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Although the literature has emphasized the importance of understanding multiple aspects of collective group identity, relatively little attention has been directed toward quantitatively exploring how two or more collective group identities relate to one another. Additionally, the influence of one's family of origin has not been explored in relationship to aspects of collective identity development, such as feminist identity development and White racial consciousness. Given the unique nature of undergraduate White women's identities, both historically oppressed and historically oppressive, this study examined the connections between White racial consciousness and feminist identity development. Further, this study investigated how family environment related to both White racial consciousness and feminist identity development.

A sample of 394 White, undergraduate females participated in this study. Participants completed a demographic questionnaire and three assessment measures: the Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale-Revised (ORAS-R) (Vandiver & Leach, 2005), the Feminist Identity Composite (FIC) (Fischer et. al., 2000) and the Family Environment Scale-Real Form (FES-R) (Moos & Moos, 1974, 1994, 2002). Four separate canonical correlation analyses were conducted to examine the relationships
between White racial consciousness, feminist identity development and family environment. Based on the relationships described by the canonical functions considered noteworthy in the analyses three main findings appeared to emerge. First, family environments that were perceived by White undergraduate women to promote engagement with a variety of outside perspectives were related to more actively anti-racist worldviews and well-developed feminist identities; while family environments perceived to reflect a more insular focus (i.e. less exposure to divergent opinions) were related to more prejudicial racial attitudes and less feminist identity development. Second, the more advanced stages of feminist identity development were related to more anti-racist White racial consciousness attitudes. Third, emerging understandings of both sexism and racism appear to be related to each other. Findings and implications are discussed and suggestions made for future research.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this project is due to the support and encouragement of my doctoral committee, friends and family. To begin the members of my doctoral committee deserve special thanks. To Dr. Patrick Munley, my dissertation chair, thank you for working with me persistently on this project. Your guidance has made this final product possible. To Dr. Lonnie Duncan and Dr. Evelyn Winfield, members of my committee, thank you for encouraging me personally and professionally to work for justice in my corner of the world. This project is in part a result of your investment towards teaching me what it means to be a culturally competent psychologist.

Many others have helped me to stay in touch with the “big picture” during this occasionally isolating experience. Thank you to Joy Bailey and Carlie Street for keeping me grounded through weekly runs around Kalamazoo. Your friendship has meant so much to me! Also to the Justice and Racial Reconciliation Team at Immanuel Christian Reformed Church for helping me to learn to “organize” towards dismantling racism. Thanks also to Abby Reel and Amy Kurz for always providing a supportive and encouraging word throughout this process.

I am incredibly indebted to my partner Jeffrey Swigart for his longstanding love and support that often included reading drafts of this paper. It is also important to note that this project would not have been possible without the influence of my home community, Lawndale Christian Reformed Church. It was there that I learned why
Acknowledgments—continued

“loving your neighbor” is important and began to cultivate a heart for social justice. Thank you to my parents, James and Kathy Wolff, for taking a risk thirty years ago and letting the Lawndale neighborhood choose us. I hope that you see the completion of this project as one of the results of that choice. Thank you for teaching Anna, Laura and I that family includes all those who chose to join us in the journey. My life has been enriched by your examples.

Kara E. Wolff
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | ................................................................. | ii |
| LIST OF TABLES | ........................................................................... | viii |

## CHAPTER

### I. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM .......................................................... 1

- Introduction .............................................................................. 1
- Understanding the Identity Models and Family Environment ....... 2
- Purpose of the Study ............................................................... 9
- Research Questions .................................................................... 10
- Importance of the Study .......................................................... 11
- Summary .................................................................................... 12

### II. LITERATURE REVIEW .............................................................. 13

- Introduction .............................................................................. 13
- White Racial Identity Development and White Racial Consciousness 16
  - Race, Racial Identity and Racism ........................................... 16
  - White Racial Identity Development ....................................... 23
- Research with Helms’ White Racial Identity Development Theory ........................................... 28
- White Racial Consciousness Model .......................................... 33
- Research with the White Racial Consciousness Model ............... 36
- Summary .................................................................................... 42
- Feminist Identity Development ............................................... 42
Table of Contents—continued

CHAPTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical Overview</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions of Feminism</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Identity Development Model</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopting a Feminist Identity</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the Research on Feminist Identity Development</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist and Racial Identity Development</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Aspects of Collective Identity</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family of Origin and Family Environment</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Environment</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Environment and College Students</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Identity Development</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. METHOD</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale-Revised</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Identity Composite</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table of Contents—continued

CHAPTER

Family Environment Scale .................................................. 91
Procedure ........................................................................... 95
Data Analysis ...................................................................... 97
Summary .............................................................................. 101

IV. RESULTS ........................................................................... 102
Introduction .......................................................................... 102
Descriptive Statistics .......................................................... 102
Canonical Correlation Analyses ............................................ 106
Summary .............................................................................. 118

V. DISCUSSION ...................................................................... 120
Introduction .......................................................................... 120
Family and Feminist Identity Development ......................... 120
Family Environment and White Racial Consciousness .......... 123
White Racial Consciousness and Feminist Identity Development .. 124
Family Environment, Feminist Identity Development and White Racial Consciousness ....................................................... 127
Main Findings Across Analyses .............................................. 130
Implications .......................................................................... 132
Limitations of the Current Study ............................................ 136
Summary .............................................................................. 137
Table of Contents—continued

APPENDICES

A. Anonymous Survey Consent Forms .................................................. 138
B. Invitation Scripts........................................................................... 141
C. Demographic Questionnaire ............................................................ 144
D. HSIRB Approval............................................................................ 148

BIBLIOGRAPHY ................................................................................. 150
# LIST OF TABLES

1. Frequencies and Percentages for Participant Variables ........................................... 85
2. Means, Standard Deviations and Pearson Moment Correlation ............................... 104
3. Canonical Correlation Analysis 1 (FIC and FES-R) ............................................. 108
4. Summary of Canonical Correlation Analysis 1 ..................................................... 110
5. Canonical Correlation Analysis 2 (ORAS-R and FES-R) ................................... 111
6. Summary of Canonical Correlation Analysis 2 ..................................................... 112
7. Canonical Correlation Analysis 3 (ORAS-R and FIC) ......................................... 114
8. Summary of Canonical Correlation Analysis 3 ..................................................... 115
10. Summary of Canonical Correlation Analysis 4 ................................................... 118
CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

Identity development has been the focus of a large amount of empirical research in the field of psychology. This is not surprising since identity development can be seen as a central piece in further understanding human development and growth. Identity can be broadly defined as a way of understanding an individual’s sense of self in context (Markland & Nelson, 1993). Historically, the concepts of psychosocial development and ego statuses as defined by Erikson (1968) and Marcia (1980) have been investigated in order to understand how an individual’s sense of self emerges in relationship to other factors. This conceptualization of identity has been labeled personal identity development. The research literature has encouraged the understanding of an individual’s process of growth and maturation but has not examined how other aspects of identity such as social group identities and socio-cultural contexts impact overall identity development (Jones & McEwen, 2000; Reynolds & Pope, 1991).

Only in recent years, primarily due to the emergence of identity models that describe aspects of collective group identity (race, gender, college student development, sexual orientation etc.) have researchers begun to explore the connections between these different aspects of identity development. In forming their multidimensional model of identity Jones and McEwen (2000) documented the importance of understanding the relationships between different aspects of identity development. The ways in which White racial identity development and feminist identity development relate to each other
were of particular interest to this study. Feminist identity development was described theoretically by the stages of the Feminist Identity Development model (Downing & Roush, 1985). White racial identity was proposed by Helms’ (1984) model and later updated to include a total of six statuses of White Racial Identity Development (Helms, 1995). However, due to persistent concerns with the theory and the instrument designed to measure the statuses an alternative lens of White Racial Consciousness was suggested (Rowe, Bennett, & Atkinson, 1994). Summarized below are Helms’ (1984, 1995) developmental model of White racial identity, the White Racial Consciousness model (Rowe, Bennett & Atkinson, 1994) and Downing and Roush’s (1985) developmental model of feminist identity development for women.

Understanding the Identity Models and Family Environment

Helms (1984, 1995) introduced one of the first models of White racial identity development to the literature. She has since updated her model to include six statuses of identity development that operate under two overall phases. The first phase, Abandonment of Racism begins with the Contact status and ends with Reintegration. The Contact status is characterized by a lack of awareness of the importance that race plays in society. The Disintegration status is defined by confusion about one’s own racial group membership and limited acceptance of the reality that people of color are oppressed. The Reintegration status is when an individual accepts a White identity and believes that the superiority of Whites and inferiority of people of color is justified. The second phase, Defining a Positive White Identity begins with Pseudo-Independence and ends with Autonomy. The Pseudo-Independent status is characterized by an intellectualized
acceptance of Whiteness and a focus on helping people of color rather than changing White attitudes and actions. The Immersion/Emersion status reflects a shift to a more proactive development of a positive White identity, which involves changing White's attitudes rather than focusing on people of color. The final status, Autonomy is defined by a new expression of whiteness that actively rejects White privilege and works to dismantle existing structures of racism. Helms considered her model developmental but recognized that the statuses might not proceed linearly and that individuals may recycle through pervious statuses when faced with new information and racial situations. Her model is assessed through the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS) (Helms & Carter, 1990).

Due to persistent concerns with the psychometric properties of the WRIAS Rowe et al, (1994) introduced the White Racial Consciousness model, which purports to be more parsimonious than Helms' theory. In its original construction the model suggested seven attitude types that reflected “one’s awareness of being White and what it implies in relationship to those who do not share White group membership” (Rowe et al., 1994, p 133-134). The seven attitude types were grouped under two categories: Achieved White Racial Consciousness and Unachieved White Racial Consciousness. The authors borrowed this conceptualization from Phinney’s theory of Ethnic Identity Development (1992). In these seven attitude types there was a high degree of similarity to Helms’ WRID theory and Rowe et al., suggested that this was due to the fact that Helms’ theory more accurately describes the attitudes Whites develop about others rather than a sense of themselves as White people. The White Racial Consciousness model has been revised
from its earlier version due to scale development and research indicating that fewer than seven types may more accurately reflect Whites attitudes about people of color.

The updated White Racial Consciousness model is described by two overall constructs: Racial Acceptance and Racial Justice (LaFleur, Rowe & Leach, 2002). The common theme within Racial Acceptance is an individual’s expressed comfort with people of color. There are two attitude types that make up Racial Acceptance, Dominative and Integrative. A Dominative attitude type is characterized by negative and stereotypical feelings about people of color. A person who holds this attitude type also believes in the inherent superiority of White culture and White people. An Integrative attitude type operates at the other end of the spectrum and expresses acceptance and comfort with racial material. Individuals with Integrative attitudes often believe that ending racism is a moral imperative and act according to that principle. The second overall construct is Racial Justice, which is characterized by beliefs that certain groups are benefiting from the way society operates. The two attitudes that make up this construct are Reactive and Conflictive. A Reactive attitude type reflects beliefs that Whites have unearned advantages and privileges in society while a Conflictive attitude type reflects beliefs that people of color unfairly benefit from governmental aid and programs. The White Racial Consciousness model does not claim to be a theory of identity development, but does describe the varying attitudes that White people can hold in relationship to race. Though the authors do not assume a developmental sequence some of the attitudes reflect more closed attitudes about race while others reflect more open attitudes. While the White Racial Consciousness model is not a model of racial identity it can be conceived as somewhat similar but focused on the attitudes that
individuals develop. This new conceptualization is measured using the Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale-Revised (Vandiver & Leach, 2005).

Downing and Roush (1985) introduced the only model of feminist identity development for women which consists of five stages and was heavily based on Cross' (1971) model of psychological Nigrescence. The five stages of the Feminist Identity Development model include: Passive Acceptance, Revelation, Embeddedness-Emanation, Synthesis and Active Commitment. The Passive Acceptance stage is characterized by a lack of awareness or denial of the personal and institutional oppression of women. Women in this stage are likely to insulate themselves against opinions that might challenge their worldview. The Revelation stage is marked by a woman’s encounter with sexism either personally or through education. Transition to this stage can result in anger and psychological distress for the woman as she shifts her worldview. The Embeddedness-Emanation stage is a two-step process, in the first step a woman surrounds herself with women-centered spaces and others who support women’s development. In the second step she begins to perceive the world through more flexible terms and acknowledges that anger is not the most effective means of social change. The Synthesis stage is characterized by an emphasis on valuing the positive aspects of being female and responding both effectively and productively to the challenges of sexism. The final stage, Active Commitment, is defined by a woman’s commitment to activism around social change. Downing and Roush believed that very few women reach this stage and that those who are participating in activist events are often operating out of earlier stages. While this is a stage model Hansen (2002) has suggested a fluidity in progression through the stages.
While some connections between aspects of collective identity development have been investigated in the literature there have not been any studies that quantitatively explored the connections between racial consciousness and feminist identity development for White women. Hoffman (2006) and Miville et al., (2005) have both recently quantitatively examined how aspects of collective group identity similar to race and feminism may relate to each other. Hoffman found connections between a measure of ethnic identity and the stages of feminist identity development for women. Miville et al. reported relationships between a measure of personal identity and measures of White racial and gender identities. Even in light of these recent studies the literature is limited in its understanding of how processes of identity development relate to one another. In response to these limitations several researchers have suggested theoretical models that emphasize the importance of understanding multiple dimensions of identity (Jones & McEwen, 2000; Reynolds & Pope, 1991).

Examining feminist identity development and White racial consciousness for White women is important due to these women’s experience of both privilege and marginalization. Exploring the potential relationships between these aspects of collective identity and attitude development provides a means of understanding how both a dominant identity (whiteness) and a historically marginalized identity (female) develop and function. Frankenberg’s (1993) qualitative study focusing on White women and race pointed to a disparity in her participants’ ability to identify their disadvantages due to sexism and their privileges due to racism. She found that the White women she interviewed had a difficult time verbalizing their whiteness while at the same time had a variety of means of conceptualizing their gender and experiences of sexism.
Frankenberg’s study as well as other scholars in both Women’s Studies and Critical Race Studies have demonstrated the need to further understand the interactions of sexism and White privilege as related to identity development (Delgado & Stefanie, 1997; Frankenberg, 1993; McIntosh, 2005; Rothenberg, 2005). This study attempted to understand the relationships between White racial consciousness and feminist identity development.

The theoretical context of Jones and McEwen’s (2000) model of multiple dimensions of identity as well as the models of feminist identity development and White racial consciousness provide an opportunity to further understand how attitudes and development may relate and interact with each other. However, it is also important to examine how specific factors influence the development of attitudes and identity. In their model of multiple dimensions of identity Jones and McEwen (2000) suggested that many factors including background experiences, socio-cultural conditions, religious beliefs, cultural traditions, sibling and peer relationships, romantic attachments, educational contexts, family of origin, race and gender can all influence growth and development. Very few studies have attempted to understand the relationship of these factors to racial consciousness and aspects of collective identity development. The influence of one’s family of origin has been studied extensively with regards to personal identity development, generally defined using Marcia’s (1980) ego statuses, but has not been explored in relationship to aspects of collective identity development such as feminist identity development and White racial consciousness (Adams et al., 2000; Kamptner, 1988; Markland & Nelson, 1993).
The influence of one’s family of origin can be studied through exploration of family environment. Family environment is defined by the relationships between family members, the organization of the family and the family’s emphasis on personal growth (Moos & Moos, 1974, 1994, 2002). Family environment primarily reflects the family’s climate and functioning rather than the family’s structure. Family environment has been primarily operationalized using the Family Environment Scale (Moos & Moos, 1974, 1994, 2002). This scale consists of ten subscales organized into three dimensions. The Relationship dimension consists of the Cohesion, Expressiveness and Conflict subscales. The Personal Growth dimension consists of the Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Active-Recreational Orientation and Moral-Religious Emphasis subscales. The System Maintenance dimension consists of the Organization and Control subscales. The influence of family environment has been found to be significantly related to psychological distress and well-being (Bopaiya & Prasad, 2004), psychological hardiness and social interest (Amerikaner, Monks, Wolfe & Thomas, 1994) and psychological reactance (Buboltz, Johnson & Woller, 2003). The Cohesion, Expressiveness and Independence subscales tended to relate to positive wellbeing while the Conflict subscale was related to psychological reactance and distress. Family environment allows exploration of an individual’s perception of their family of origin. Since family environment has been shown to impact other areas of psychological well-being and development exploring it’s relationships with racial consciousness and feminist identity development is a logical step.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was twofold, first investigate the relationship of one's family of origin to feminist identity development and White racial consciousness and second explore the possible relationships between feminist identity development and White racial consciousness. In particular this study examined the relationships between White racial consciousness and feminist identity development for undergraduate female students who identify as White. This study also explored the possible relationships of White racial consciousness and feminist identity development to family environment. Though there is considerable research on identity development, both personal and collective aspects, the literature that specifically examines how feminist identity and attitudes about race may be related is lacking. There is also very limited research on the impact of one's family of origin on collective group identity development and racial attitudes. Though the potential relationships between aspects of identity development and the development of more flexible attitudes about race have been suggested in the theoretical and model building literature very little quantitative research has explored the connections. Given the lack of research this study was somewhat exploratory in nature because the relationships between feminism, White racial consciousness and family or origin environment had not yet been empirically examined. In order to explore the relationships between these constructs this quantitative study used a demographic questionnaire and three assessment measures: the Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale-Revised (Vandiver & Leach, 2005), the Feminist Identity Composite (Fischer et. al., 2000) and the Family Environment Scale (Moos & Moos, 1974, 1994, 2002).
Research Questions

Research Question 1: What is the nature of the relationship between family environment and feminist identity development for undergraduate White women?
Null hypothesis 1: The canonical correlation analysis between the family environment variables and the feminist identity development variables will indicate that all squared canonical correlation coefficients, $R^2$, are equal to zero.

