This paper describes a study on how, and to what degree, students' demographic information, ethnic identity, and attitudes about women contribute to their ability to be empathic. The report defines an empathic person as one who is interpersonally sensitive and aware of one's self and impact in relationship to others and is responsible for the improvement of self and society in general. These variables, one's sense of self as a member of an ethnic group and one's commitment to feminist thought, are specifically examined, given that these are the training interventions that are most typically visible and strongly recommended in training efforts to decrease stereotypical thinking and to increase trainees' self and other awareness, knowledge, and interpersonal skills. For the study, 179 students aged 19-25 completed the Scale of Intellectual Development, the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, and Attitudes toward Women Scale. The results show that ethnic identity and attitudes about women were found to contribute to the ability to think empathically. Among the three independent variables, ethnic identity was found to be the only significant variable. Findings suggest that the more positive and secure individuals' ethnic identity was, particularly in relationship to the orientation to other groups, the greater the ability to think empathically. Implications for undergraduate education, admissions, and training in counseling programs are discussed. (MKA)
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Abstract

In a study of university undergraduate students' (n = 179) demographic information, the results of a hierarchical multiple regression analysis indicated that ethnic identity, and attitudes about women were found to contribute significantly to 23% the variance in the ability to think empathically. Among the three independent variables, Ethnic Identity was found to be the only significant (p < .01) contributor in the model, explaining 17% of the 23% of the variance. Findings suggested that the more positive and secure individuals ethnic identity was, particularly in relationship to the orientation to other groups, the greater the ability to think empathically. Implications for undergraduate education and admissions and training in counseling programs are discussed.
The Influence of Demographic Background, Ethnic Identity, and Attitudes toward Women on the Ability to Empathize

Being empathic, or valuing and being sensitive to one's impact on others and having a commitment to the improvement of self, others, and the world in general, has been cited as an essential, core, characteristic of individuals who are effective in the profession of counseling (Carkhuff, 1987; Egan, 1990; Rogers, 1942; Weitz, 1957). Empathy has been found to be significantly associated with altruistic behaviors (Jegerski & Upshaw, 1987; Oswald, 1996), high levels of ethical-decision making (Foltz, Kirby, & Paradise, 1989), and pro-social behaviors such as nurturance, succorance, higher cognitive functioning and cognitive complexity, and social responsibility (Jegerski & Upshaw, 1987; Roberts & Strayer, 1996). Given these relationships, it would seem critical that we, as members of the counseling profession, more clearly identify the significant influences in the development of empathy not only for the sake of effective and ethical service delivery, but also in order to maintain healthy, work environments and relationships with colleagues. Providing students with opportunities during training for increasing a deeper understanding of self as an individual, as well as in relationship to others within a given setting and in society in general, would also seemingly fit with the objective of facilitating the development of empathy in future senior members of the profession.

Many graduate training programs in counseling have committed to activities that encourage and enhance counselor trainees ability to introspect about the impact of their complete person (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, etc.) on not only members within individual student cohorts, but upon the experiences of potential client populations as well. In addition to the traditional and long-standing strategies for increasing competence in expressed empathy during service delivery
to clients (i.e., counseling laboratories, theories courses, use of microcounseling skills, counseling techniques and strategies, Karkoff's model, etc.), the development of specific coursework and the inclusion of discussions within all courses, addressing diversity-related topics are just two ways in which this is accomplished (Carter & Qureshi, 1995; Hills & Strozier, 1992; LaFromboise & Foster, 1992; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). In addition, efforts are also made to insure a diverse representation of background, race, ethnicity, and gender during recruitment and admissions allow built-in unique training opportunities for students to be confronted with and learn about the impact of self in relationship to others (Reynolds, 1995). Such training environments allow trainees the invaluable gift of learning from exposure to interpersonal challenges that also allow students to assess the degree to which they are comfortable, effective, and committed to being and remaining interpersonally sensitive and responsible. Attending to issues related to diversity within counselor training has become a common-place occurrence in recommendations of accrediting agencies/organizations, within the development of professional ethical guidelines, within research, and service delivery to clients (American Psychological Association, 1991b; Aponte, 1992).

