happens to me, I get angry or critical with myself for having gotten into the situation.
4. When something bad happens, I usually think it's due to some flaw or defect in me.
5. Once I have done what I can about a situation, I tend to put it out of my mind until further action is needed.
6. As far as I am concerned, when something is done it's done and I don't worry about it.
7. I spend a lot of time painfully worrying about things that end up not happening at all.
8. When something goes wrong, I usually add to the upset by thinking how awful it is that it didn't go the way I wanted.
9. I can't stand disapproval, even when it comes from someone who isn't very important to me.
10. I feel that I am more anxious than most people about what other people think of me.
11. I often can't get myself to let go of things, such as a bad relationship or a job, that I would be probably be better off giving up.
12. I typically hold back from doing what I want to do or think should be done because someone important to me might not like it.
13. I tend to stand on my own two feet and do my own thinking and acting.
14. I spend a lot of time inwardly criticizing myself (my appearance, my skills, what I've done, etc.).
15. If a job I do doesn't come out just about perfect, I usually end up critical of myself and/or others.
16. I really can't stand it if I do even the smallest thing to upset another person.
17. It is so hard for me to say "No" to people that I end up wearing myself out doing things I don't want to do.
18. I tend to be over-involved with other people so much that my happiness depends too much on what happens to them.
19. I tend to feel that I must be thoroughly adequate, achieving and good at just about everything or I am not a worthwhile person.

APPENDIX N
CLOSING TEXT

Closing Text:

As mentioned in the directions for this study, this project is simply aiming to better understand how we are affected by different types of peer relationships. In particular, we are interested in developing our understanding of the influence of "enemyships." For while considerable research has investigated friendships, far less has investigated the role of adversaries in our life. Yet, we believe that enemies may have significant impact, and, further, that this impact can be both negative (e.g. make you feel bad about yourself) and positive (e.g. making you work harder to spite them). Enemy research is in its infancy, and the latter hypothesis (that enemies could have a positive impact) has barely even been suggested by existing literature. Your contributions here will help us build the scales we hope will be used by future scholars to study both the positive and negative impact that foes can have on our life. In future research we hope to also look at how we cope with enemies, and how we might turn negative relationships into positive sources of motivation. Feel free to check out the following references:

- Hartup, W. W. and Abecassis, M. (2002). Friends and Enemies. In Smith, P.K. and Hart, C.H. (Eds.) *Blackwell Handbook of Child Social Development*. (pp. 285-306). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Hodges, E. V. E. and Card, N. A. (Eds.) (2003). *Enemies and the darker side of peer relations. New directions for child and adolescent development*, 102. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wiseman, J. P., & Duck, S. (1995). Having and managing enemies: A very challenging relationship. In S. Duck, & J. T. Wood (Eds.) *Confronting relationship challenges. Part of the Understanding relationship processes series*, vol. 5. (pp. 43-72). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Thank you for your participation in this study. If you have any questions or comments, feel free to contact either Amanda Smith [ags33@msstate.edu] or Colleen Sinclair [csinclair@psychology.msstate.edu]. When contacting via email, please put "Enemies Survey" in the subject line. Thank you again for your time!

APPENDIX O
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER



October 20, 2006

Amanda Smith
Psychology
Mailstop 9514

RE: IRB Study #06-205: Keep Your Friends Close and Your Enemies Closer: Investigations into
Enemy Relations

Dear Ms. Smith:

The above referenced project was reviewed and approved via expedited review for a period of 10/19/2006 through 10/15/2007 in accordance with 45 CFR 46.110 #7. Please note the expiration date for approval of this project is 10/15/2007. If additional time is needed to complete the project, you will need to submit a Continuing Review Request form 30 days prior to the date of expiration. Any modifications made to this project must be submitted for approval prior to implementation. Forms for both Continuing Review and Modifications are located on our website at <http://www.msstate.edu/dept/compliance>.

Any failure to adhere to the approved protocol could result in suspension or termination of your project. Please note that the IRB reserves the right, at anytime, to observe you and any associated researchers as they conduct the project and audit research records associated with this project.

Please refer to your docket number (#06-205) when contacting our office regarding this project.

We wish you the very best of luck in your research and look forward to working with you again. If you have questions or concerns, please contact me at cwilliams@research.msstate.edu or by phone at 662-325-5220.

Sincerely,

Christine Williams
IRB Administrator

cc: Kristine Jacquin

Office for Regulatory Compliance

P. O. Box 6223 • 8A Morgan Street • Mailstop 9563 • Mississippi State, MS 39762 • (662) 325-3294 • FAX (662) 325-8776