Research Question 2: What is the nature of the relationship between family environment and White racial consciousness attitudes for undergraduate White women?
Null hypothesis 2: The canonical correlation analysis between the family environment variables and the White racial consciousness attitude types will indicate that all squared canonical correlation coefficients, $R^2$, are equal to zero.

Research Question 3: What is the nature of the relationship between White racial consciousness attitudes and feminist identity development for undergraduate White women?
Null hypothesis 3: The canonical correlation analysis between the White racial consciousness attitude types and the feminist identity development variables will indicate that all squared canonical correlation coefficients, $R^2$, are equal to zero.

Research Question 4: What is the nature of the relationship between family environment, and White racial consciousness attitudes and feminist identity development variables considered together for undergraduate White women?
Null hypothesis 4: The canonical correlation analysis between the set of family environment variables, and the combined set of White racial consciousness attitude types
and feminist identity development variables will indicate that all squared canonical correlation coefficients, $R_c^2$, are equal to zero.

Importance of the Study

It is clear from the literature that multiple aspects of identity are important to understand when considering growth and development. An essential question to consider is how feminist identity development and White racial consciousness have relationships for undergraduate White women. Given the unique nature of undergraduate White women’s identities, both historically oppressed and historically oppressive, this study examined the connections between the two and can help in understanding how White women grapple with race and feminism. Further, this investigation into how family environment was related to both White racial consciousness and feminist identity development provides evidence for the types of environments that promote more mature feminist identity stages and White racial consciousness attitudes that express comfort with people of color and concern for racial justice.

This study explored among undergraduate White women the important relationships between feminist identity development, White racial consciousness and family environment. To date there have not been any studies that have explored the relationships between the Feminist Identity Development model, White Racial Consciousness model and Family Environment Scale. This study contributed to the literature in this area and offered a new perspective on how feminist identity development, racial attitudes and family environment relate to each other.
Summary

Chapter one introduced the literature on identity development and specifically feminist and White racial identity development. The prominent models in the field have been summarized with Feminist Identity Development being represented by Downing and Roush's 1985 model and White Racial Identity Development being described by Helms' 1995 model. The White Racial Consciousness Model was also presented as an alternative means of viewing whiteness (LaFleur et al., 2002; Rowe et al., 1994). Family environment has been defined and operationalized using the Family Environment Scale (Moos & Moos, 1974, 1994, 2002). The purposes of the study as well as the hypotheses have also been described. Potential implications of this study have been suggested. Chapter two will review the relevant literature on identity development, racial identity, feminist identity development and family environment. Chapter three reviews the research methods and procedures employed for this study. This review includes a description of the participants, measures, procedures, research design and data analysis methods. Chapter four outlines the results of the canonical correlation analyses conducted for this study. Chapter five provides a discussion of these results.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Identity development has been widely studied and recognized as an important aspect of an individual growth and development. Several researchers have noted the significance of psychosocial identity development also referred to as personal identity development (Erikson, 1968; Marcia, 1980). More recently the importance of socially constructed or collective identity development has been emphasized (Cross, 1971; Downing & Roush, 1985; Helms, 1984, 1990, 1995). College student development (Chickering & Reisser, 1993), women's identity development (Josselson, 1987) sexual minority development (Cass, 1979), racial identity development (Cross, 1971; Helms, 1984) and feminist identity development (Downing & Roush, 1985) are all examples of collective identity development models that have evolved from Erikson's (1968) psychosocial stages, Marcia's (1980) ego statuses and various sociopolitical realities (racism, sexism, and heterosexism). Though the importance of these identity models and emphasis on understanding aspects of identity development is clearly evident in the literature (Fischer & Moradi, 2001; Ponterotto, Casas, Suzuki & Alexander, 1995) very few studies have explored how specific processes of identity development relate to each other.

Despite the growing base of literature that emphasizes the importance of understanding multiple aspects of collective group identity (Jones, 1997; Jones & McEwen, 2000; Reynolds & Pope, 1991) relatively little attention has been directed
toward quantitatively exploring how two or more collective group identities relate to one another (Hoffman, 2006; Miville, Darlington, Whitlock & Mulligan, 2005). In their conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity Jones and McEwen (2000) used qualitative data to describe the many ways in which collective group identities have the potential to interact and operate in tandem. They called for more research that examines how different aspects of identity development may interact and influence each other (Jones & McEwen, 2000). The following review attempts to synthesize and evaluate the literature on two aspects of collective identity development, feminist identity development and White racial identity development as well as consider and explore the possibility that one’s family of origin may be potentially related to both of these processes of identity development.

The two aspects of identity development that will be focused on in this paper are feminist and White racial identity development. Exploring the connections between these two processes of identity development for White women provides a unique opportunity to further understand how a dominant and oppressive identity and a marginalized and historically oppressed identity can both develop within an individual. White women as a group have historically been marginalized but are also members of the racial group that has benefited from oppressing others. Scholars in Women’s Studies and Critical White Studies have noted the importance of understanding the interactions of sexism and White privilege for White women (Delgado & Stefancic, 1997; Frankenberg, 1993; McIntosh, 2005; Rothenberg, 2005). This review will explore both sexism and White privilege as related to identity through feminist and White racial identity development. Research on the connections between feminist identity development and White racial identity
development is limited so both qualitative and quantitative work that examines the relationships between race, ethnicity, gender and feminism in identity development will be included.

Thus far the importance of exploring the connections between different aspects of collective identity development, particularly White racial identity and feminist identity development, has been outlined. It is also important to consider the contextual factors that may relate to processes of collective identity development. Various factors have been suggested to relate to the process of identity development (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Jones & McEwen, 2000). These factors have included: sociocultural conditions, background experiences, religious beliefs, cultural traditions, sibling and peer relationships, romantic attachments, educational contexts, race and gender (Jones & McEwen, 2000). More recently researchers have examined the impact of one’s family of origin on identity development. This research has focused on personal identity development as defined by Erikson’s (1968) psychosocial stages and Marcia’s (1980) ego statuses. It has also emphasized the development of identity during later adolescence, which for many is during the college years. Though family environment variables have been extensively studied as related to some aspects of college student development such as career development they have not been examined in relationship to feminist and racial identity development (Berrios-Allison, 2005; Whiston & Keller, 2004). The literature summarized in this chapter will also suggest that an individual’s perception of his or her family of origin is one construct that may be related to both of these processes of identity development.
The present review attempts to synthesize and evaluate the literature on two aspects of collective identity development, feminist and White racial identity development. Feminist identity development will be conceptualized using Downing and Roush’s Feminist Identity Development Model (1985). White racial identity development will be summarized using Helm’s (1984, 1995) White Racial Identity Development Theory and Rowe, Bennett and Atkinson’s (1994) White Racial Consciousness Model. In addition this review will summarize the research on family environment and lay the groundwork for a study exploring the connections between family environment, feminist identity development and White racial consciousness.

White Racial Identity Development and White Racial Consciousness

Racial identity development is one aspect of collective group identity development. The major White racial identity development model emerged from the counseling psychology literature and assumed the importance of historical and contemporary racism in shaping racial identity (Hardiman, 1982; Helms, 1984). The theory of White Racial Consciousness was suggested as an alternative lens to White racial identity development. The following section will include: definitions and discussion of the terms race, racial identity and racism, a presentation of the major model of White racial identity development, a summary of the model of White Racial Consciousness and a summary of the strengths and criticisms of each model.

Race, Racial Identity and Racism

Throughout most of U.S. history race has been defined as a biological trait, however, in recent decades many social scientists have noted the limitations and lack of
evidence for this approach and moved toward an understanding of race as a social construct (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Thompson & Neville, 1999). Defining race as a social construct indicates that race is not a natural or biological category but rather given importance and status based on the social context in which it is defined (Thompson & Neville, 1999). Race has been given meaning by the way in which it has been used as a marker of difference within society. In the United States this has historically meant that privileges and advantages have been assigned based on a person’s skin color. Whites have benefited from a system that attributes superiority to whiteness while people of color have been systematically denied rights and access due to their racial group membership (Thompson & Neville, 1999). Often race is inappropriately used interchangeably with ethnicity. However, ethnicity differs from race and refers to a common cultural socialization and shared nationality (Helms, 1996). Ethnicity exists independent of racial socialization and oppression and instead relies on connectedness to a culture. Race is assigned by the laws and customs of the society and defines an individual’s position in the social structure of society (Helms, 1996). It is out of this history of racial domination and subordination that racial identity develops.

Racial identity was originally conceptualized as a developmental process (Cross, 1971; Helms, 1984). This process describes an individual’s psychological reactions to being socialized in a society where privilege and disadvantage are assigned by race. The focus of racial identity theory is “examining the person’s internalized reactions to being treated as though he or she belongs to a “real” racial group” (Helms, 1996, p. 154). Helms described four themes of racial identity development across groups. First, individuals develop a racial identity in comparison to their contrast racial group. For Whites this has
historically meant developing a racial identity in contrast to African Americans while for people of color racial identity forms in contrast to Whites. Second, more mature racial identity development involves relying on one’s self-definitions of race rather than society’s racial hierarchy. Third, Helms identified that racial identity develops through a process of more complex ego statuses evolving from earlier statuses. Fourth, Helms acknowledged that while expressions of racial identity statuses can be measured development could only be inferred from the measurement instrument. Developmental models of racial identity have assumed that racism is one of the major influences in the process of identity development both for those who are oppressed (people of color) and those who are privileged (Whites) (Hardiman, 2001: Wijeyesinghe & Jackson, 2001).

Racism has been a powerful force in shaping contemporary U.S. society. Racism is the systematic mistreatment of people based on their racial classification (Thompson & Neville, 1999). Thompson and Neville identified three major elements that compose racism. First, racism includes both structural and ideological components. The authors identified that racism is perpetuated by a structure that organizes around racial differences in which the group that has power can restrict access and impose policies that disadvantage other racial groups. This structure has resulted in the under representation of people of color in areas such as politics and higher education while at the same time overrepresentation in poverty and prison populations. Racism is justified by ideologies emphasizing the validity of White superiority and inherent inferiority of other racial groups.

Second, Thompson and Neville (1999) state that there are multiple forms of racism including: individual, institutional, cultural and environmental. Individual racism
describes the discrimination against people of color in everyday situations. Institutional racism "refers to the policies, practices, and norms that incidentally, but inevitably perpetuate inequality" (Thompson & Neville, 1999, p. 167). Cultural racism is based on the assumption that White cultural values are normal and superior while the cultural practices of people of color are pathologized or omitted from the general discourse. Environmental racism is evident in the greater proportion of garbage and pollutants dumped in communities of color. The third element of racism is its changing nature across time and geographic regions. Though the expressions of racism have differed throughout the history of the U.S. it has always been present. When segregation was legal overt racism was sanctioned by the federal government and while in the contemporary U.S. this is no longer the case racism has evolved into a color-blind ideology (Bonilla-Silva, 2006).

The color-blind ideology of racism is a form of racism distinct from the older expressions of legalized segregation but still maintains much of the same impact. Bonilla-Silva (2006) describes this new racism as an ideology that allows Whites to continue to justify racial inequality while denying the significance of race. He uses the phrase "abstract liberalism" to explain how Whites can frame race-related issues (i.e. employment and integrated schools) in liberal terms and thus appear righteous and reasonable but at the same time openly oppose practical means of dealing with these issues (i.e. affirmative action and school busing policies). For example, Whites may explain that they are for equal opportunity employment and thus against affirmative action because it represents preferential treatment for people of color. This claim does not require the speaker to examine the underrepresentation of people of color in higher
paying employment, universities and politics or the historical affirmative action for
Whites that operates in many of these institutions. This color-blind racist ideology also
allows Whites to frame all choices as individual preferences rather than primarily the
result of the systemic discrimination and mistreatment of people of color (Bonilla-Silva,
2006).

Bonilla-Silva (2006) identifies two ways in which this color-blind racist ideology
persists, first through specific language usage and second through the practice of story
telling. Using qualitative data he explains that Whites use four types of “rhetorical
strategies” to perpetuate color blindness: avoidance, semantics, projection and
diminutives (p. 53). Whites tended to avoid openly racist terminology and attribute things
like segregation completely to class or economics rather than race. Several different
semantic strategies allowed Whites to deny any racism on their part but then speak in
racially stereotyping ways. One example is the phrase, “I’m not racist”, followed by a
statement that could be interpreted as racist. This strategy gives Whites a way out if they
are challenged on the racist nature of their statements, they can deny any allegiance to
racism. Projection also serves to help Whites neglect responsibility and guilt while
identifying people of color as the problem. Bonilla-Silva (2006) observed that Whites
attributed the high level of residential segregation experienced in this country to people
of color who supposedly chose to live together. They did not usually recognize the
systemic barriers people of color face when trying to move into White neighborhoods.
Finally, diminutives, such as “I’m just a little bit against affirmative action because it is
terribly unfair to Whites” serve to soften the impact of racially or politically controversial
remarks (p. 71). Bonilla-Silva (2006) found that the vast majority of Whites used these
linguistic strategies as well as the practice of story telling to maintain their color-blind racist ideology.

The practice of story telling is a powerful method of perpetuating colorblind racism. Bonilla-Silva (2006) identified two types of racial stories: story lines and testimonies. Story lines are “the socially shared tales that are fable-like and incorporate a common scheme and wording” (p. 76). These story lines tended to be vague and rely on generic or stereotypical information. Common story lines tended to minimize discrimination by placing it in the past rather than present and blaming people of color for not succeeding where other immigrant groups (Irish, Italian etc) had. Whites also used the phrase “I didn’t own any slaves” to deny any responsibility for racism (p. 79). Perhaps the most common story line Bonilla-Silva reported was the “I did not get a job because of a minority” claim (p. 83). These story lines allows Whites to blame affirmative action or people of color rather than grapple with the idea that they may not have been qualified for a job. This common type of story line also serves to distance Whites from acknowledging the power and privilege they do hold. Bonilla-Silva (2006) also describes testimonies, which are types of stories where the person telling the story is the main character or in close relationship to the central character. Testimonies tend to be perceived as authentic and emotion laden. These stories tend to be personal and thus an effective rhetorical tool in arguments about race. It is difficult to refute someone’s personal experience and so the story tends to be accepted as truth even when the facts are unclear. Colorblind racism has been labeled the “new racism” due to its difference from older Jim Crow racism but it’s effectiveness at perpetuating similar outcomes. These
varied uses of language provide evidence for the role of colorblind racism in shaping White’s general discourse on race (Bonilla-Silva, 2006).

Racism has historically been explained by its oppressive presence in the lives of people of color. However, in recent decades scholars have also noted the importance of understanding how racism shapes the experience of Whites (Delgado & Stefanic, 1997; Rothenberg, 2005). Studies on whiteness have indicated that Whites’ experiences are shaped by privilege and superiority through racist ideologies and policies that position whiteness as the dominant norm (Delgado & Stefanic, 1997). McIntosh (2005) coined the term “White Privilege” to describe the various ways in which Whites benefit from the oppression of people of color. She described White privilege as an invisible knapsack that contains a variety of tools that can be used to access an array of benefits. These benefits range from the freedom to shop in stores without being watched over to economic advantages such as higher housing values and overall net worth. McIntosh noted that White privilege is supposed to remain invisible to the Whites who rely on it everyday. If White privilege is made visible Whites can no longer believe that their achievements are simply a result of merit (Rothenberg, 2005). White privilege gives Whites a sense of superiority through unearned advantage and conferred dominance. This idea that whiteness is superior to people of color allows Whites to justify the oppression of people based on the idea that racial categories are inherent and infallible (McIntosh, 2005).

One potential hazard in studying whiteness and White privilege is that it may direct attention away from the oppression of people of color and on to Whites. However, by neglecting to study whiteness Whites can simultaneously reject any responsibility for racism and benefit from it’s oppression of others. Rothenberg (2005) stated, “White
privilege is the other side of racism” to indicate the importance of understanding how Whites benefit from racism in order to deconstruct it (p. 1). The goal in studying White privilege and whiteness is to help Whites take responsibility for their role in racism and become active in dismantling the institutional structures that discriminate against people of color (Rothenberg, 2005). Another means of understanding how Whites benefit from racism and develop in relationship to White privilege is to explore White racial identity development.

White Racial Identity Development

Helms (1984) originally proposed a model of White racial identity development that outlined a sequence of stages where one moves from a racist worldview to an actively anti-racist stance. A key piece of this is the individuals’ awareness of his or her whiteness and development of a positive view of what it means to be White. Though Hardiman (1982) and Helms’ (1984) introduced similar stage models of White racial identity development at roughly the same time Helms’ model has been the most widely researched and discussed in the literature. Helms (1995) chose a stage model because of the potential for flexibility and growth within such a model. However, in practice and research many interpreted her original five stages as rigid and non-permeable, though she had intended for them to be seen as much more flexible and interactive. In her 1995 revision of the model Helms renamed them statuses in order to reflect her intention that each be seen as dynamic and potentially interacting with one another. The developmental nature of her model has been criticized primarily due to the lack of longitudinal research (Rowe et al., 1994). However, various authors have identified the ways in which the White Racial Identity Development (WRID) theory qualifies as a developmental theory.
Specifically, Thompson explained that Helms' theory reflects changes over time that are relatively stable and in a particular direction. These characteristics as well as its attention to the influence of the environment and an individual's increased capacity for self-control help to show how Helms' model corresponds to a developmental model (Thompson, 1994).

Helms' (1995) model is grounded in the philosophy that all people regardless of their specific racial group go through a developmental experience with regards to their racial identity. This philosophy also acknowledges the reality that those developmental processes will be different for specific racial groups given the distribution of power in a society and reality of oppression and discrimination. In the U.S. society Whites have been and continue to be the dominant group, which has meant unearned access to privileges and an entitled status. People of color have been a marginalized and oppressed group, which has meant the dehumanization and denial of human rights. Helms (1995) argued that given the reality of a social structure set up to deny rights to some and give unearned advantages to others people of color and Whites have different racial identity developmental issues. For Whites the central issue is the abandonment of privilege and internalized superiority. For people of color the central issue is addressing internalized racist oppression and its consequences.