Given that most seeking training within the counseling profession also tend to indicate a strong interest in social or helping others or working with people activities, it would seem reasonable to assume that most of these individuals would also naturally seem to be interpersonally sensitive and competent or empathic, too. However, review of research that specifically assesses the ability to think empathically across masters and doctoral level trainees and post-doctoral professional populations appears to indicate a wide range of degrees of empathic thinking and interpersonal sensitivity (Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994; Reynolds, 1995; Ridley, Mendoza, & Kanitz, 1994; Steward, Morales, Bartell, Miller, & Weeks, 1998). It
appears that in spite of systematic training commitments to assist trainees awareness of self in relationship to self and others and to society in general, the degree to which training influences the development of empathic thinking is varied. Consequently, some trainees and professionals are more aware of and more willing to be responsible for their impact on others than other professionals. This may also mean that these professionals also have varying levels of the characteristics and counseling competence as indicated above that have been found to be systematically associated with empathic thinking.

One possible explanation for this within group diversity in empathy that may also directly influence the within group diversity in competency is that though the commitment to attend to diversity may be systematic across many programs and professional accrediting organizations, the manner in which individual programs attend to this commitment may be as varied as the number of training programs and the qualities of faculty members within each. In addition, training programs may not typically be tailored to the unique individual backgrounds and experiences of students admitted to the programs. Consequently, some students may be in need of greater attention in the areas of empathic thinking than others. If, how, and the degree to which individuals’ familial ethnicity, age, gender, and socioeconomic status, and areas of self awareness as an ethnic group member and as a male or female relates to others and society in general contributes to the ability to think empathically is not fully understood. Having a clearer understanding of these relationships would assist us in our more effectively fine-tuning and shaping coursework and training experiences that will most comprehensively ready all trainees for most effectively putting into practice the basic counseling skills required by all.

The purpose of this study is to specifically examine if, how, and to what degree students’ demographic information, ethnic identity, and attitudes about women contribute to the ability to
be empathic: interpersonally sensitive and aware of one’s self and impact in relationship to others and responsible for the improvement of self and society in general. These variables, one’s sense of self as a member of an ethnic group in this country and one’s commitment to feminist thought, were specifically chosen given that these are the training interventions that are most typically visible and strongly recommended in training efforts to decrease stereotypical thinking and increase trainees’ self and other awareness, knowledge, and interpersonal skill (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1970; Okun, 1987). Issues of race and gender are components of one of the most recent forces within this profession, multicultural counseling (Pedersen, 1991). Undergraduate students, who had not been exposed to graduate training in counseling or training in empathic thinking, were chosen for participation in this study to address the impact of students’ background information and awareness of and sensitivity to ethnicity and gender. In addition, undergraduate populations may not be as influenced by pressures to respond with ‘political correctness’ as graduate level counseling student populations.

Method

Participants

The participants for this study were students enrolled at the University Tennessee at Martin in the Fall semester of the academic year during data collection. The surveys used were distributed to 180 students who were enrolled in undergraduate courses in psychology. Of the 179 students who completed survey packets, 141 (78.8%) self-identified as White American and 38 (21.3%) self-identified as African American; 134 (74.9%) female and 45 (25.1%) male.

The mean age of the sample was 20.35 years (SD = 4.31, range = 18-49). The modal age was 21 years, and approximately 70% of the sample fell in the age range of 19 to 25. The distribution of the sample with regard to year in school was somewhat skewed with 92% being
either freshmen or sophomores. The mean annual income for participants families of origin was $55,806 (SE = $35,601, range = $9,000-$250,000).

Measures

Scale of Intellectual Development (SID) (Erwin, 1981). This 115-item instrument was chosen as the measure of cognitive complexity in this study. SID, based on Perry's scheme of intellectual and ethical development (1968), was designed to measure the construct of cognitive development. Each survey item is presented as a 4-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (4) to strongly agree (1). Scoring results in four scores related to each of the following subscales: Dualism, Relativism, Commitment, and Empathy.

Dualism (Stage I) items access the extent to which individuals see issues in clear-cut, dichotomous terms and look to authority to provide the correct answers. Relativism (Stage II) items assess the extent to which individuals have discovered that alternative perspectives and diversities exist, but believe that external forces determine their futures. Individuals scoring high on this scale are afraid to make decisions or accept consequences, and their moral positions are influenced primarily by other people. Commitment (Stage III) items assess the extent to which individuals have become committed to a personal viewpoint, even while recognizing the diversities among others. High scorers on this scale report a tolerance of other viewpoints; however, these persons know where they stand in relation to other people. They have begun to make major decisions in their lives and accept the responsibilities and consequences of these decisions.

Finally, Empathy (Stage IV) items measure the extent to which individuals have not only made major life decisions, but also are aware of their impact on other people. Those scoring high on this scale have developed a sensitivity about other people and feel responsibility for
improving society in general. It is the inclusion of this final scale, Empathy, in the design of this measure that supports the authors' decision to include this measure in this study. This subscale purports to assess a construct, the ability to empathize, which has been consistently identified as a critical component in counseling training, as well as counseling process (Brammer, Shostrom, & Abrego, 1989; Egan, 1990; Hammer, 1983). Given that the focus of this paper is the study of the ability to empathize, this is the only subscale score that will be used in the data analyses.

Coefficient alpha reliabilities for these four stages are .81, .70, .76 and .73, respectively. Evidence for construct validity of the four scales, designed to measure Chickering's vector of identity, has been found in Erwin and Delworth (1980), Erwin and Schmidt (1982), and Erwin (1982).

The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure. The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM: Phinney, 1992) was developed to assess ethnic identity attitudes among diverse minority groups. The MEIM consists of 14 items measuring three aspects of ethnic identity: (1) Affirmation/Belonging (5 items); (2) Ethnic Identity Achievement, including both exploration and resolution of identity issues (7 items); and, (3) Ethnic Behaviors (2 items). Item responses are obtained using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 4 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). Additional 6 items are included in the questionnaire to assess Other-Group Orientation.

Reliability coefficients (Cronbach's Alphas) were reported for the MEIM and two of its subscales. Phinney (1992) found that overall reliability of the measure was .81 for the 417 high school students and .90 for 136 college students. For the 5-item Affirmation/Belonging subscale, reliabilities were .75 for the 417 high school students and .86 for the 136 college students. For the 7-item Ethnic Identity Achievement subscale, reliabilities were .69 for 417 high school students and .80 136 college students. Reliability were not calculated for the subscale of Ethnic
Behaviors because it has only two items. For the separate Other-Group Orientation, reliabilities were .71 for the high school students and .74 for the college students.

The Attitudes Toward Women Scale. The short form of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (ATW; Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1973) consists of 25 Likert-type items that assess the degree to which individuals adopt liberal or pro-feminist views of women’s roles. This short form is developed from a 50 item longer form version (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). Higher scores on this scale are interpreted as a greater adherence to pro-feminist consciousness, whereas lower scores indicate more conservative views toward the roles of women in general society.

There has been positive evidence of construct validity, criterion validity, and reliability. An administration of the scale to 258 female and 293 male university students yielded only one major factor, accounting for 23% and 30% of the total variance, respectively. Separate reliability analyses over female and male participants yielded alphas of .90 for the short form. A Person correlation between the short and long forms produced a coefficient of .99 (Smith & Bradley, 1980).

Procedure

Participants were asked to respond to three questionnaires which were distributed together in individual survey packets to students who signed and returned consent for participation in research forms. All identifying information was removed from survey packets which were numbered and maintained in a locked file cabinet.

Results

Means and standard deviations were computed for each of the primary variables and Pearson product correlation analysis results are presented in Table 1. All of the correlations between the independent variables of components of ethnic identity, attitudes about women, and
demographic information were low to moderate. These results reduced the possibility of having to deal with the problem of multicollinearity in the primary analyses.

(Insert Table 1 here.)

To determine whether men and women differed significantly in their scores on the primary variables, t tests were performed. A significant gender difference was found on the dependent variable of empathy. Women had a significantly higher total SID Empathy subscale score than did men, t(179) = 2.1, p<.05. The result means that in general women are more aware of their impact on other people, have greater sensitivity about others, and feel responsibility for improving society moreso than men do. In addition, women tended to have more liberal and positive attitudes about women than men, t(179) = 3.72, p<.05.