The racial identity model Helms proposed operates out of the belief that the statuses proceed sequentially and that each allows the individual to handle more complex racial material. This is a developmental theory that assumes individual maturation through the statuses. This maturation may be triggered by necessity. When an individual is faced with a situation that includes racial material he or she will rely on whichever
status is most dominant unless that status does not relieve or explain the situation. In this case the individual will likely rely on a previous status’ strategy until none of the previous strategies facilitate relief or change. It is at this point that an individual may be pressed to develop new ways of thinking and relating thus potentially moving towards the next status (Helms, 1995).

Helms’ (1984, 1990, 1995) WRID model has two phases that contain several different statuses within each. The first phase, Abandonment of Racism, begins with the Contact status and ends with Reintegration. The second phase, Defining a Positive White Identity, begin with Pseudo-Independence and ends with Autonomy. The Contact (C) status is characterized by denial, naïveté and obliviousness. A person in this status does not think of themselves in racial terms nor do they acknowledge that they see others that way. They may avoid racial material because it is anxiety provoking. Near the end of the Contact status is the first time that a person may begin to think about racial realities, this is usually the result of personal interaction with people of color. In order to move to the next status, Disintegration, individuals will have been faced with repeated experiences that reveal that people of color are treated differently than Whites in U.S. society (Helms, 1990).

Disintegration (D) is characterized by acknowledgement and discomfort with Whiteness. It is likely in this status that individuals begin to understand that people of color are not equal to Whites in the United States. In the midst of this discomfort and incongruence the individual makes a decision to pull away from cross-racial interactions or makes attempts to change others attitudes in a racial naïve manner. An individual in this status may be disoriented about racial material, confused about their previous
worldview and this new information about racial inequality. People in disintegration may attempt to suppress information that does not correspond with their worldview (Helms, 1990, 1995).

The Reintegration (R) status is where an individual fully acknowledges a White identity. However, this White identity is marked by a belief that White people have earned more power than people of color and that White superiority is justified. Historical and contemporary information is distorted to support White dominance. The individual has moved from feelings of discomfort to fear and anger towards people of color. These feelings may not be overtly expressed but may appear when the individual is challenged and immediately becomes defensive. This is a particularly easy status to remain in given the ability of Whites to isolate themselves from people of color and surround themselves with other Whites. In order to move from this status an event must occur that requires the individual to question their claims to privilege and power based on skin color (Helms, 1990, 1995).

The second phase, defining a positive White identity, begins with the Pseudo-Independent (PI) status. This status is characterized by strongly held intellectual views about racism. The person is focused on helping people of color rather than changing White attitudes. The person rejects the belief that Whites are superior but he or she may still behave in ways that perpetuate systemic racism. Instead of seeing the problems with institutions and systems people in this status will focus on helping people of color better conform to the White standard. The pseudo-independent individual will likely feel uncomfortable with his or her White identity and attempt to over identify with people of color, which will also leave him or her feeling uncomfortable. In this status liberal
tolerance is evident along with an intellectual commitment to whiteness (Helms, 1990, 1995).

The next status, Immersion/Emersion (IE), is characterized by an individual’s desire to have a better definition of Whiteness. This stage focuses on redefining a positive White identity through discussion with other Whites who have made this anti-racist journey. The person’s attention has also shifted to the goal of changing White people rather than people of color. This process of re-education about race and historical racism is evident in the Immersion/Emersion individual’s attempt to understand his or her personal benefits and privileges as a result of being White. A personal definition of racism and whiteness may emerge from this status as the individual questions previously held beliefs. Attention is also directed at understanding the role of systemic racism and identifying how Whites can enact change. This status may also lead to activism around racial issues (Helms, 1990, 1995).

The final status, Autonomy (A), is focused on internalizing a new view of Whiteness. This individual feels free to abandon both institutional and personal racism. In this status an individual has integrated a well-informed description of what it means to be White in the U.S. This allows the individual to live an authentic whiteness that includes rejecting the privileges of a dominant group identity and using non-stereotypical standards for self-definition. Autonomous individuals are characterized by flexibility and complexity in their handling of racial matters. Individuals in this status may consciously avoid choices that perpetuate racism and oppression. While this is the last stage of this identity model it is best conceptualized as a process that is ongoing and not officially
completed in this last stage. There is no absolute ending, rather a series of developmental stages that are dynamic and flexible (Helms, 1990, 1995).

Research with Helms' White Racial Identity Development Theory

Helms' (1984) theory has been widely studied and empirically reviewed in the counseling psychology literature. Helms and Carter (1990) introduced the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS) in order to measure the five original stages of the WRID theory. The Immersion/Emersion status was added later and thus not included in the original measure's construction (Helms, 1995). Throughout its use the WRIAS tended to perform according to the theory's predicted directions, however, the psychometrics have been widely reviewed and often criticized as less than adequate (Behrens, 1997; Behrens & Rowe, 1997; Fischer & Moradi, 2001; Pope-Davis, Vandiver & Stone, 1999). Various researchers have cautioned use of the WRIAS without additional empirical research to identify what constructs are being measured (Fischer & Moradi, 2001).

In an examination of the validity of the WRIAS, Tokar and Swanson (1991) noted that higher levels of self-actualization were related to further developmental statuses of the WRID theory. Self-actualization was measured using three of the subscales of the Personal Orientation Inventory: Time Competence, Inner Directedness and Capacity for Intimate Contact (Tokar & Swanson, 1991). Higher scores on these subscales indicate that an individual is orientated towards the present, relies on oneself and has the ability to develop close meaningful relationships. The Pseudo-Independence ($r = .14$ to $.26$) and Autonomy ($r = .20$ to $.33$) subscales were positively correlated with the three subscales measuring self-actualization while the Disintegration ($r = -.25$ to -.37) and Reintegration ($r = -.26$ to -.37) subscales were negatively correlated with the same measure. Tokar and
Swanson (1991) found this to be consistent with Helms’ theory that more mature statuses (Pseudo-Independent and Autonomy) would also reflect higher levels of insight and self-awareness while earlier statuses (Disintegration, Reintegration and Contact) would not. Several studies of racism and White racial identity have also found significant relationships between earlier statuses of WRID and higher racism scores (Carter, 1990; Carter, Helms & Juby, 2004; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994). Of particular interest are the gender differences that have also been noted in these studies. Two of the studies found that women were more likely to be further along in their White racial identity development and more likely to have lower racism scores than men (Carter, 1990; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994). The authors suggested several interpretations for this finding most notably that women’s emotional socialization and women’s experience of sexual discrimination might make them more sensitive to racial matters (Carter, 1990; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994).

Since it’s introduction the WRIAS has also been studied in connection to a wide variety of topics including: the multicultural counseling competencies (Ottavi, Pope-Davis & Dings, 1994), perceived comforted in working with African Americans (Block, Robertson & Neuger, 1995; Carter, Gushue & Weitzman, 1994), social cognition and racial stereotypes (Gushue & Carter, 2000), religious orientation (Sciarra & Gushue, 2003) and the NEO personality constructs (Silvestri & Richardson, 2001). In each of these studies the WRIAS has performed according to the direction explained by the theory. In their exploration of the attitudes of Whites towards working with people of color Block et al. (1995) found that Pseudo-Independence ($r = .42$) and Autonomy ($r = .42$) were positively correlated with the subscale indicating comfort in working with
African Americans. They interpreted this to mean that individuals in the later statuses of White racial identity development (PI and A) have greater comfort in interracial interactions. In another study Gushue and Carter (2000) examined how social memory was related to relying on racial stereotypes and found negative correlations with the Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy subscales that were non-significant but in the predicted direction. This provides empirical support for the theory that the Autonomy status corresponds to more flexible ways of thinking about race.

With regards to religious orientation Sciarra and Gushue (2003) found that Autonomy was significantly correlated (r = .20) with a quest orientation toward religion while the Disintegration subscale was correlated with the Fundamentalism subscale (r = .20). A high score on the quest orientation toward religion scale indicates that an individual thinks about religion flexibly and creatively rather than dogmatically. Interestingly, in this study the WRIAS performed in the predicted direction, an earlier status (Disintegration) characterized by less flexible thinking was associated with the Fundamentalism scale which is a measure of more dogmatic and ritualistic thinking. In another study examining the NEO personality constructs and White racial identity Silvestri and Richardson (2001) found that the Autonomy subscale was positively related to openness while Pseudo-Independence was negatively related. Again in this study the final WRIAS subscale (Autonomy) was related to a personality construct that reflected flexibility and openness to new ways of thinking. Consistently throughout these studies the more mature racial identity statuses, Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy, tended to be related to an increased sense of cultural competence (Ottavi et al., 1994), increased comfort in working with other racial groups (Block et al., 1995), less reliance on racial
stereotypes (Gushue & Carter, 2000), a more integrated and flexible religious orientation (Sciarra & Gushue, 2003) and a tendency towards openness as a personality trait (Silvestri & Richardson, 2001). Overall the results of these studies supported the statuses as explained by Helms’ theory.

Given the widespread use of the WRIAS so quickly after its introduction multiple authors have reported on its psychometric properties. In their review chapter, Fischer and Moradi (2001) summarized the literature on the psychometric properties of the WRIAS and eventually concluded that it demonstrates some strengths but also serious limitations. Behrens (1997) conducted a meta-analysis of data from 22 previous studies and reported internal consistency coefficients of .50 (Contact), .77 (Disintegration), .78 (Reintegration), .67 (Pseudo-Independence) and .61 (Autonomy). After conducting both item and exploratory factor analysis, Swanson, Tokar and Davis (1994) concluded that the five-factor structure originally proposed was not supported. Several of the subscales were highly related and did not appear to be measuring separate constructs. The authors of this study also noted that most of the items correlated more highly with other subscales than their own. They cautioned use of the WRIAS in its original form without substantial revision. Helms (1999) conducted another meta-analysis on the data that Behrens (1997) used in his meta-analysis. She concluded that the WRIAS scales most likely function interdependently and as a result statistical procedures that rely on the independence of these subscales might not be appropriate for use with the WRIAS. She also suggested that systemic measurement error might account for some of the low reliability coefficients and difficulty identifying the factor structure of the WRIAS. Helms’ encouraged
researchers to examine the WRIAS using statistical procedures appropriate for measuring developmental and personal characteristics.

Several studies have attempted to validate a factor structure for the WRIAS. Pope-Davis, Vandiver & Stone (1999) conducted both an exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis and reported a three-factor structure for the WRIAS. They labeled these factors: degree of racial comfort, attitudes toward racial equality and attitudes toward racial curiosity. Their findings indicated that most of the subscales appeared to measure the degree of racial comfort an individual experiences rather than five distinct developmental statuses. Mercer and Cunningham (2003) also found a reduced number of factors in their principal components analysis of the WRIAS. However, they reported four factors, two representing a positive White identity (Interest in racial diversity; Perceived cross-racial competence and comfort) and two others representing a negative White identity (White superiority/segregationist; Reactive racial dissonance). Mercer and Cunningham suggested that these factors could be used to measure different dimensions of White identity though they did not explain racial identity as a developmental process. Instead of conceptualizing identity development the authors noted that the WRIAS could be used to examine how Whites respond to racially different situations. Mercer and Cunningham echoed other researchers’ (Pope-Davis et al., 1999; Rowe et al., 1994) calls for more empirical evaluation of the developmental nature of the White racial identity model. Both of these studies suggested that the WRIAS merits further evaluation and potential revision in order to be used effectively to examine Helms’ theory of WRID. Due to concerns with the WRIAS’ psychometric properties the White Racial
Consciousness Model was introduced (Rowe, 2006; Rowe & Atkinson, 1995; Rowe et al., 1994).

**White Racial Consciousness Model**

White Racial Consciousness was proposed as an alternative to the White Racial Identity Development theories. Due to concerns with the psychometric properties of the WRIAS and the developmental nature of White identity models Rowe et al., proposed the White Racial Consciousness Model (WRC), which is meant to describe “one’s awareness of being White and what it implies in relationship to those who do not share White group membership” (p. 133-134). This model was primarily developed as researchers pointed out the lack of empirical evidence for the developmental process described by Helms’ (1984, 1995) White Racial Identity Development model (Rowe et al., 1994). The authors of the WRC model also believed that Helms’ WRID theory purports to describe identity development but in practice it examines attitudes Whites’ have about people of color rather than true developmental statuses. Rowe et al acknowledged that some of the attitude types summarized in the WRC model are conceptually very similar to the statuses described in Helms’ theory (Block & Carter, 1996; Pope-Davis et al., 1999). Rowe et al. proposed that this is because the statuses of the White Racial Identity development theory developed by Helms are more accurately described as the attitude types in the WRC model. Notably in an attempt to revise the White Racial Consciousness Development Scale (Claney & Parker, 1989), which was originally developed to reflect Helms’ conceptualization of White racial identity development, the authors found that their revised scale more accurately fit the model of White Racial Consciousness proposed by Rowe et al. (Lee et al., 2007). It appears that there are a number of both conceptual
and measurement similarities between the White Racial Consciousness Model and the
White Racial Identity Development theory.

The WRC model was originally described using seven different attitude types
(Rowe et al, 1994). The seven attitude types are grouped under two major statuses:
This model was partially based on Phinney’s (1992) model of Ethnic Identity
Development and Marcia’s (1980) description of the Ego Identity Statuses. Given that
Rowe et al., partially based their model on a developmental model Block and Carter
(1996) found it surprising that the authors considered it a non-developmental model.
There is no linear or stage-based assumption of this model. The authors believed that
individuals could move through these attitude types in differing sequences based on life
experiences and observations (Rowe, Behrens & Leach, 1995). The WRC model assumes
that cognitive dissonance between currently held beliefs and new attitudes will fuel
movement between the attitude types. The model also assumes that attitudes are formed
through observation and experience and that racial attitudes are no different.

Rowe et al., defined three types of attitudes in the first status, Unachieved White
Racial Consciousness: the Avoidant type, the Dependant type and the Dissonant type.
The Avoidant attitude type ignores one’s own racial identity and any other racial matters.
A minimization and dismissal of racial issues characterizes this attitude type. The
Dependent attitude type uses other’s views to define their own ideas of about race.
Individuals best characterized by this attitude type look to others for information on how
to think about racial matters instead of internalizing personally meaningful racial beliefs.
The Dissonant attitude type is uncertain about racial attitudes and thus open to new
experiences with race. Individuals whose attitudes reflect this type are non-committal about racial matters and are often found in a transitional phase regarding racial beliefs.

There are four types of attitudes listed for the second status, Achieved Racial Attitudes: the Dominative type, the Conflictive type, the Reactive type and the Integrative type. The Dominative attitude type believes in the superiority of White culture. Individuals who express this attitude type tend to believe that negative stereotypes about people of color are true and use them as a justification for the superiority and inherent value of whiteness. Active expression of this attitude involves overt acts of racism towards people of color while more passive endorsement is usually reflected in the individual’s avoidance of people of color. The Conflictive attitude type is against practices that overtly discriminate but is usually also against the policies put in place to end discrimination (i.e. Affirmative Action). Individuals characterized by this attitude type often believe that an equal playing field has been achieved and so any measures that would attempt to address the inequity in society are opposed.

The Reactive attitude type acknowledges the benefits of whiteness and is highly sensitive to discrimination against people of color. Individuals who operate from this attitude type are likely to over-identify with people of color and intellectualize racism. This can result in cultural marginalization as both the majority and minority groups may reject the individual. The Integrative attitude type has a complex sense of being White and is able to respond flexibly to racial material. This attitude type is characterized by a sense of moral responsibility about ending racism and discrimination combined with a realistic vision of what can be accomplished. Individuals best represented by this attitude type are seen as engaged in a process of integrating racial material into their overall
worldview. The need to view racial matters in a narrow way is not present in this attitude type. Individuals with this attitude type may be involved in active social change or have significant relationships with people of color. This model was originally operationalized using the Oklahoma Racial Attitude Scale—Preliminary Form (ORAS-P) (Choney & Behrens, 1996). The ORAS-P is composed of 50 items that are scored on a 5-point Likert scale yielding scores on seven separate subscales. Fischer and Moradi (2001) noted several strengths of the ORAS-P in their review of racial and ethnic identity measures. They found that the grounding of the instrument in theory, the well-documented development process and refinements over a period of years contributed to the overall strength of this instrument.

Research with the White Racial Consciousness Model

Due to the commonalities between the WRC theory and WRID theory a comparison was made of the two instruments purported to measure each of these theories (Pope-Davis et al., 1999). Pope-Davis et al. conducted exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses on both instruments with the expressed purpose of exploring their assumed factor structures. When comparing the factor structure and validity of the WRIAS and ORAS-P Pope-Davis et al., (1999) found that the two measures have a large degree of overlap. While the ORAS-P was purported to measure seven factors it is more likely that it has a three-factor solution. The first factor was labeled degree of racial comfort and was defined by Dominative and Integrative attitudes loading in a bi-polar manner. The second factor was labeled attitudes toward racial equality and was defined by the Conflictive and Reactive subscales. The third factor consisted of the three unachieved racial attitude types. The authors also found a three-factor structure for the
WRIAS. Pope-Davis et al., concluded that the two measures are very similar with the ORAS-P measuring perhaps one more factor then the WRIAS. Given Block and Carter’s (1996) theoretical comparison of the two theories and Pope-Davis et al.’s, empirical comparison of the two instruments it appears that the two models and instruments are explaining many of the same constructs. Pope-Davis et al. suggested that both instruments measure two of the same concepts, the first being the degree of comfort Whites have with their whiteness in relation to people of color and the second being Whites attitudes about equality. The main difference they found between the two measures was that the WRIAS contained items that reflected attitudes of racial curiosity while the ORAS-P contained items that described undefined or unachieved racial attitudes. Pope-Davis et al., (1999) concluded that neither instrument performed according to the full theoretical model and that both appear to be measuring many of the same constructs with regards to Whites and race.

Both theoretically and with respect to the measures developed for each similarity is evident between WRC and WRID theories, however Leach, Behrens and LaFleur (2002) have recently identified that there are distinct conceptual differences between the two. They believe that one of the major differences is that the WRID theory attempts to describe a complex process that includes both sociopolitical and psychological features while the WRC model simply describes attitudes that Whites have about people of color without assuming a sociopolitical influence. In this way the WRC model can be seen as primarily concerned with description rather than understanding complex identity phenomena. Another major difference is that the WRID theory assumes a developmental model that proceeds to a desired endpoint. The WRC model does not assume any given
sequence for racial attitudes nor a desired final attitude. Given these two conceptual differences it is interesting to note that the ORAS-P and WRIAS have been shown to measure some of the same constructs (Pope-Davis et al., 1999). Leach, Behrens and LaFleur (2002) commented that the WRID theory may be particularly difficult to measure because of its complexity while the WRC theory’s emphasis on describable phenomena might make it more readily accessible at least at this point in the literature. They also point out that the WRIAS has consistently demonstrated weak psychometric properties and has not been convincingly shown to reflect Helms’ (1995) White Racial Identity Development theory. With regards to the WRC model and the ORAS-P they suggest that more research on the instrument needs to be done in order to move the field further conceptually.

The original conceptualization of the WRC model has been updated in response to ongoing psychometric development of the ORAS-P. In 2002, LaFleur, Rowe and Leach offered an updated 35-item version of the WRC model and the ORAS. In 2005, Vandiver and Leach released the newest 21-item version of the ORAS now referred to as the ORAS-Revised. In the updated version of the WRC model there are two constructs under which four attitude types exist. The first theoretical construct is Racial Acceptance, which includes the Dominative and Integrative attitude types. This is similar to the first factor that Pope-Davis et al. (1999) referred to as “degree of racial comfort” (pg. 77). The second theoretical construct is Racial Justice, which includes the Conflictive and Reactive attitude types. This is similar to the second factor that Pope-Davis (1999) referred to as “attitudes toward racial equality” (p. 77). Three of the attitude types have been discarded (Avoidant, Dissonant and Dependant) and re-conceptualized as an
individual’s expressed commitment to the other four attitude types. The authors believe that these three attitude types did not necessarily reflect ways of grappling with racial material but were rather the degree to which a person “admits to being unconcerned (Avoidant), being uncertain (Dissonant), or simply reflecting the views of others (Dependant) (LaFleur, Rowe & Leach, 2002, p. 151). Within the Racial Acceptance construct the Dominative attitude type represents one end of a continuum while the Integrative attitude type represents the other end. Dominative attitudes are characterized by negative feelings about people of color while the Integrative attitude is best characterized by and expression of comfort with people of color. The common theme is one’s acceptance of people of color. Within the Racial Justice construct the common theme is the attitude that society is biased but the difference between the two attitudes is that Conflictive attitudes reflect a belief that society’s functioning benefits people of color while Reactive attitudes reflect a belief that White’s have unearned advantages in society.

This new conceptualization is reflected in the revised version of the ORAS (Vandiver & Leach, 2005). Instead of measuring seven different factors it now looks at three subscales, which describe four attitude types. There is one bi-polar subscale representing the Racial Acceptance construct and it is scored to reflect a Dominative or Integrative attitude type. A high score on this subscale indicates an Integrative attitude type while a lower score reflects a Dominative attitude type. There are two subscales representing the Racial Justice construct, which are scored to reflect the Conflictive and Reactive attitude types. The 21-item measure, scored on a 5-point Likert scale, yields three scores which reflect the level of endorsement for these four attitude types. Leach
(personal communication, March 19, 2007) reported alpha coefficients of Conflictive (.87), Dominative/Integrative (.82) and Reactive (.76). The three-factor solution of the ORAS-R was supported through exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. Adequate validity was established through comparisons with attitude consistency measures and an instrument measuring modern racism (Leach, personal communication, March 17, 2007).

The three versions of the ORAS have been used to empirically examine constructs similar to those of the WRIAS (Mueller & Pope, 2001; Castillo et al., 2006). In a study using the ORAS-P Mueller and Pope (2001) examined the relationship between multicultural competence and White racial attitudes for student affairs professionals. After controlling for social desirability effects and demographic variables they found that certain White Racial Consciousness types contributed to the differences in a measure of multicultural competence. Specifically, the Dominative \((r = -.39)\) and Conflictive \((r = -.61)\) subscales had significant negative relationships with multicultural competence while the Reactive \((r = .58)\) subscale had a significant positive relationship. The authors suggested that this supports their theory that higher Dominative attitude scores would be associated with lower multicultural competency scores because the Dominative attitude type believes in the inherent superiority of White culture and engages in overt discrimination. Similarly it also supports the suggestion that Conflictive attitudes, which are described as believing that overt discrimination is wrong but also opposing all methods towards ending discrimination, would not be related to higher levels of multicultural competency, which is defined by an active willingness to challenge the status quo. The only attitude type that had a significant relationship with multicultural
competence in the positive direction was the Reactive attitude type. This also aligns with the authors’ expectations that individuals who hold attitudes of openness and acceptance toward people of color would be more likely to have higher multicultural competency scores. This study suggests that the racial attitudes of White student affairs professionals are an important factor to study in order to understand the development of multicultural competency.

More recently Castillo et al., (2006) studied how White racial identity relates to the development of prejudice for White graduate students in counseling. These authors used the updated 35-item version of the ORAS as a measure of White racial identity due to the perceived similarities between it and the other models of White racial identity. Specifically, they gave participants the three subscales of this measure that reflect the Dominative/Integrative, Reactive and Conflictive attitude types. They found that higher scores on the Conflictive subscale had the greatest impact in predicting higher scores on the Modern Racism Scale (MRS) (McConahay, Hardee & Batts, 1981). The Conflictive subscale significantly correlated with the MRS (r = .74). So attitudes that do not support overt discrimination but also do not favor programs designed to help end racial discrimination are related to higher racism scores. The authors believed that this might be due to the fact that modern racism is subtler than past forms of racism. Higher scores on the Reactive subscale were significantly related to lower racism scores (r = -.54). It appears that as Whites develop attitudes that reflect knowledge of White privilege and how they unintentionally participate in racism they also have lower levels of prejudice. Higher racism scores were also significantly correlated with Dominative scores (r = .31). This study supports the idea that White racial attitudes and identity are related to the
development of prejudice and racism. It appears that the ORAS performs appropriately as a measure of White racial attitude types. The authors of this study argue that it can also be used in understanding White racial identity due to its similarity with other White racial identity models.

Summary

White racial identity development has since the introduction of Hardiman (1982) and Helms' (1984) models received considerable attention in the literature. As reviewed above Helms' model has been the most widely used and tested primarily due to the introduction of the WRIAS. Though the psychometrics of the WRIAS have been criticized its widespread use has resulted in greater understanding of the ways in which White racial identity is connected to a variety of psychological constructs. The White Racial Consciousness model provides an alternative lens and instrument for looking at the attitudes that Whites have about people of color.

Feminist Identity Development

Feminist identity development is another aspect of collective group identity development. The feminist identity development model emerged from the historical and contemporary sociopolitical feminist movement (Downing & Roush, 1985; Hansen, 2002; Moradi, Subich & Philips, 2002b). This section of the review will include: a brief summary of the history of the feminist movement, a discussion of the various definitions of feminism, a presentation of the model of feminist identity development as well as a summary of the relevant research on the model and a synthesis of the research that identifies both barriers and predictors to adopting a feminist identity.
Historical Overview

Feminism has been defined in a variety of different ways throughout its use in U.S. history. The term has traditionally been associated with a sociopolitical movement defined by three distinct waves of history (Faludi, 1991; Shaw & Lee, 2007). The dates of the beginning and end of these three waves are somewhat flexible and what follows is a brief summary of the historical events of the feminist movement. The first wave, beginning in the middle of the 1800s and ending with women’s acquisition of the vote in 1920, included demonstrations of women organizing politically such as the Seneca Falls Convention and the initial campaign for the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) (Shaw & Lee, 2007). During this time abolitionists who had been working to end the enslavement of African peoples turned their energies towards securing women’s right to have a political voice. A major setback during this time was the overt and implicit racism of the women’s movement, which advanced rights primarily for White middle and upper-class women while both ignoring and rejecting the concerns of women of color and working class women (Giddings, 1984). This wave ended during the 1920s when the ERA was defeated (Faludi, 1991).

The second wave of feminism, also known as the contemporary feminist movement, beginning with the 1963 publication of Freidan’s “The Feminine Mystique” and ending in the 1980s, was commonly called the Women’s Liberation Movement and focused on equal opportunity employment, freedom from traditional gender roles and the social equality of the sexes (Shaw & Lee, 2007). This time period was also focused on obtaining equal pay for women as well as access to birth control and abortion services. During the second wave feminists were united in the goal of ratifying the ERA (Moradi
et al., 2002b). It was also during this time that feminism moved from being a list of concerns about women and became an ideology that crossed all disciplines (Moradi et al., 2002b).

The third wave of feminism has been defined more fluidly in terms of time periods but many scholars agree that the late 1990s through the turn of the century can be characterized as third wave feminism (Shaw & Lee, 2007). This wave is focused on issues of body and sexuality, particularly in how they affect young women of a variety of races, classes and sexual orientations. Attention is directed toward the need for a multicultural feminist movement that addresses the concerns of a variety of women from differing backgrounds and not simply White middle-class females. Current feminist political organizing relies heavily on sources of technology and the publication of “zines” which are smaller Internet based magazines (Shaw & Lee, 2007).

Definitions of Feminism

Throughout these time periods the definition of feminism has varied and changed resulting in several different schools of feminist thought. Some of these varied perspectives include: radical feminism, liberal feminism, cultural feminism, socialist feminism and womanism (Liss, et al., 2001; Moradi et al., 2002b). Radical feminism refers to the belief that any system founded on the principles of patriarchy must be completely dismantled and redesigned in order to treat women fairly. This philosophy positions gender oppression as the central motivating force for the organization of society. Liberal feminism focuses on changing a patriarchal system from the inside of the system. It also emphasizes similarities between men and women with the goal of promoting social change and equal rights (Liss, Hoffner & Crawford, 2000; Moradi et al.,
Cultural feminism focuses on changing the culture from one that focuses on violence and sexism (seen as masculine values) to one that focuses on peaceful social change and caring for one another (seen as feminine values) (Liss, et al., 2000; Moradi et al., 2002b). Socialist feminism views the solution to sexism as economic equality for women and men. Womanism was conceptualized by Alice Walker to refer to the potential for multiple oppressions for women of color and to provide an alternative lens for viewing feminism through non-White eyes (Shaw & Lee, 2007; Liss et al., 2000). Liberal feminism, as reflected through beliefs in equal rights and equal employment opportunities for women, has been used most often to measure feminist ideology (Liss et al., 2000).

Research on college women and feminist ideology has indicated that liberal feminism was a commonly held set of beliefs while conservatism (as defined by traditional gender roles for men and women) was held by only a small number of the college women (Liss et al., 2000). However, liberal feminism scores were higher for women who identified themselves as feminist than those women who stated that they were not feminist. This indicates that there are differences in the beliefs held by women who call themselves feminists and those who do not. Based on Liss et al.'s (2000) study it appears that liberal feminism may appeal to younger feminists because of its emphasis on the similarities rather then the differences between women and men. The majority of the available measures of feminism as well as the feminist identity model are based on a liberal feminist philosophy (Downing & Rousch, 1985; Hansen, 2002; Moradi et al., 2002a, 2002b).
The following definition from an introductory text to Women’s Studies reflects a definition of liberal feminism: “First, feminism concerns equality and justice for all women and it seeks to eliminate systems of inequality and injustice in all aspects of women’s lives. ... Second, feminism is inclusive and affirming of women: it celebrates women’s achievements and struggles and works to provide a positive and affirming stance toward women and womanhood” (Shaw & Lee, 2007, p. 9). This definition focuses on the importance that feminism places on equality between men and women. Equality is a broad term that can refer to economics, expression of gender roles, division of household labor, representation in government, leadership in religious institutions and opportunities for personal growth and change. It is important to note that feminism can emphasize a wide range of issues and still maintain the unity of the movement due to the central focus of the elimination of sexism and dismantling of patriarchal structures (Shaw & Lee, 2007). These historical events and the conceptualization of liberal feminism have shaped the emergence of a feminist identity development model within the counseling psychology literature.

**Feminist Identity Development Model**

Downing and Roush (1985) proposed a five-stage model of feminist identity development for women. Their developmental model was heavily influenced by Cross’ (1971) model of psychological Nigrescence (Hansen, 2002). Downing and Roush based their model on Cross’ work due to their perception that both women and African Americans experience oppression and discrimination in society. They argued that Cross’ model provided a useful framework for conceptualizing women’s process in forming a positive female-centered identity rather than an identity based on the denial of sexism.
The historical context of the women’s movement of the 1960s and 1970s highlighted women’s experiences of oppression and discrimination while at the same time Cross’s model provided a means of examining within-group differences related to oppressed identities (Moradi et al., 2002b).

Moradi, Subich and Philips (2002a) noted that this model does not incorporate or attend to the diversity of feminist philosophies (i.e. cultural, socialist and womanist, etc.). The model was originally designed to assess a blending of liberal and radical feminist development for women (Hansen, 2002). The model’s attention to the reality and centricity of gender oppression reflects radical feminism while its emphasis on the importance of social change is indicative of liberal feminism (Hansen, 2002). This philosophical grounding was not articulated in the model’s original description however, given the focus of unity in the feminist movement during the 1970s and 1980s it is not surprising that Downing and Roush operationalized feminist identity as a combination of the two leading feminist philosophies at the time, liberal and radical (Hansen, 2002; Moradi et al., 2002b). It may also reflect the authors’ belief that all feminist philosophies share some common beliefs and these beliefs are essential to understanding feminist identity development (Moradi et al., 2002b).

It appears that Downing and Roush used Cross’ original blueprint without openly acknowledging the inherent differences between the development of an oppressed racial identity and the development of a feminist identity. The previous literature surrounding feminism focused on the political agenda of the women’s movement rather then the differences in identity development among women (Moradi et al., 2002b). Cross’ (1971) model appears to have provided a new way of thinking about individual identity.
development within groups. Downing & Roush (1985) responded to that by changing the focus of the research surrounding feminism from issue to identity based. While it seems that they may at times have drawn too close a parallel between racial and feminist identity development they do offer one of the first and only theoretical models aimed at understanding women's feminist identity development (Moradi et al., 2002a, 2002b).

Downing & Roush (1985) described a linear stepwise model with five stages. The first stage of the model, Passive Acceptance (PA), is characterized by a lack of awareness or denial of personal and institutional discrimination against women. Women in this stage accept wholeheartedly the appropriateness of the White male system and the perspective of a patriarchal society, though they may not recognize or label it as such. Women also carefully choose situations where these beliefs will be accepted and affirmed. In this stage women often engage in traditional gender roles and believe traditional stereotypes, which include that men are inherently superior to women. Women in this stage also tend to avoid situations that challenge these assumptions and beliefs. Near the end of this stage the woman is characterized by an openness to challenge and a readiness to take greater risk (Downing & Roush, 1985).

The second stage of the model, Revelation (R), focuses on the socialization of women into more awareness of gender discrimination. This usually happens when a woman has experienced or is made aware of discrimination based on gender repeatedly. The woman can no longer deny that oppression and unfair treatment based on one's gender is unlikely. Rather it becomes a much more common experience and reality. This can happen through a woman's personal experiences or the stories of women around her whom she trusts and believes. Often progression to this stage is gradual and related to the
individual’s readiness and willingness to change her frame of reference. Downing and Roush (1985) theorized that this transition is made more difficult because of the socialization of women to distrust their perceptions and rely on the distortions they previously believed that are presented in a patriarchal society. Women who move in to this stage are likely to have intense emotions of anger towards a sexist society as well as guilt about their own participation in that society (Moradi et al., 2002b). They will gravitate towards individuals who support these emotions and away from those who cannot relate to them. This can also promote “us and them” thinking where all men become the enemy and all women allies. This facilitates women’s restriction of their social circles to a few people with whom they are comfortable. In this stage women may appear to have a well-formed positive identity, however women’s development during this stage is more focused on a rejection of traditional gender roles and the dominant culture rather than an affirmation of being female (Downing & Roush, 1985).

Embeddedness-Emanation (EE), the third stage, is a two-part stage that begins with women embedding themselves into women centered spaces. This may be difficult for many women because of their potential for intimate involvement with men and the dominant culture. Downing and Roush theorized that the transition to embeddedness might be smoother for lesbians who may not have the same intimacy with men and women of color who may not have an attachment to the dominant culture. Moving to women-centered spaces can be done through attending women’s studies courses, finding women’s health resources, joining women-led church organizations or support groups. These spaces provide women in this stage with an opportunity to explore this new frame of reference, express anger in a supportive environment and receive affirmation as a
woman. In the embeddedness phase women often accept feminist ideology without hesitation and continue a relatively rigid way of thinking. As women come out of embeddedness they move to emanation, which is characterized by awareness that the most effective means to social change is not anger or rage and that diving headfirst into a feminist worldview is much like uncritically accepting patriarchy. Women who had a difficult time moving into embeddedness because of their intimate relationships with men may find emanation a smoother transition. In this stage women tend to perceive the world through more flexible and relativistic terms. Women at this stage are learning to adopt a variety of viewpoints and form adaptive coping strategies. In this stage women tend to approach interactions with men cautiously (Downing & Roush, 1985).