To determine racial differences on the primary variables, t tests were also performed. Significant differences were found between the two groups on several variables. White participants’ families of origin annual incomes were significantly higher than those of African American participants, t(179) = 4.41, p<.05. In addition, White participants had significantly higher Empathy scores than African American participants, t(179) = 2.22, p<.05. The result means that, in general, White participants are more aware of their impact on other people, have greater sensitivity about others, and feel responsibility for improving society moreso than African American participants do. In addition, African American students’ responses indicated significantly more liberal and positive attitudes about women than did White American participants, t(179) = 2.91, p<.05, and also had an overall stronger ethnic identity than White American participants t(179) = 5.35, p<.05. No other significant differences were found based upon race and gender. However, these significant t test results led to the decision to include gender, race, and socio-economic background as predictor variables in the regression analysis.
Given the developmental nature of ethnic identity and cognitive thinking, age was also included in the regression analysis as well.

A multiple regression analysis procedure was used to assess the degree of impact that each of the independent variables had on the dependent variable of empathy. A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted with demographic variables, ethnic identity, and attitudes about women as the predictors for the total SID Empathy subscale score (Table 3). Age, family income, racial status, and gender were entered in the first block because these are primary demographic variables. Ethnic Identity was entered in the second block before the other predictor variables because previous research done on the impact of racial identity on cognitive developing (Steward, Boatwright, Sauer, Baden, & Jackson, in press). The effect of ethnic identity was also controlled by entering it on this block. Attitudes Toward Women Scale scores were entered in the third block because this was the variable that had not been researched before in the study of empathy. Interactions between the above variables were entered in the fourth block suggested by Wampold and Freund (1987). The interaction effects entered in the fourth block included demographic variables x Ethnic Identity, demographic variables x Attitudes about Women, and Ethnic Identity x Attitudes about Women.

The overall regression model was significant for the criterion variable of Empathy, F(10,121) = 3.57, p = .0004, as noted in Table 2. Twenty-three percent of the variance in Empathy can be explained by the variables within the whole model. The results of the multiple regression analysis showed that only one of the three independent variables, ethnic identity, was a significant predictor of the total Empathy score. In predicting the tendency to think in an empathic manner, none of the interaction effects added unique predictive variance beyond that accounted for by ethnic identity.
Demographic information accounted for 5% and Attitudes about Women, .6% of the variance in Empathy, however neither was a significant predictor of Empathy. Ethnic Identity, which accounted for 17% of the variance, contributed significant incremental variance over demographic information. The results supported the hypothesis that students who had a stronger ethnic identity would also report greater levels of empathic thinking than those who do not.

Discussion

The goal of this study was to explore whether, and how, the predictor variables of demographic information (i.e., gender, SES, race), ethnic identity, and attitudes toward women predicted the degree to which college students use empathy. Though the whole model was found to contribute approximately 23% of the variance in the SID Empathy subscale scores, only one of the three independent variable sets, ethnic identity, was found to be a significant predictor of the subscale scores, (17% of the variance) which measures individuals’ awareness of their impact on other people, a greater sensitivity about others’ feeling, and a stronger sense of responsibility for improving society.

Four important points should be remembered as the results of this study are discussed. First, the only reason that results are interpreted and discussed with reference to Black and White student is because they composed the sample in this study and we do not wish to make generalizations beyond the scope of this study’s results. The same relationship between variables may or may not be found for other groups and for other campus populations wherein the majority-minority representation is significantly different and in different geographical locations.

Second, group differences in beliefs about assuming responsibility for improving society in general and for understanding personal impact on others based on race and gender may be
explained in several ways. The most obvious is the limited representation of both males and Blacks in this sample. Women and Whites made up approximately 75% of the sample. Though some researchers' findings do not support these results (Monahan, 1989), gender differences have been found in earlier research addressing empathic thinking (Hatcher, 1994; Roberts & Strayer, 1996; Sullivan, 1989). Male participants in this study might have tended to have had more qualities that might be identified as masculine which are not as interpersonally oriented than the traditionally identified qualities identified as feminine.