The fourth stage, Synthesis (S), is characterized by an increase in women’s valuing of the positive aspects of being female. Women in this stage have developed a flexible and realistic way of thinking about themselves and their world. They see the impact of oppression and sexism but are able to also attribute causality to other factors. Women in this stage are less likely to assume that sexism is the cause of all events (Moradi et al., 2002a). These women are not confined or bound by sex roles and instead make their choices based on well explored and thoroughly explained personal values. Women in this stage have realized how to use their energy most productively and respond appropriately to experiences of sexism. These women also approach and evaluate men on an individual basis rather than as a whole group. They also personally interpret feminism to make it their own and attempt to internalize this into their everyday experience and life. This stage is primarily characterized by celebration (Downing & Roush, 1985).
The fifth and final stage, Active Commitment (AC), is when women apply their feminist identities to activism. This is where the goal of eliminating social injustice created by sexism becomes most salient (Moradi et al., 2002). Women in this stage are committed to social change and see the goal of gender role flexibility as important. These women select projects to work on based on their unique talents and abilities. Downing and Roush (1985) believed that very few women actually reach this stage and that most who are involved in activism are actually operating out of earlier stages (revelation and embeddedness-emanation). This final stage is seen as the developmental end, however Downing and Roush theorized that women would recycle through the stages throughout their lives and each time experience the stage in a deeper and more complete manner. They also noted that women could become stagnated in any given stage but that it appeared more likely in revelation and embeddedness.

Several authors have wondered whether this model is truly a stage model or more reflective of different dimensions that do not proceed sequentially (Hyde, 2002; Moradi et al., 2002; Vandiver, 2002). A traditional stage model assumes that once an individual enters the next stage she does not return to her previous worldviews or behaviors (Hyde, 2002). However, contemporary stage models have included provisions for movement between stages by renaming them statuses or dimensions (Helms, 1995; Hyde, 2002). Hyde (2002) suggested that due to the lack of research on the stage model of feminist identity it might be more appropriate to label the five categories different dimensions of feminist identity rather than sequential stages. Hansen (2002), one of the original authors of the feminist identity model, suggested that the dynamic nature of three of the stages (R, EE and AC) and the relatively static nature of the other two (PA and S) may make it
difficult to assess an individual's progression through the stages. During the dynamic stages women are actively doing things while the static stages appear to refer more to how women are in the world. Moradi and Subich (2002a) use the term "theorized fluidity" to describe the recycling process through the stages of the model (p. 48). Hansen (2002) noted that fluidity is difficult to describe as a model and so it becomes necessary to simplify an ultimately complex process into linear, developmental stages. Moradi and Subich (2002a, 2002b), Hyde (2002) and Hansen (2002) all articulated the need for further qualitative and longitudinal research on the model in order to more clearly describe women's feminist identity development.

Another area of the model that needs further research is its applicability across diverse groups. Originally, Downing and Roush (1985) noted that the model neglects to attend to issues of race, class and age. The applicability of the model has been questioned particularly in relationship to women of color due to its Eurocentric focus and emphasis on particular philosophies of feminism (Vandiver, 2002). Research on the model has primarily sampled White, middle to upper class, college educated women (Moradi et al., 2002b). It appears that for this group of women the Feminist Identity Development model can reasonably be used to explore their feminist identity development. However, caution should be exercised in using the model to describe the experiences of women of color, women from lower socioeconomic statuses and older women (Moradi & Subich, 2002a; Moradi et al., 2002b). Given these limitations the model may need to be renamed to specifically refer to White, educated, middle to upper class, younger women (Vandiver, 2002).
Downing and Roush’s (1985) model provided a new means of understanding feminist identity. Before this model most of the measures assessed a woman’s attitudes about feminism rather than a woman’s sense of self as a feminist (Moradi et al., 2002b). Several measures have been developed to study women’s feminist identity development. Rickard (1990) initially operationalized Downing and Roush’s Feminist Identity Model using the Feminist Identity Scale (FIS). This scale measured the first four stages of the model because Rickard perceived the Active Commitment stage to be a behavioral characterization of Synthesis (Moradi & Subich, 2002a). The FIS’s psychometrics have been questioned due to the low internal consistency estimates of some of the subscales and limited validity information (PA .67, R .80, EE .69, S .77). During a very similar time period Bargad & Hyde (1991) developed the Feminist Identity Development Scale (FIDS). This scale used self-descriptive statements scored on a 5-point Likert scale to reflect all five stages of the Feminist Identity Development Model (Moradi & Subich, 2002a). The FIDS’ factor structure has yielded several factor solutions including 5, 4, and 3 factor solutions as well as varying internal consistency estimates (PA .79, R .64, EE .76, S .52, AC .77) (Moradi & Subich, 2002a).

Most recently Fischer et al. (2000) introduced the Feminist Identity Composite (FIC). The FIC is a composite of items from both the FIS and FIDS that were derived through factor-analysis. Fischer et al.’s (2000) confirmatory factor analysis supported a five-factor solution that accounted for 36% of the total item variance. Moradi & Subich (2002a) also reported reasonable internal consistency estimates (PA .74, R .76, EE .84, S .73, AC .77) and evidence of the instrument’s validity demonstrated through it’s relationship to a measure examining perceptions of sexist events and involvement in
women's organizations. The FIC attempts to capitalize on the strengths of the FIS and FIDS while also eliminating some of their weaknesses (Fischer et al., 2000; Moradi & Subich, 2002a). Fischer et al. (2000) noted that the FIC appears to benefit from the complementary strengths and weakness of the FIS and FIDS. The FIC has emerged as the strongest instrument available to measure feminist identity development.

Adopting a Feminist Identity

The feminist movement has a rich and unique history and a very significant contemporary presence in both politics and academia. Due to the prevalence of Women’s Studies departments and the visible nature of many feminist groups most people will encounter some representation of feminism during their life in the United States. These encounters with feminism can shape whether or not an individual adopts a feminist identity or integrates some of the principles of feminism into her or his life choices. Feminist identity development is unique due to its status as a “chosen” identity. A considerable body of literature has formed to examine the factors and precipitating events that impact an individual’s development of a feminist identity and adoption of a feminist label (Buschman & Lenart, 1996; Henderson-King & Stewart, 1994; Liss et al., 2001). Based on this research it appears that there are some barriers to adopting a feminist label, even though many women and men voice beliefs that could be characterized as feminist. It is common for men and women to state, “I’m not a feminist, but” and follow these words with an affirmation of the need for the equality of the sexes or a desire to see women paid as much as men in the workforce (Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). These statements are puzzling and at face value appear contradictory.
Several studies have attempted to explore this phenomenon, particularly with college-aged White women (Buschman & Lenart, 1996; Liss et al., 2001; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Quinn & Radtke, 2006; Zucker, 2004). Many of these studies focused on exploring what predicts women’s adoption of a feminist or non-feminist identity. In the 1990s a series of studies attempted to document these predictors and explain why college-aged women were reluctant to adopt a feminist identification (Buschman & Lenart, 1996; Burn, Aboud & Moyles, 2000; Cowan, Mestlin, & Mesak, 1992; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997, Williams & Wittig, 1997). Buschman and Lenart (1996) labeled those women in their study who recognized the need for collective group action but also felt that they could individually advance on their own standing “precarious feminists” (p. 67). Their study examined group consciousness levels related to feminist beliefs and concluded that these precarious feminists did not fit into a feminist or non-feminist categorization. These authors designed a questionnaire that assessed degree of experience with feminism using a 5-point Likert scale and statements regarding women’s place in society and feelings about feminism. Buschman and Lenart’s (1996) explanation was that these women may recognize the need for the improvement of women’s status but the negative representations of feminism and the women’s movement deter them from identifying as feminist.

Myaskovky and Wittig (1997) conducted a similar study but focused more heavily on what might predict college women’s identification as feminists. They used the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale, which assesses one’s opinion about gender role and feminist goals through statements scored on a Likert scale. The authors also asked participants “What is your opinion of the feminist movement?” and seven other
statements to evaluate the participants’ evaluation of feminism that were scored on a 6-
point Likert scale. A major strength of this study was that the sample was highly racially
diverse with women of color making up approximately 52% of the group. Similarly to
Buschman and Lenart (1996), Myaskovsky and Wittig found that a large percentage of
their sample did not identify as feminist but supported one or more goals of the feminist
movement. Myaskovsky and Wittig labeled these women “closet feminists” (p. 880). They
found that support for feminism was not predicted by simply endorsing feminist goals.
Instead, they noted that a positive opinion of the feminist movement and exposure to
feminism also contributed significantly to adopting a feminist social identity. These two
studies underscore the importance of understanding how women are developing support
for feminist goals but resisting the label of feminist.

Several more recent studies have attempted to further explore college women’s
concerns when adopting a feminist identity (Liss, et al., 2001; Quinn & Radtke, 2006;
Zucker, 2004). Liss et al., (2001) asked whether or not the woman was a feminist and
gave measures of feminist ideology, feminist identity development, evaluation of
feminists, collectivism and individualism to college-aged, predominately White, middle
to upper class women and looked at what predicted their adoption of a feminist identity.
They found that when measured, as a forced-choice yes or no, women’s identification as
a feminist was predicted by a generally positive evaluation of feminism and not holding
conservative beliefs. Liss et al., (2001) also found that when measured as a continuous
variable, on a 7-point Likert scale asking women to endorse their degree of feminist
identity, adoption of a feminist identity was significantly correlated with all types of
feminist ideology: liberal, radical, socialist, cultural and womanism. Given that a
conservative ideology was the only type of ideology to contribute unique variance to identification with feminism during a simultaneous regression it appears that disagreeing with conservative beliefs is more important than the type of feminist ideology when determining a woman’s degree of identification with feminism (Liss et al., 2001). Liss et al., (2001) noted that the greatest proportion of women in the study identified support and belief in many of the ideas of the feminist movement but declined when asked if they were feminists.

Women who support the ideals of the feminist movement but do not identify with it present a contradiction when trying to understand how a feminist identity develops. One explanation is that though these women believe in equal rights they do not want to risk rejection due to the negative stereotypes associated with feminism. Zucker (2004) framed women’s rejection of a feminist identity as a disavowal of a marginalized political belief. She identified that though women may report support for various feminist principles and acknowledge the reality of gender-based discrimination they do not want to label themselves as feminists. She labeled these women “non-feminist liberal egalitarians” that believe in the equality of men and women but actively reject the label of feminist (p. 424). The purpose of the study was to empirically examine the predictors and factors that influence adopting one of three identities: non-feminist, liberal egalitarian and feminist. This study was unique in its aims because it attempted to explore women’s self-labeling rather then only their attitudes about gender and sexism.

Zucker (2004) predicted that exposure to information about feminism through the media, educational contexts, reading feminist texts, encountering peers or family members who hold feminist identities and experiences of personal discrimination would
all impact whether a woman chose to adopt the label of feminism. Zucker (2004) gave several measures including a series of three statements scored in a yes/no format, designed to indicate agreement or disagreement with basic feminist principles. She also asked women whether or not participants identified themselves as feminist. Zucker (2004) surveyed three graduating classes from a large Midwestern university, the class of 1951-1952, the class of 1972 and the class of 1992. Zucker hypothesized that these cohort differences would also contribute to women’s adoption of a feminist label. One limitation of this study was that her sample was largely middle to upper class, heterosexual, White and college educated. Given the limited diversity in the sample these results should be applied to other groups cautiously (Zucker, 2004).

Zucker (2004) found that women from the earliest graduating class, 1951 - 1952 were less likely to identify with the feminist movement or feminist ideas. Women from the later cohorts (1972 and 1992) were more likely to identify with feminist ideas. Zucker measured feminist consciousness through instruments asking participants to rate the collective power of feminists, indicate how warm or cool they felt about feminists on a thermometer, several Likert scale items regarding the rejection of sex discrimination and ten items measured on a Likert scale reflecting attitudes toward feminism. She examined the developmental component of feminist identity using the FIS. Her data was also consistent with the hypothesis that women who identified as feminist would score highest in feminist consciousness while women who were considered liberal egalitarian (endorsing feminist beliefs but rejecting the label) scored lower then feminists but higher then non-feminists with regards to feminist consciousness. Zucker (2004) also found that consistent with her predictions exposure to feminism was an essential part of self-labeling
as feminist. If women are given more favorable information about feminism, which is more likely to occur through relationships with self-identified feminists and educational contexts that support feminist inquiry, they appear more likely to identify with the feminist movement. However, given the negative stereotypes propagated by the media representing feminism as a “man-hating” group, it is not surprising that women who only related feminism to images that they found in the media were less likely to identify as feminist (Zucker, 2004).

It appears that women’s perception of feminism and the feminist movement whether informed through the media, personal relationships or educational settings impacts the adoption of a feminist identity. It is also important to note that women who identified as feminist were also more likely to report personal experiences of sexism. In a society where sexism is normalized it is important to further understand how women who identified as feminist were able to link their experiences with sexism and create meaning that included consciousness-raising about gender discrimination (Zucker, 2004). Zucker’s study provides a useful framework for understanding some of the precipitating factors involved for women in deciding whether or not to adopt a feminist identity (2004).

Quinn and Radtke (2006) explored women’s identification with feminist through a qualitative study based on discourse analysis. They had pairs of female graduate and undergraduate students discuss feminism for hour-long sessions. They theorized similarly to Zucker (2004) that by using the statement “I’m not feminist but,” women can state a relatively egalitarian view without ascribing to themselves the politicized identity of feminist. Using a discourse analytic approach the authors sought to present richer data on the perceived inconsistency between college women’s belief in feminist views and
behavior of rejecting the feminist label. They found that women tended to change their position throughout the dialogues in relationship to the person that they were talking with. The pairs consistently drew upon three images of feminism: liberal feminism, negative/extremist feminism and lifestyle feminism. Liberal feminism focused on equality but was often followed by a desire to distance oneself from a more extreme feminist position that was considered negative. The authors used lifestyle feminism to describe women who identified that their lives reflected some aspects of feminism but did not identify as feminist. This is similar to the previous research labeling this group of women precarious feminists, liberal egalitarians and closet feminists (Buschman & Lenart, 1996; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004).

Quinn and Radtke (2006) noted that lifestyle feminism allows women to practice feminism without identifying with the politicized identity of feminist, which has broader societal implications. The authors state, “being a feminist by virtue of the way one lives while resisting proclaimed feminism (i.e., identifying oneself as feminist) undermines a feminist critique of a patriarchal society” (Quinn & Radtke, 2006, p. 196). This type of identification reduces feminism to simply a personal choice and neglects the importance of group organizing around issues of equality. However, the authors also indicate that their study suggests the importance of various feminist identities. The various negotiations that went on between the participant pairs in their study highlighted the importance of examining the potential for multiple positions within feminism and how women adopt those identities. These multiple positions may help to further explain how college aged women particularly relate to feminism and develop a feminist identity. This is important because a feminist identity has been linked to various aspects of
psychological health and well-being for college-aged women (Fischer & Good, 2004; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006).

Review of the Research on Feminist Identity Development

Feminist identity development has been studied in connection with various factors including psychological well-being, self-esteem, body satisfaction, perceptions of women in society, heterosexual interaction and global distress (Fischer & Good, 2004; Moradi et al., 2002b; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006). Adopting a feminist identity has been tied to positive self-esteem, assertiveness, self-control and feeling a higher locus of control (Carpenter & Johnson, 2001; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006). Carpenter and Johnson (2001) explored the potential relationship between feminist identity and collective group self-esteem using the FIDS and the Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSE). They found that in a regression equation the levels of feminist identity accounted for 10-26% of the variance. Consistent with their predictions they also found that the Passive Acceptance subscale did not predict collective self-esteem while the Embeddedness-Emanation, Synthesis and Active Commitment subscales predicted higher collective self-esteem scores. They noted that the Revelation stage might be particularly turbulent for women as it was negatively predicted self-esteem scores. This study’s finding that the later stages of feminist identity (EE, S and AC) predict more positive self-esteem evaluations is helpful in understanding the benefits of developing and maturing this aspect of collective group identity.

Saunders & Kashubeck-West (2006) examined the connections between the FIC and a measure of psychological well-being. They found that in a regression equation the feminist identity variables accounted for 24% of the variance in psychological well-
being. They further found that higher scores on the Active Commitment subscale and lower scores on the Revelation subscale predicted greater well-being. This is consistent with the belief that the Revelation subscale is a time of questioning and forming the beginnings of new worldviews. There was also a positive association between the Active Commitment subscale and overall psychological well-being. Finally, Saunders and Kashubeck-West (2006) noted that individuals who scored higher on Passive Acceptance also scored lower on the personal growth dimension of psychological well-being. This is consistent with the feminist identity development theory which would suggest that women in the Passive Acceptance stage do not self-reflect or explore their worldview but rather accept life uncritically.

Fischer and Good’s (2004) research on psychological well-being has indicated that women in earlier stages of feminist identity development (Revelation) may experience some psychological distress relevant to their realizations about women’s oppression in society. They found that the Revelation subscale of the FIC significantly correlated with nine of the subscales of the Symptom Checklist-90-Revised indicating psychological distress. These subscales included: Global Severity Index (r = .25), Depression (r = .25), Obsessive-Compulsive (r = .25), Interpersonal Sensitivity (r = .24), Anxiety (r = .26), Hostility (r = .15), Phobic Anxiety (r = .21), Paranoid Ideation (r = .23) and Alienation (r = .27). This is consistent with the potential for distress during a time when beliefs and worldviews are being challenged. Women in the later stages of feminist identity development (Synthesis and Active Commitment) appear to experience better psychological well-being and utilize feminist principles to moderate the effects of sexism and oppression (Fischer & Good, 2004). The Synthesis subscale was negatively
correlated with three of the subscales indicating psychological distress (Interpersonal sensitivity $r = -.19$, Hostility $r = -.13$, and Phobic Anxiety $r = -.13$). It appears that a feminist identity that relies on the later developmental stages (Synthesis and Active Commitment) helps women to be resilient in the face of oppression and discrimination.