Significant racial differences between Blacks and Whites also may be interpreted in several ways, probably based upon the readers racial identity. Given that the SID measure does purport to assess levels of cognitive development and identifies the Empathy subscale as the highest form of cognitive development, some might conclude that these findings support the notion that Black are less cognitively developed than Whites. This is not the conclusion of the authors of this paper. Readers must be cautioned to revisit the operational definition of Empathy as defined by this measure: sensitivity to one’s impact on others and assumption of responsibility of the improvement of society in general. SID Empathy subscale scores may be influenced by the quality of race relations within mainstream America. African Americans may be less likely to have higher empathic thinking scores due to living in a predominantly White environment wherein it might be unhealthy and unproductive to be interpersonally sensitive. Earlier studies have found that White university students believe that they would withdraw interpersonally when in the presence of African Americans (Steward, Davidson, & Borgers, 1993), and that African American university students in a predominantly White setting who are feel least alienated are those who want nothing from White peers (Steward, Jackson, & Jackson, 1990). Given this possible interpersonal dynamic, it might make sense that African Americans
within a predominantly White setting may not report being as interpersonally sensitive as White peers in the same setting. African American students as members of a racial minority group, may also not feel as responsible for the improvement of society in general and given the significant reported family annual income differences, less economically advantaged students may not only experience the powerlessness of minority group membership, but that which might be associated with lower socio-economic status. Consequently, the SID Empathy subscale may be a measure of self-perceived levels of interpersonal and social power, influence, and responsibility, and not the highest levels of cognitive functioning for both groups.

Third, results of this study are subject to the limitations of any self-report survey. A sampling bias may have been operating and no information was obtained on non-participants outside of these classes. Also, only attitudinal criterion variables were examined, with no behavioral indicators being included. Consequently, women and White students, overall, might have reported empathic thinking to a greater degree than men and African Americans, but in reality only engage in empathic behaviors to the same degree or less. In contrast, individuals may tend to over-report or under-report what their self report actually reflects. Men and African Americans might have reported less engagement in empathic thinking than their behavior reflects.

Fourth, with participants in the sample being located on only one university campus in one geographical region, a generalization to students in other parts of the country may not be merited. It is also not possible to generalize the results of this study to a non-student population.

The direct and significant predictive relationship between ethnic identity and empathic thinking, as measured by the SID, supports earlier similar research findings linking attitudes about race and empathic thinking (Steward et al, in press). In other words, the degree to which
university students have a secure and positive sense of self as a member of their ethnic group in relationship to other ethnic groups (ethnic identity) is predictive of the degree that they will be sensitive to their impact on others and assume responsibility for improvement in general society (empathic thinking). In other words, persons with insecure and negative feelings about group membership in relationship to other groups would be less likely to be socially consciously and interpersonally sensitive. These findings certainly suggest the necessity of university curriculum that specifically attends to all levels of ethnic identity measured by the scale used in this study if we are to facilitate the development of an educated socially conscious populace in this country.

For example, training programs would strategically provide and require curriculum and training experiences that would: increase ethnic pride, support feeling good about one’s ethnic background, and being happy with one’s ethnic group membership, as well as feelings of belonging and attachment to the group (Phinney, 1992) (Affirmation/Belonging); guide and encourage students’ exploration and resolution of past and current beliefs and attitudes that impede the development of a secure and positive ethnic identity (Achievement); provide structured and unstructured opportunities to be involved in social activities with members of one’s ethnic group and participating in cultural traditions (Ethnic Behaviors); and provide structured and unstructured opportunities to specifically identify, address, and resolve negative attitudes, beliefs, and feelings toward other ethnic group members (Ethnic Others). Training programs might use this as a model to assess ethnic identity, and plan and evaluate curriculum and training experiences that will facilitate the development of a secure ethnic identity even prior or simultaneously to developing competence in general counseling competence. Doing so initially and throughout the training experience might be the baseline experience in assisting those in training toward becoming effective members of the counseling profession. Doing so
might also serve as a guide for systematically developing and maintaining climates within training programs that are truly respectful of cultural diversity in the training of effective counselors.

Though attitudes toward women was part of the model which was overall a significant contributor to the variance in empathic thinking, the degree to which participants' pro-feminist view toward women contributed very little to SID Empathy subscale scores (r square change = .006). Findings would seem to suggest that there is no significant association between the degree to which individuals have pro-feminist views and the degree to which one is sensitive to their impact on others or willingness to assume responsibility for the improvement of general society. Students with liberal attitudes about women as well as those with conservative attitudes may or may not be socially or interpersonally sensitive. Though gender related education may inform and increase awareness and understanding of gender related issues and strengths, the findings suggest that it does not enhance the development of empathic thinking. This is a very confusing outcome given the fact that women had significantly higher empathy scores and African American students had significantly higher Attitudes toward women scores which is contrary to findings in earlier research (Silver, 1988). Much thought must be given in the interpretation of this finding as not to encourage readers who conclude that gender is not worthy of note within the context of facilitating the development of empathic thinking.

Steward, Gimenez, & Jackson (1995) concluded from the results of an empirical study of race/ethnicity and gender that ethnicity and gender should be unique and critical components of training, however, readers must once again take note of the attitudes that are measured by the Attitudes Toward Women Scale and significant correlates of such attitudes: politically liberal (Ghaffaradli-Doty & Carlson, 1979) greater self-report hostility (Gackenbach & Auerback 1975);
less social conformity (Johnson & MacDonnell, 1974); inner-directedness (Hunt, 1976); goal-oriented toward non-traditional vocational and educational roles (Redfering, 1979); high self-actualization (Hjell & Butterfield, 1974; Follingstad, Kilmann, & Robinson, 1976); assertiveness and more masculine orientation (Volgy, 1976); outspokenness, ambition, independence, competitiveness, aggressiveness, dominance, self-reliance, persistence, versatility, and wick to challenge the laws of society (Joesting, 1976). Such descriptors are bound to be heavily culture based. Subsequently, attitudes toward women, whether defined as liberal or conservative by leading feminist researchers within mainstream academic settings, may be so tightly interwoven within the context and experience as a member of an ethnic group that the degree to which one has liberal attitudes about women become insignificant. This hypothesis is further supported by the absence of a significant correlation between Ethnic Identity and Attitudes Toward Women scores. For example, “White American” being identified as an ethnic identity may mask within group diversity among Whites. Some participants who identified in this manner may or may not value and embrace an unspoken or maybe even unknown ethnic group and associated cultural norms with values that support and encourage more conservative attitudes toward women. The same might be true for those self identified as African American. Future researchers might be aware of the necessity to encourage research participants to identify more specifically in relationship to their ethnic group membership. Researchers also might include a measure of religion and/or degree of religiosity in order to provide a more complete picture of participants backgrounds. This might be very important given that ethnic group and associated cultural norms might include well-defined sex-role behaviors with which members are very familiar and comfortable that are in no way related to pro-feminist views. Additional information might aid in developing a more comprehensive description of what these cultural norms are.
Nevertheless, a step has been taken to understand that which has been identified as the highest level of cognitive development among some within the profession of counseling. More specifically, findings also more clearly identify how the development of empathy among university populations might be strategically influenced. Many scholars have emphasized the importance of teaching empathic thinking at the university undergraduate level and have developed curriculum that effectively increases students' ability to do so (Gallo, 1989; Gladstein, 1983; Hatcher, 1994). Student orientation, campus program development, and faculty may be more effective in creating an overall socially responsible climate within university populations if ethnic identity is considered within the process of planning the educational experiences of our future educated populations and, in particular, our future counselors.

However, readers must also note that only 17% of the variance in the SID Empathy subscale score can be attributed to Ethnic Identity as measured by the MEIM. This outcome supports prior literature that identifies Empathy as a multi-stage process that consists of multiple elements (Barrett-Lennard, 1981; Gladstein, 1983). Future research is certainly warranted.
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Table 1.

Means, standard deviations, range, and Pearson product correlations between each pair of variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>r = -.03</td>
<td>r = -.05</td>
<td>r = .16 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>18 - 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>r = .08</td>
<td>r = -.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$55806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$35601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>$9000-$250000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r = .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>1.64 - 4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>56.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>22 - 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.
Hierarchical Multiple Regression of Effects of Demographic variables, Ethnic Identity, and Attitudes about Women on Total Score of the Scale of Intellectual Development Empathy Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 1: Demographics</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 2: Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 3: Attitudes about Women</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 4: Interactions between variables</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The overall regression model was significant, F(10,121) = 3.57, p = .0004. For Ethnic Identify, a higher score demotes a higher level of ethnic identity or a stronger sense of cultural group identification. On attitudes about women, a higher score demotes a more liberal view of women's roles or a greater tendency to see women as being able to assume non-traditional roles. On the SID Empathy subscale, higher scores denote greater awareness of their impact on other people, a greater sensitivity about others' feeling, and a stronger sense of responsibility for improving society.

* p<.001.
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