Given the psychological benefits to adopting a feminist identity it is not surprising that researchers have attempted to investigate this process using Downing and Roush’s model (1985). The majority of the research has focused on the perceptions of women in society and social attitudes concerning women (Moradi et al., 2002b). Overall the research in this area has supported the different stages of Downing & Roush’s model when used with White, middle class, college women (Moradi & Subich, 2002a; Moradi et al., 2002b). In regards to perceptions of gender roles Rickard (1990) found that women in further stages of feminist identity development were less likely to stereotype individuals based on gender. Similarly, Fischer and Good (1994) noted that more egalitarian views on gender roles were found for women in the Revelation and Embeddedness-Emanation stages of feminist identity development. Moradi et al., (2002b) summarized the research in this area in their review article and concluded that generally when young, college-aged, White women are surveyed about their feminist identity development, feminist consciousness, feelings about feminism and gender correlations were found in the expected directions. Higher scores in the passive acceptance stage were related to lower feminist consciousness scores, more negative feelings about feminism and warmer feelings about men. Given the repeated research findings that support the theoretical basis of Downing and Roush’s (1985) model it appears to be viable with the limited population expressed above.
Summary

Feminist identity development has since the introduction of Downing & Roush’s (1985) model received considerable attention in the literature. This body of literature has grown in a variety of directions with findings across studies indicating that self-identification with feminism is somewhat different from feminist identity development but that theoretically the two have a relationship, that there are psychological costs and benefits to adopting a feminist identity, that a feminist identity can offer opportunities for resilience in women and that feminist identity development is a complex process that deserves more attention in the literature (Moradi et al., 2002a).

Feminist and Racial Identity Development

A thorough review of the literature indicates that there are currently no studies that quantitatively examine the connection between feminist and White racial identity development. However, two recent studies have addressed the potential interactions of similar aspects of identity, Miville et al., (2005) examined racial and gender identity development while Hoffman (2006) examined feminist and ethnic identity development.

Multiple Aspects of Collective Identity

Miville et al., (2005), studied how collective group identities (gender and race) might relate to personal identity (ego statuses) for White college students. They surveyed three hundred White, college students from the Midwestern United States. One hundred and seventy-five of the participants were women who filled out the WRIAS, the Womanist Identity Attitude Scale (WIAS) (Ossana et al., 1992) and the Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (Bennion & Adams, 1986). The authors of this
study vocalized the need to examine the relationship between privileged collective identities and personal identity as represented through ego statuses. Miville et al., (2005) found that race and gender identity statuses did predict ego identity statuses. Gender identity assesses a woman’s sense of herself as female and tended to predict ego identity statuses in Miville et al.’s study. Interestingly, for women the authors found that particular stages of gender identity significantly predicted all ego statuses while stages of racial identity only significantly predicted two. This is important because it appears that moving along in gender identity development predicts moving further along in ego identity development while taking a “naïve” stance on race predicts a stronger ego development. This could indicate that for White women in particular dealing with race has some negative effects on their self-concept (Miville et al., 2005). Miville et al., also found that the final subscale of the WIAS, Autonomy, was significantly correlated with the WRIAS subscales Pseudo-Independence ($r = .51$) and Autonomy ($r = .31$). This study demonstrates the importance of researching how different aspects of identity interact.

In a similar study that examined different aspects of identity development Hoffman (2006) hypothesized that constructs related to gender definition and acceptance might have interactions with feminist and ethnic identity. Over three hundred racially diverse women from a university in southern California completed the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992), the Hoffman Gender Scale (Hoffman et al., 2000), the FIDS, the WIAS and the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Paulhus, 1984). Hoffman found that ethnic identity was significantly correlated with several stages of feminist identity development: Revelation ($r = .27$), Embeddedness/Emanation ($r = .24$) and Active Commitment ($r = .27$). She also noted that greater gender self-acceptance was
significantly correlated with the later stages of feminist identity development (Synthesis $r = .22$ and Active Commitment $r = .16$). This is consistent with Hoffman’s theory that women’s contentment with their womanhood would be related to more mature identity stages. Greater gender self-definition was significantly correlated with Revelation ($r = .19$), Embeddedness/Emanation ($r = .32$) and Active Commitment ($r = .25$). It would appear that the stages of the feminist identity model that reflect a struggle or commitment to ending sexism also related most strongly to women’s struggle to define themselves as women.

Hoffman (2006) does not offer much explanation of her results regarding ethnicity and feminist identity development. She states that the connections between women’s ethnicity and feminist identity development could reflect a parallel process of women’s overall development. She also refers to previous researchers (Parks, Carter & Gushue, 1996) who studied the potential relationships between African American and White women’s racial and gender identities. Parks et al. suggested that for African American women a similar pattern of racial and gender identity development takes place. However, Parks et al., also found that for White women there was no demonstrated relationship between gender and racial identity development. These two studies explored similar constructs however; Hoffman did not attend to the differences between ethnicity and race as well as the differences between gender and feminism. Both of these differences could have an impact on the seemingly different findings of the studies. The measures chosen to study these constructs may also have influenced the researchers’ findings. Hoffman suggests that her data be considered exploratory and that the
connection between ethnicity and feminist identity should be the topic of further research and exploration.

Summary

Both Hoffman (2006) and Miville et al.'s (2005) studies suggest that there are relationships between different aspects of collective identity development. These two studies also provide the groundwork for further exploration of multiple aspects of collective identity development.

Family of Origin and Family Environment

Researchers' attention has been directed to the effects of one's family of origin on personal identity development (Adams, Ryan & Keating, 2000). However, very few studies have explored a possible relationship between family environment and collective group identity development (Jourdan, 2006). This section of the review will include: a description of the concept of family environment and a review of the literature on family's impact on the development of college students and a summary of the literature available on family and personal identity.

Family Environment

Family environment is one method of exploring one's family of origin through exploration of family functioning rather than describing family structure. Family environment is intended to reflect the perceived climate of one's family of origin. McEachern & Kenny (2002) described family environment "in terms of the interpersonal relationships shared among family members; the internal family functioning, organization
and structure of the family, and the emphasis the family places on the direction of personal growth” (p. 40). Family environment has been operationalized using the Family Environment Scale (FES) (Moos & Moos, 1974, 1994, 2002). Moos and Moos (2002) designed the FES, which consists of three dimensions and several subscales within each. There are 90 items on the scale scored in a true-false format. The Relationship and System Maintenance dimensions refer to the internal workings of family while the Personal Growth dimension reflects the links between the family and the larger world. The Relationship dimension includes the Cohesion, Expressiveness and Conflict subscales. Cohesion measures “the degree of commitment, help and support family members provide for one another” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). Expressiveness reflects “the extent to which family members are encouraged to express their feelings directly” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). Conflict measures “the amount of openly expressed anger and conflict among family members” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1).

The Personal Growth dimension includes the Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Active-Recreational Orientation and Moral-Religious Emphasis subscales. Independence refers to “the extent to which family members are assertive, are self-sufficient, and make their own decisions” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). The Achievement Orientation subscale reflects “how much activities (such as school and work) are cast into an achievement-orientated or competitive framework” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). The Intellectual-Cultural Orientation subscale measures “the level of interest in political, intellectual, and cultural activities” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). The Active-Recreational Orientation subscale refers to “the amount of participation in social and recreational activities” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). The Moral-Religious
Emphasis subscale measures “the emphasis on ethical and religious issues and values” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). The System Maintenance dimension includes the Organization and Control subscales. Organization measures “the degree of importance of clear organization and structure in planning family activities and responsibilities” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). The Control subscale refers to “how much set rules and procedures are used to run family life” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). The FES has been widely used as an indicator of perceptions of family functioning for children and adults.

Since its introduction the FES has been a popular tool for exploring family functioning in research and clinical settings. The psychometric data has yielded acceptable internal consistency estimates and test-retest statistics (Halvorsen, 1991). In the original development of the FES the authors reported subscale alpha coefficients ranging from .61 (Independence) to .78 (Cohesion and Moral-Religious Emphasis) with the majority falling between .65 and .75 (Moos & Moos, 2002). The authors also reported test-retest reliability at the two and four month marks. These scores ranged from .68 (Independence) to .91 (Active-Recreational). The factor structure of the FES has been the subject of study with researchers suggesting a three-factor solution comprised of: affect, psychological and behavioral closeness and organization-control (Gondoli & Jacob, 1993).

Another study using a principal components analysis also found three factors but labeled them: supportive, conflicted and controlling (Kronenberger, Thompson & Morrow, 1997). While a three factor solution differs significantly from the stated ten subscales Gondoli and Jacob (1993) suggested that their three factors might be better represented by the three dimensions that organize the subscales. They note that the
structure of the FES may more accurately reflect the Relationship, Personal Growth and System Maintenance dimensions rather than the ten separate subscales (Gondoli & Jacob, 1993). Evidence of the construct and content validity of the FES is extensive and the authors provide some psychometric data in the instrument’s manual (Moos & Moos, 2002). They found that the Cohesion subscale was positively related to several measures of social support, parental care and relationship adjustment (Moos & Moos, 2002). Also families who reported predictable and stable routines scored higher on the Organization and Control subscales. In a study of the FES and the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale (FACES-II) the authors noted that there was good convergent validity between the measures of cohesion and adaptability in both instruments. Discriminant validity for the FES was demonstrated through its low subscale correlations with measures that define family cohesion differently (Moos & Moos, 2002). The data on the FES indicates that it is a widely accepted instrument for examining family functioning.

Recently, researchers have used the FES to explore how family functioning differs based on ethnic and racial group identification. In a study of Mexican American married heterosexual couples Negy and Snyder (2006) found that the participants reported less expressiveness and independence in their families of origin as compared with the normative data in the instrument’s manual. Participants also reported higher Control and Moral-Religious Emphasis subscale scores than the normative data. McEachern and Kenny (2002) found differences between the family environments of the White, Hispanic and African Caribbean undergraduate and graduate students they surveyed. The authors suggested that based on the available literature White families might be more likely to value autonomy, independence and individual achievement.
White families appear to have gone through a series of changes over the course of U.S. history moving from a strictly patriarchal model to a more egalitarian relationship. The current family structure of Whites is labeled postmodern and characterized by greater variation of family structures with more blended families and single parent families becoming evident. In this postmodern family individuality is valued and the family is less reliant on outside influences such as the community.

Using the FES McEachern and Kenny (2002) found that White participants scored significantly higher on the Independence subscale than did African Caribbean participants. Whites also scored lower on the Moral-Religious Emphasis subscale when compared to both Hispanics and African Caribbeans. The African Caribbean participants scored the lowest of the three groups on the Expressiveness subscale and highest on the Moral-Religious Emphasis subscale. This is consistent with McEachern and Kenny’s (2002) description of the importance of authority and strong ties to spiritual teachings evident in African Caribbean families. Hispanic participants tended to score between the White and African Caribbean participants as a group. The findings of this study indicate the importance of understanding the norms, traditions and culture that guide family life. Particularly, for Whites who are the dominant group, there may not be any awareness that certain family values are different in families of various cultural backgrounds.

Family Environment and College Students

Various researchers have examined how family environment impacts the psychological functioning of college students. College aged students have been the focus of these studies because of their unique relationship to and perspective on their families of origin. They are still connected to their families but also transitioning into adulthood.
providing both a retrospective look and current perspective on family relationships (Adams et al., 2000). Family environment has been studied in relationship to psychological distress and wellbeing (Bopaiya & Prasad, 2004), psychological hardiness and social interest (Amerikaner, Monks, Wolfe & Thomas, 1994), psychological reactance (Buboltz, Johnson & Woller, 2003), romantic attachment styles (Kennedy, 1999) and adoptees’ successful adjustment (Kelly, Towner-Thyrum, Rigby & Martin, 1998).

In their study of female college students in India, Bopaiya and Prasad (2004) found that there were significant relationships between some of the FES subscales and psychological wellbeing and distress. There was a negative relationship between the measure of psychological distress and the Cohesion subscale ($r = -0.18$), the Intellectual-Cultural Orientation subscale ($r = -0.39$), the Conflict subscale ($r = -0.27$), the Independence subscale ($r = -0.30$) and the Organization subscale ($r = -0.30$). There was a positive relationship between the measure of psychological wellbeing and the Cohesion subscale ($r = 0.37$), the Expressiveness subscale ($r = 0.38$) and the Organization subscale ($r = 0.26$). These results support the theory that family environment impacts the development of individuals beyond childhood. Amerikaner et al., (1994) ran a similar study with the FES in the United States and found that higher levels of psychological health as measured through psychological hardiness and social interest were related to the following higher subscale scores: Cohesion, Moral-Religious Emphasis, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Active-Recreational Orientation and Organization. Their study further supported the importance of examining the effects of family of origin on student development.
Buboltz et al., (2003) studied what aspects of family environment predicted psychological reactance for university students. They found that high levels of psychological reactance, (i.e., when freedoms are threatened individuals are motivated to protect their sense of freedom) were significantly related to several of the FES subscales. Specifically, psychological reactance increased as levels of family conflict decreased ($r = -.39$) and levels of cohesion increased ($r = .41$). Psychological reactance also increased as scores on the Independence ($r = .34$), Achievement Orientation ($r = .50$) and Moral-Religious Emphasis ($r = .51$) subscales increased. Buboltz (2003) explained that, "being raised in a family that has low levels of openly expressed anger and aggression, has high levels of commitment and family support, strongly encourages its members to be assertive and self-sufficient, casts activities into an achievement-oriented or competitive framework, and emphasizes ethical and religious values all tend to produce young adults who are highly sensitive to perceived and actual threats to their freedom" (p. 314). Buboltz et al.'s study provides another example of the effects of family environment on psychological functioning.

Kennedy (1999) found that family environment factors were associated with romantic attachment style later in life. In a study of White, African American and Asian first-year college students Kennedy explored how attachment style was related to the subscales of the FES. A secure attachment style was related to a family environment higher in Expressiveness ($r = .21$), Cohesion ($r = .17$), Active-Recreational Orientation ($r = .18$) and Intellectual-Cultural Orientation ($r = .24$). While a causal relationship cannot be inferred it is notable that this study supported the importance of understanding the family environment's impact on adult relationships.
Kelly et al. (1998) compared the adjustment of adoptees and non-adoptees based on their family environments. The purpose of this study was to identify the family environment characteristics that predict successful adjustment. In this study using the FES and a multidimensional measure of self-esteem Kelly et al., found different predictors in a MACOVA of moral self-approval and self-control for adoptees and non-adoptees. The Active-Recreational, Organization and Expressiveness subscales predicted self-control for adoptees while the Independence and Expressiveness subscales predicted non-adoptees self-control. The Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Organization and Expressiveness subscales predicted moral self-approval for adoptees while only the Expressiveness subscale predicted moral self-approval for non-adoptees. This study found both differences and similarities in the family environments of adoptees and non-adoptees. All of the research reviewed above points to the significance of family environments to psychological constructs such as wellbeing, development and attachment styles for college students.

Family and Identity Development

In their model of multiple dimensions of identity Jones and McEwen (2000) indicated that family and background experiences were one of the ten key categories comprising the core category of identity development. This core category represented the integration of various contextual influences including: race, culture, gender, family, educational, relationships with those different from oneself and religion. In her qualitative study of college aged women Jones (1997) noted that all of her participants linked their family experiences to their discussions of identity. Family experiences were defined by contacts with parents, siblings and extended relatives, childhood years and
early educational experiences. Jones’ participants also emphasized the developmental struggle of attempting to define their identity without abandoning all of the values and lessons learned from their families. Consistently throughout the interviews the influences of cultural environment and family background emerged as essential components to how these women understood and made meaning of their identities (Jones & McEwen, 2000). While Jones and McEwen’s (2000) conceptual model provides an important theoretical base for examining the connection between family and identity it does not explain how family relates to identity development.

Given the popularity of Erikson’s (1968) psychosocial stages of development and Marcia’s (1980) ego statuses it is not surprising that the connections between the personal identity development of adolescents and their families of origin have been explored (Adams et al., 2000; Berrios-Allison, 2005; Kamptner, 1988; Markland & Nelson, 1993; Willemsen & Waterman, 1991). Personal identity has been operationalized in this area of research through examination of the successful or unsuccessful resolution of the first six stages of Erikson’s psychosocial stages of development (i.e. Trust v. Mistrust, Autonomy v. Shame and Doubt, Initiative v. Guilt, Industry v. Inferiority, Identity v. Role Confusion and Intimacy v. Isolation) and an individual’s classification within Marcia’s Ego Statuses (i.e. Identity Diffusion, Identity Foreclosure, Identity Moratorium and Identity Achieved) (Adams et al., 2000; Kamptner, 1988; Markland & Nelson, 1993). Willemsen and Waterman (1991) define personal identity as including “our understandings of ourselves as continuously existing persons with certain complexes of traits and self-perceptions experienced in the context of our social roles and our social experience”(p. 1203). The measurement of identity has focused on variations of Erikson and Marcia’s work, which
emphasize internal, personal processes of biological maturation with respect to one’s view of the self. College students have often been the focus of these studies because although they are struggling with the later stages of identity development in adolescence they are also likely to be closer to a resolution then their younger peers (Berrios-Allison, 2005).

Using an Eriksonian framework to define identity Markland and Nelson (1993) explored the relationship between family conflict and identity development. They hypothesized that since identity “is the integration of feelings, needs, and roles that a person’s sense of individuality, worth, and purpose” then family conflict would result in less successful resolution of the psychosocial stages (p. 198). Using the Conflict subscale of the Family Environment Scale (Moos & Moos, 1974, 1994, 2002) they found that when higher levels of family conflict were present in any psychosocial stage preceding the identity versus role confusion stage (fifth stage) the result was lower identity achievement as defined by lower confidence levels and less satisfaction with body and appearance. Markland and Nelson (1993) pointed out that because this study’s participants were college students and perhaps in the later stages of adolescent development they were able to look at how one aspect of family environment impacts individuals who are transitioning into adulthood. This study provides evidence for the assertion that family environment may have a significant impact on children’s and later adolescent’s personal identity development and formation.

In another study of undergraduate college students and identity development Kamptner (1988) attempted to identify the specific influences of the family on identity formation. This study also conceptualized personal identity from an Eriksonian
perspective. Identity was defined by three interrelated components: ego identity, self-identity and achieving a sense of purpose. Ego identity referred to the development of a worldview while self-identity described one’s sense of self. Achieving purpose related to Erikson’s suggestion that identity is also defined by an individual’s confidence in the direction of his or her life. These constructs were assessed using four different measures of identity formation. Family was operationalized using a variety of scales reflecting familial security, internal relationships, cohesion and wider social relationships. The author found that overall connectedness in the form of security, closeness and warmth appeared to support and enhance the identity process during late adolescence. However, she also found when families were perceived to have demonstrated very high levels of warmth those adolescents tended to adopt all of their parents’ ideas and philosophies without questioning or exploring alternatives. Kamptner’s data also emphasized the importance of encouraging individuality and independence within the family in order to facilitate development of a self that is distinctive and unique. Kamptner, similarly to Markland and Nelson’s study, did not report the racial make-up of her participants but did indicate that over 50% were female and the majority reported being from middle-class homes. This data is important because it may help to explain the values (independence and autonomy) emphasized by middle-class and presumably White families that promote and encourage identity development within those families. However, caution should be exercised when applying these results to families that are not White and middle-class.

Willemsen and Waterman (1991) explored how Marcia’s four ego identity statuses might be related to family environment. Their eighty-three male and female
White college aged participants completed the Extended Version of the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (Bennion & Adams, 1986) and the FES. The authors were interested in how family environment variables might be connected to the four different ego identity statuses. Those ego statuses were: diffusion (individuals who have not searched or committed to ideas about the self), foreclosure (individuals who have committed to the values of their families without searching), moratorium (individuals who are searching but not yet committed) and achievement (individuals who searched and made a commitment). They found that for the women in their sample the identity achievement ego status was positively correlated with the intellectual-cultural orientation subscale of the FES ($r = .33$). The foreclosure ego status was negatively correlated with family conflict ($r = -.36$). The diffusion ego status was negatively correlated with family organization ($r = -.56$) and a moral-religious emphasis ($r = -.29$). In this study the women participants were more likely than the men to score towards identity achievement and rate their families with less conflict, less of a focus on independence and more expressiveness. In general this study lends support to the idea that family environment variables are related to identity development.

In a longitudinal study of college students and personal identity development Adams et al., (2000) looked at the influence of family relationships on transition to college for White middle-class undergraduates. Identity development was conceptualized from an Eriksonian framework that was measured by evaluating identity achievement versus role confusion. Forms of decision-making and an aspect of ego strength, fidelity, were also assessed in this study. The authors pointed out that the family is often an overlooked context that supports and facilitates college students’ development. This
study emphasized the importance of social environments in shaping an individual’s behaviors and thoughts. The family is viewed as a type of social environment that maintains and regulates a set of relationships in which individuals support, help and interact with each other, reinforces various forms of psychological functioning and provides order, compliance and social norms to behavior. Family environment was operationalized using modified versions of the Expressiveness and Cohesion subscales of the Family Environment Scale (Moos & Moos, 1974, 1994, 2002). Adams et al., (2000) noted that research on the influence of family environment has indicated that cohesive, warm, expressive and open families may facilitate personal identity development in adolescence.

A unique contribution of this study is it’s focus on understanding the environment of the family and transferring the components of that environment to the college experience in order to facilitate identity development. The authors hypothesized that educational systems, which resembled a supportive family environment, would aide in personal identity development through encouragement of fidelity. Their findings supported this hypothesis and indicated that supportive, helpful, encouraging and open-minded academic environments predicted higher levels of fidelity and thus more achieved personal identity. Adams et al. (2000) noted that the for the college students in their study the level of cohesiveness and expressiveness in their family environments played a significant role in personal identity development. They encouraged other researchers to further investigate how family environment influences young adult development.
The studies reviewed thus far have examined how family affects personal identity development. An unexplored area of research is how family might impact aspects of collective group identity development such as race and feminism. Collective identity development differs from personal identity due to its grounding in the development of a socially bound or collective identity based on one’s characteristics or choices. In a qualitative study of multi-ethnic college students Jourdan (2006) explored how five participants made sense of their ethnic identity in relationship to their families. She found that all of the participants discussed their ethnic identity development in relationship to their families. Her results indicated that the climate of an individual’s family environment played an important role in developing security in their multi-ethnic identity. A family that was supportive of a participant’s multiple ethnic identities resulted in that participant feeling confident identifying as multi-ethnic and exploring aspects of their ethnic identity. For example, Leah, a participant whose mother was Trinidadian and whose father was Ethiopian, found that her parents encouraged her to explore both sides of her ethnic identity and engage with the cultures of both and as a result she felt comfortable and knowledgeable about her multiple ethnic backgrounds.

Jourdan’s participants all mentioned their family’s particular impact on their ethnic identity development. She found that family interactions both verbal and behavioral shaped how participants’ conceptualized their ethnic identity. Most participants noted that their families gave and received messages about race and ethnicity. Some participants reported that these messages were primarily positive and supportive regarding their multiple identities while other participants were scorned or rejected by family members due to their multiple ethnic backgrounds. For example,
Kevin, whose mother was Chinese and father was African American and White, received very mixed messages about his ethnic heritage. He watched as his Chinese grandmother actively rejected his father but also received messages from his father that he should only identify as African American. Kevin reported that he had a difficult time accepting his multiple ethnic backgrounds because of his experiences around race and ethnicity that were mainly negative. All the participants indicated that their family interactions about race and ethnicity shaped their responses to the outside world and their adjustment to the college environment.

These findings are consistent with Smith and Ross’ (2006) study that examined the relationship of family environment to the development of racist beliefs. In their study of primarily White college students they found that while casual contact with racially diverse groups does not promote anti-racist attitudes, relationships with people of color and families-of-origin promoting openness towards others might impact attitudes about race and racism. Both Jourdan’s (2006) and Smith and Ross’ (2006) study’s offer exploratory evidence that family environment influences college student’s ethnic and racial identity development.

Summary

Family of origin is one of the many factors that has been explored related to personal identity development. Family environment is related to psychological constructs such as attachment, wellbeing and adjustment. It appears clear from the literature that family of origin has an influence on the identity development of individuals as they transition into adulthood. While family influences the personal identity development of college students there is also some evidence that family may affect the ethnic identity
development of multiethnic college students (Jourdan, 2006). The FES has been used to study the influence of family environment on college students though not yet in relationship to White racial consciousness and feminist identity development.

Summary

Clearly, identity development has been the subject of a large and growing body of research. While personal identity development has been examined in connection with a variety of psychological and environmental factors rarely have aspects of collective identity development been explored in similar contexts. Aspects of collective identity development have been related theoretically to one another but have not been thoroughly examined empirically. While various researchers have noted the importance of understanding the multiple ways in which identity develops no research has explored the potential connections between feminist identity development and White racial consciousness. The current study will explore the potential relationships between feminist identity development and White racial consciousness. For White undergraduate women how does progression through the stages of feminist identity development relate to the various attitude types of the White Racial Consciousness model? Though family of origin factors have been studied in relationship to personal identity development no study has explored the potential connections between these two aspects of collective identity development and family environment. The current study also seeks to explore how an individual’s family of origin environment may relate to their process of collective identity development. Specifically, for White women how do their feminist identity development and White racial consciousness processes relate to their perceptions of the environment of
their family of origin? The following chapter describes the research methods and procedures employed for this study.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Introduction

This chapter reviews the research methods and procedures employed for this study. This review includes a description of the participants, measures, procedures, research design and data analysis methods.

Participants

Three hundred and ninety four participants who identified as White, undergraduate females were recruited for this study. Participants all endorsed U.S. citizenship and their ages ranged from 17-82 with the average age being 21 (SD=5.69). The majority of participants were first, second or third year undergraduate students, 24.9% (n=98), 31.2% (n=123) and 21.8% (n=86) respectively. Two hundred and ninety-one participants (73.9%) endorsed Christianity as their religious affiliation. The sample was also predominately heterosexual with 94.4% (n=372) of participants indicating this sexual orientation. The majority of participants reported no disability (88.6%, n=349). Participants' self-reported social class was 1.5% (n=6) lower class, 11.7% (n=46) lower middle class, 52.5% (n=207) middle class, 32% (n=126) upper middle class, 2% (n=8) upper class and .3% (n=1) unreported. Participants' identified their childhood neighborhoods as 26.9% (n=106) rural, 64% (n=252) suburban, 6.3% (n= 25) urban and 2.8% (n=11) unreported. Table 1 presents the demographics of the participants.
## Table 1

*Frequencies and Percentages for Participant Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Variables</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability Status</strong></td>
<td>No disability</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical disability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visually impaired</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deaf/hard of hearing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning/cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disability</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Educational Level</strong></td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth Year</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fifth Year</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atheism</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Class</strong></td>
<td>Lower class</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower middle class</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper middle class</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 413 survey packets were returned for this study. Packets were excluded from data analysis if participants did not identify as White female undergraduates and U.S. citizens or if there were a substantial number of missing items on any of the research measures. Of the 413 packets collected, 19 were considered unusable. Participants for this study were recruited from undergraduate courses at a large Midwestern university. The investigator invited participants through use of a written script, which was read aloud during a variety of undergraduate courses. Individuals who indicated a willingness to participate were given a research packet containing an anonymous consent form approved by the university’s Human Subject Institute Review Board (see appendices A-D).

**Instrumentation**

A demographic questionnaire was used to gather information on participants’ race, gender, age, current educational level, self-identified socio-economic status, ability status, religious affiliation, sexual orientation, U.S. citizenship status and type of childhood neighborhood (suburban, urban or rural). Three assessment measures were also used: the Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale-Revised (Vandiver & Leach, 2005), the Feminist Identity Composite (Fisher et al., 2000) and the Family Environment Scale-Real Form (Moos & Moos, 1974, 1994, 2002).

**Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale-Revised**

Choney and Behrens (1996) developed the Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale-Preliminary form (ORAS-P) to reflect the seven attitude types described by the White Racial Consciousness (WRC) model (Rowe et al., 1994). The ORAS-P was composed of
50 items scored using a 5-point Likert scale. Each of the seven subscale scores was obtained by summing the items contributing to the particular subscale. A higher score on the subscale indicated more alignment with the particular attitude type assessed by the scale. Lafleur, Rowe and Leach (2002) introduced an updated and revised 35-item version of the Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale (ORAS) that purported to measure the seven attitude types. This version of the scale had four subscales reflecting the specific racial attitude types (Integrative, Dominative, Conflictive and Reactive) and three subscales indicating the individual’s commitment to an attitude type (dependant, dissonant and avoidant).

Recently, Vandiver and Leach (2005) developed a revised version of the ORAS. The ORAS-Revised (ORAS-R) consists of 21 items scored on a 5-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. These items reflect the revised theoretical conceptualization of the WRC model which LaFleur, Rowe and Leach (2002) suggested. The ORAS-R contains three subscales that are grouped under the larger constructs of Racial Acceptance and Racial Justice. In order to measure the first construct, one’s level of Racial Acceptance, a bi-polar scale reflecting the Dominative and Integrative attitude types is scored. Lower scores on this scale reflect Dominative racial attitudes while higher scores reflect Integrative racial attitudes. This bi-polar scale reflects an individual’s expressed comfort with people of color. Dominative attitudes are characterized by negative and stereotypical views of people of color while Integrative attitudes reflect an expression of comfort with people of color. Two separate subscales for the Conflictive and Reactive attitude types measure the second construct, Racial Justice. Both the Conflictive and Reactive subscales reflect beliefs that one group of
people is benefiting from societies current system of operating. The difference is that individuals with Conflicitive attitudes believe that people of color unfairly benefit while individuals with Reactive attitudes believe that Whites have unearned privilege and advantage. The attitude types previously classified as unachieved (dependant, dissonant and avoidant) have been eliminated from this version of the ORAS-R.

The 21-item measure is divided into three subscales with six items reflecting the bi-polar Dominative-Integrative subscale, and seven each reflecting the Conflicitive and Reactive subscales. The first item of the measure is not scored. There is no overall score for the ORAS-R. Each of the three subscale scores is obtained by averaging the sum of the items on the subscale. Three items are reverse scored within the Dominative-Integrative subscale. An example from this bi-polar subscale is: “In selecting my friends, race and culture are just not important”. “Minorities have more influence on government programs than they should have” and “Sometimes I feel guilty about being White when I think about all the bad things Whites have done to minorities” are examples of the Conflicitive and Reactive subscales respectively.

Recently, in a study of the validity and reliability of the ORAS-Revised Leach (personal communication, March 19, 2007) reported alpha coefficients of .87 (Conflicitive), .82 (Dominative/Integrative) and .76 (Reactive). After conducting an exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis on two separate samples a three-factor solution was considered the best fit for the 20 scored revised items of the ORAS-R (Leach, personal communication, March 19, 2007). The validity of the instrument was assessed through comparison with two other instruments, the Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale (Henry & Sears, 2002) and the Attitude Argument Consistency
Measure (Friedrich & Verive, 1991). The Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale is designed to measure modern or symbolic racism. The ORAS-R Dominative-Integrative and Reactive subscales were negatively correlated with the Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale subscale scores while the Conflictive subscale was positively correlated (Leach, personal communication, March 19, 2007).

The Attitude Argument Consistency Measure represents a non-traditional method of assessing convergent validity. This involves presenting participants with statements that reflect the attitudes being assessed in the ORAS-R. In response, participants are asked to provide arguments to the attitude statements either for or against. The attitude scores on the ORAS-R and the attitude consistent arguments on the Attitude Argument Consistency Measure are compared to determine the degree of commitment of the attitudes. As expected higher scores on the attitude argument statements reflecting the Conflictive attitude type positively correlated with the ORAS-R Conflictive subscale and negatively with the Reactive subscale. The Reactive Attitude Argument measure was positively correlated with the Reactive subscale and negatively correlated with the Conflictive subscale of the ORAS-R. The Dominative Attitude Argument measure was correlated with all of the ORAS-R subscales, positively with the Conflictive subscale and negatively with the Reactive and Dominative-Integrative subscale (Leach, personal communication, March 19, 2007).

**Feminist Identity Composite**

Fischer et al., (2000) developed the Feminist Identity Composite (FIC) based on the two previous measures, the Feminist Identity Development Scale (FIDS) (Bargad & Hyde, 1991) and the Feminist Identity Scale (FIS) (Rickard, 1990), to assess the process
of feminist identity development. The FIC was developed to specifically identify and describe a woman’s status during the five stages of the Feminist Identity Development Model conceptualized by Downing and Roush (1985). The FIC is composed of 33 items scored on a 5-item Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree, 20 of these items are derived from the FIS and 13 of them are from the FIDS (Moradi & Subich, 2002a). The five subscales are Passive Acceptance (PA-7 items), Embeddedness-Emanation (EE-4 items), Revelation (R-8 items), Synthesis (S-5 items) and Active Commitment (AC-9 items). Each of the five subscale scores is obtained by averaging the sum of the items on the subscale. A higher mean score on the subscale indicates more alignment with that particular stage of feminist identity development. Some example items include: “I enjoy the pride and self-assurance that comes from being a strong female” (Synthesis subscale), “I think it’s lucky that women aren’t expected to do some of the more dangerous jobs that men are expected to do, like construction work or race car driving” (Passive Acceptance subscale) and “Gradually, I am beginning to see just how sexist society really is” (Revelation subscale). Fischer et al., (2000) reported internal consistency alpha coefficients of .75 (PA), .80 (R), .84 (EE), .68 (S) and .77 (AC). Moradi and Subich (2002a) reported alpha coefficients all above the .70 cutoff, the coefficients were .74 (PA), .76 (R), .84 (EE), .73 (S) and .77 (AC). The two week test-retest reliability reported by Moradi and Subich (2002a) indicated that the Active Commitment subscale was potentially problematic (r=.36). The test-retest data for the other subscales was acceptable: PA (r=.65), R (r=.71), EE (r=.80) and S (r=.70).

Moradi and Subich (2002a, 2002b) also reported acceptable construct validity in the forms of discriminant and convergent validity for the FIC based on the measures'
correlation with an instrument assessing social desirability and another assessing the perceived frequency and appraisal of sexist discrimination. All of the correlations between the FIC and the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding-Version 6 (BIDR) were non-significant. The correlations between the FIC and the Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE), which should correlate negatively with the subscale PA and positively with all of the other subscales, were found in the expected directions with 73% of the correlations being significant. This data is consistent with Fischer et al.'s (2000) reported correlations between the FIC, the SSE and the BIDR. Moradi and Subich (2002b) also used independent judges to assign the items within each measure to the subscale they felt appropriate in order to assess content validity. The authors found that the three judges, who were female doctoral students, had accuracy rates ranging from 73 to 94 percent with the Synthesis subscale items being misidentified most often at 27 percent of the time. Fischer et al. (2000) reported that the FIC corresponded to Downing & Roush's five-stage model via the five-facture structure of the instrument. The confirmatory factor analysis Fischer et al. (2000) conducted resulted in fit values that corresponded well to the model. Moradi and Subich (2002a) also expressed support for the FIC based on their confirmatory factor analysis.

Family Environment Scale

Moos and Moos (1974, 1994, 2002) developed the Family Environment Scale (FES) to assess the social climate and functioning of families. The FES uses a total of 90 items divided into ten subscales to assess different aspects of the social climate and functioning of families. There are three forms of the FES: the Real Form, (FES-R) the Ideal Form (FES-I) and the Expectations Form (FES-E). The FES-R is used to measure
an individual’s actual perceptions of his or her family as opposed to the FES-I or FES-E, which require speculation about the ideal or expected family. The FES-R, which was used for this study, consists of ten subscales organized into three dimensions: Relationship, System Maintenance and Personal Growth (Moos & Moos, 2002). The Relationship and System Maintenance dimensions refer to the internal workings of family while the Personal Growth dimension reflects the links between the family and the larger world. The Relationship dimension includes the Cohesion, Expressiveness and Conflict subscales. Cohesion measures “the degree of commitment, help and support family members provide for one another” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). Expressiveness reflects “the extent to which family members are encouraged to express their feelings directly” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). Conflict measures “the amount of openly expressed anger and conflict among family members” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1).

The Personal Growth dimension includes the Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Active-Recreational Orientation and Moral-Religious Emphasis subscales. Independence refers to “the extent to which family members are assertive, are self-sufficient, and make their own decisions” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). The Achievement Orientation subscale reflects “how much activities (such as school and work) are cast into an achievement-orientated or competitive framework” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). The Intellectual-Cultural Orientation subscale measures “the level of interest in political, intellectual, and cultural activities” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). The Active-Recreational Orientation subscale refers to “the amount of participation in social and recreational activities” (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). The Moral-Religious Emphasis subscale measures “the emphasis on ethical and religious issues and values”
The System Maintenance dimension includes the Organization and Control subscales. Organization measures "the degree of importance of clear organization and structure in planning family activities and responsibilities" (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). The Control subscale refers to "how much set rules and procedures are used to run family life" (Moos & Moos, 2002, p. 1). The FES has been widely used as an indicator of perceptions of family functioning for children and adults.

Each of these ten subscales includes nine items scored in a dichotomous True or False format. Participants are instructed to read each statement and chose True or False based on their perception of their families of origin. Some sample items include: "Family members really help and support one another." (Cohesion), "We don’t do things on our own very often in our family." (Independence) and "Activities in our family are pretty carefully planned." (Organization). Ten separate subscale scores are calculated by adding the responses in the keyed direction, which can then be converted to standard scores. A high subscale score indicates that an individual strongly perceives that particular family environment variable within their family of origin. Moos and Moos (2002) reported the following subscale alpha coefficients: Cohesion (.78), Expressiveness (.69), Conflict (.75), Independence (.61), Achievement Orientation (.64), Intellectual-Cultural Orientation (.78), Active-Recreational Orientation (.67), Moral-Religious Emphasis (.78), Organization (.76) and Control (.67). They also reported test-retest reliability coefficients for an interval of one year for the subscales ranging from .53 (Conflict) to .84 (Moral-Religious Emphasis).

The FES-R has demonstrated adequate content and construct validity through its established relationships with measures of social support, parental care, relationship
adjustment, family routine, and adaptability. The authors of the FES-R found that the Cohesion subscale was positively related to several measures of social support, parental care and relationship adjustment (Moos & Moos, 2002). Also families who reported predictable and stable routines scored higher on the Organization and Control subscales. In a study of the FES-R and Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation (FACES-II) the authors noted that there was good convergent validity between the measures of cohesion and adaptability in both instruments. Discriminant validity for the FES-R was demonstrated through its low subscale correlations with measures that define family cohesion differently (Moos & Moos, 2002). Negy and Snyder (2006) also found that when the FES-R and the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised (MSI-R) (Snyder, 1997) were compared the Family History of Distress subscale was significantly negatively correlated with the following subscales of the FES-R: Cohesion, Expressiveness, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Independence, Active-Recreational Orientation, Moral Religious Emphasis and Organization. The Global Distress Subscale was significantly negatively correlated with the Cohesion, Expressiveness, Independence, Organization and Moral-Religious Emphasis subscales of the FES-R. Both of the subscales from the MSI-R were positively correlated with the Conflict subscale of the FES-R. These correlations were in the expected direction and indicate the convergent validity of the FES-R.

Factor analysis of the FES-R has consistently found a three-factor solution best underlies the instrument (Gondoli & Jacob, 1993; Kronenberger, Thompson & Morrow, 1997). While this does not support the ten separate subscales various authors have suggested that the three factors better represent the three dimensions of the scale. The
factor structure of the FES-R may be better characterized by the Relationship, Personal Growth and System Maintenance dimensions. The ten subscales can be used independently if the factor structure is understood to best represent the underlying dimensions of the model (Gondoli & Jacob, 1993).

Procedure

Participants invited to volunteer for this study were undergraduate students at a large Midwestern University. After obtaining approval for this research project through the university's HSIRB permission to recruit students was requested from instructors of various undergraduate courses. Data collection occurred from September 2007 through December 2007. The investigator announced the research opportunity in various undergraduate courses and invited students who identified as White undergraduate females and U.S. citizens to participate. All participants were offered the opportunity to participate in a raffle of four fifty-dollar grocery store gift cards at the completion of data collection. Additionally, some instructors offered extra credit to those students who participated. Extra credit for this research study was only offered in those classes where other extra credit opportunities were present for all students. One hundred and sixty-three participants (41.4%) received extra credit for their participation in this research project. At the conclusion of data collection, three independent samples t-tests were performed comparing those participants who received extra credit and those that did not. In each of the three t-tests the mean differences on one of the scales (i.e. ORAS-R, FIC and FES-R) for each group were compared and indicated no significant differences between the participants who received extra-credit and those that did not.
At each undergraduate course the investigator read a written invitation script informing students of the nature of the research program, the expected time completion of the survey would take and that all responses would be anonymous. Potential participants were told that the packets consisted of questionnaires examining social attitudes, women's identity development and perceptions of one's family. Individuals who indicated a willingness to participate were given a packet consisting of: the HSIRB informed consent for anonymous survey research, a demographic questionnaire, the ORAS-R, the FIC and the FES-R. After the informed consent form and the demographic questionnaire the three instruments were counter-balanced to control for order effects in the administration. The HSIRB informed consent for anonymous survey research explained that participation was voluntary, anonymous and no links between a participant's name and completed packet would be made. Participants were instructed not to write their names on any of the forms or instruments. The consent form also explained that participants could choose not to answer any question and discontinue their participation at any time. If an individual chose not to participate she was instructed to simply discard the packet or return the blank surveys to the investigator.

Individuals who elected to participate were asked to return the research packet through the mail using the provided self-addressed stamped envelope or when the researcher returned to their class one week later. The majority of the participants returned the survey packets to the investigator in their class, while 110 participants returned the survey through the mail. After the data was collected the investigator reviewed the surveys for completion. Surveys that did not meet the inclusion criteria (White, undergraduate female U.S. citizens) were excluded for the analysis. Additionally surveys
with a substantial amount of data missing from the instruments were excluded. However, surveys with missing demographic data were included in the analyses. For those surveys with missing items on the ORAS-R and FIC (i.e. 1 or 2 missing items), which are scored by averaging the items within each subscale, the means were calculated using only the answered items. On the FES-R, where subscale scores are the sum of T or F scores representing 0 or 1, the subscales were summed without the missing items.

Data Analysis

Descriptive data analysis on the variables was conducted. This included descriptive statistics and Pearson’s r correlations for the 18 subscale scores of the three instruments, ORAS-R, FIC and FES-R. To test the four research hypotheses, four separate canonical correlation analyses were conducted. Canonical correlation analysis (CCA) is a statistical tool that is used to investigate the relationships between the multiple variables in two variable sets. These two sets should consist of at least two unique non-correlated variables. CCA provides a breakdown of the associations between the two sets of variables and describes the number and nature of the independent relationships present (Stevens, 1992; Thompson, 1991, 1996). In CCA there can be multiple dependent and independent variables. The designation of independent and dependent is less important since CCA creates the linear combination of the two (Weiss, 1972). CCA should only be used when there is a meaningful relationship theorized between the two variable sets. CCA includes assumptions of linearity between the measured variables and the created variables, multivariate normality and homoscedasticity (Leech, 2004).

There are two advantages to studying the relationships between multiple variables
over the univariate statistical methods. Arguably the most important reason for using a multivariate design, such as CCA, is that it more closely reflects the reality of the world being studied (Stevens, 1992; Thompson, 2000). Using univariate methods can deceive the researcher into believing that single variables operate in isolation from one another. Multivariate methods acknowledge the reality that there are multiple relationships and influences among variables, which can then be more reliably generalized outside of the study. Further indication of this is found when multivariate and univariate analyses are compared in a study and the multivariate results tend to reflect a more accurate picture of the phenomenon being studied (Thompson, 2000). Another reason for using multivariate methods such as CCA is that they limit the likelihood of having made an experimentwise error (Stevens, 1992).

Several advantages emerge when comparing CCA to traditional univariate methods. CCA examines the patterns that cannot be seen in a bivariate correlation matrix and determines which variables should be weighted in order to maximize the relationship between the constructs (Thompson, 2000). CCA is the multivariate version of multiple regression and is able to consider several variables simultaneously. Separate multiple regressions, however, would neglect the potential interrelationships of the variables (Licht, 1995; Weiss, 1972). Even more importantly, using more complex dependent variables in CCA may better reflect the phenomenon being studied than single dependent variables in separate regressions (Thompson, 1984). Ultimately, CCA reflects depth in quantitative data because it attempts to capture the complex dynamics of reality (Thompson, 1984).

CCA also offers several unique advantages over MANOVA, another multivariate
research method. For example, CCA uses both continuous independent and dependent variables while MANOVA only uses categorical independent and continuous dependent variables (Weinfurt, 1995). This gives more complex and multifaceted data due to the increased data potential of continuous variables. Another advantage of CCA is that the linear relationship between the two variables is being investigated rather than the effect one is having on the other (Weiss, 1972). As such CCA is useful for exploratory analyses where variables may be related conceptually but more information is needed before more concrete theories about the relationships can be formed (Harlow, 2005; Leech, 2004). For this study CCA provides an avenue for exploring how family environment, feminist identity development and White racial consciousness attitude types may be related which is a previously unexplored area research.

To consider the first research question, What is the nature of the relationship between family environment and feminist identity development for undergraduate White women? and to test null hypothesis 1, a canonical correlation analysis was performed. The ten FES-R subscales were used as the set of family environment variables and the five FIC subscales were used as the set of feminist identity development variables.

The following criteria were considered to determine the significance of the canonical functions. First, Wilk’s lambda was used as an overall test of the null hypothesis that all squared canonical coefficients, $Rc^2$ are equal to zero. Second, canonical functions were considered to be meaningful if they represented at least 10% of the variance (Pedhazur, 1997). Third, the structure coefficients ($r_s$) were used to interpret the canonical functions. Structure coefficients are considered more useful than standardized canonical coefficients or weights in interpreting canonical functions because
they explain the direct contribution of one variable to the canonical function regardless of the other variables (Sherry & Henson, 2005; Thorndike, 2000). Those structure coefficients greater than or equal to .30 were considered meaningful (Pedhazur, 1997). These criteria were used to interpret all four of the canonical correlation analyses conducted.

To consider the second research question, What is the nature of the relationship between family environment and White racial consciousness attitudes for undergraduate White women? and to test null hypothesis 2, a canonical correlation analysis was performed. The ten FES-R subscales were used as the set of family environment variables and the three ORAS-R subscales were used as the set of White racial consciousness attitude variables. To consider the third research question, What is the nature of the relationship between White racial consciousness attitudes and feminist identity development for undergraduate White women? and to test null hypothesis 3, a canonical correlation analysis was performed. The three ORAS-R subscales were used as the set of White racial consciousness attitude variables and the five FIC subscales were used as the set of feminist identity development variables. To consider the fourth research question, What is the nature of the relationship between family environment, and White racial consciousness attitudes and feminist identity development variables considered together for undergraduate White women? and to test null hypothesis 4, a canonical correlation analysis was performed. The ten subscales of the FES-R were used as the set of family environment variables, and the three ORAS-R and the five FIC subscales formed the combined set of White racial consciousness attitude variables and feminist identity development variables.
Summary

This chapter reviewed the research methods and procedures employed for this study. This review summarized a description of the participants, measures, procedures, research design and data analysis methods. The following chapter describes the results of this study.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter IV is to present the research findings of this study. The descriptive statistics are presented first and include the Pearson r correlations, standard deviations and means. Following these statistics are the results of the four canonical correlation analyses, which reflect the four main research questions of the study.

Descriptive Statistics

Means, standard deviations and Pearson r correlations were calculated for the subscales of the Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale-Revised (ORAS-R), the Feminist Identity Composite (FIC) and the Family Environment Scale-Real Form (FES-R). Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for each subscale as well as the Pearson r correlations. Due to the high number of correlations, only those significant at the .001 and .0003 levels, the latter reflecting the Bonferroni correction, are noted in Table 2. There were numerous significant correlations between the ORAS-R and FIC. The Passive Acceptance scale of the FIC was significantly negatively correlated with the Dominative-Integrative scale of the ORAS-R \((r = -0.308, p < .0003)\). It also had a significant positive correlation with the Conflictive scale of the ORAS-R \((r = 0.362, p < .0003)\). The Revelation scale of the FIC was significantly positively correlated with the Reactive scale of the ORAS-R \((r = 0.362, p < .0003)\). The Embeddedness-Emanation scale of the FIC had significant positive correlations with the Dominative-Integrative \((r = 0.221, p < \)
and Reactive ($r = 0.251, p < .0003$) scales of the ORAS-R. It also had a significant negative correlation with the Confictive scale of the ORAS-R ($r = -0.295, p < .0003$). The Active Commitment scale of the FIC had a significant positive correlation with the Reactive scale of the ORAS-R ($r = 0.255, p < .0003$). It also had a significant negative correlation with the Confictive scale of the ORAS-R ($r = -0.284, p < .0003$).

There were several significant correlations between the ORAS-R, FIC and FES. The Intellectual-Cultural Orientation scale of the FES was significantly positively correlated with the Dominative-Integrative scale of the ORAS-R ($r = 0.250, p < .0003$) and the Embeddedness-Emanation ($r = 0.239, p < .0003$) and Synthesis ($r = 0.167, p < .001$) scales of the FIC. The Intellectual-Cultural Orientation scale had a significant negative correlation with the Confictive scale of the ORAS-R ($r = -0.219, p < .0003$). The Moral-Religious Emphasis scale of the FES was significantly positively correlated with the Passive Acceptance scale of the FIC ($r = 0.250, p < .0003$).
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Table 2  
*Means, Standard Deviations and Pearson Moment Correlation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ODIscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OCscale</td>
<td><strong>-.335</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ORscale</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td><strong>-.335</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 FICPAscale</td>
<td><strong>-.308</strong></td>
<td><strong>.362</strong></td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 FICRscale</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td><strong>.362</strong></td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 FICEEscale</td>
<td><strong>.221</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.295</strong></td>
<td><strong>.251</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.276</strong></td>
<td><strong>.290</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 FICSscale</td>
<td>* .162</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td><strong>.334</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 FICACscale</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td><strong>-.284</strong></td>
<td><strong>.255</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.271</strong></td>
<td><strong>.433</strong></td>
<td><strong>.468</strong></td>
<td><strong>.425</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 FESCOHascale</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 FESEXPsacle</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td><strong>.433</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 FESCTFsacle</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td><strong>.628</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 FESINDscale</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td><strong>.218</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 FESACHscale</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 FESICOscale</td>
<td><strong>.250</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.219</strong></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td><strong>.239</strong></td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td><strong>.465</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 FESAROsacle</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td><strong>.465</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 FESMREscale</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td><strong>.250</strong></td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td><strong>.207</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 FESORGsacle</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td><strong>.380</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 FESCTLscale</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td><em>-.164</em>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N  
Mean  4.40 2.53 2.56 2.84 2.62 3.30 4.22 3.56 6.89
SD  0.57 0.74 0.69 0.70 0.65 0.83 0.49 0.57 2.26

* = p < .001, ** = p < .0003
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ODIscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OCscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ORscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 FICPAscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 FICRscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 FICEEscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 FICSscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 FICACscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 FESCOHscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 FESEXPscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 FESCFTscale</td>
<td>**-.322</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 FESINDscale</td>
<td>**.262</td>
<td>**-.288</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 FESACHscale</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 FESICOscale</td>
<td>**.246</td>
<td>**-.347</td>
<td>**.201</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 FESAROscale</td>
<td>**.246</td>
<td>**-.244</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>**.445</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 FESMRscale</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 FESORGscale</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>**-.300</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>**.190</td>
<td>**.266</td>
<td>**.251</td>
<td>**.237</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 FESCTLscale</td>
<td>**-.444</td>
<td>**.241</td>
<td>**-.309</td>
<td>**.274</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>**.336</td>
<td>**.239</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<.001, **=p<.0003
Canonical Correlation Analyses

Four canonical correlation analyses were conducted. Assumptions of multivariate normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were tested for each analysis. These assumptions were evaluated by examining the distributions of the canonical function scores from each analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). For each canonical correlation analysis regression lines were fit to the statistically significant canonical functions. The normal distributions of the residuals from the regression equations were tested to verify the multivariate normality of the analysis. The residuals were plotted using histograms and examined for statistical significance using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov non-parametric test. Both methods indicated that all the significant canonical functions met assumptions of multivariate normality. To verify homoscedasticity and linearity assumptions, residual plots and partial plots were examined. These results indicated that assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity were met by the significant canonical functions. The four canonical correlation analyses results are organized according to the four research questions.

Research Question 1: What is the nature of the relationship between family environment and feminist identity development for undergraduate White women?

Null hypothesis 1: The canonical correlation analysis between the family environment variables and the feminist identity development variables will indicate that all squared canonical correlation coefficients, $R^2$., are equal to zero.

To consider the first research question and test null hypothesis 1, a canonical correlation analysis was performed between the ten subscales of the FES-R and the five
subscales of the FIC. Table 3 presents the results of this canonical correlation analysis. The analysis yielded five canonical functions. The first squared canonical correlation was 0.1868; the second was 0.1019. The last three squared canonical correlations represented less than 10% of the variance and were not considered significant. With all five canonical correlations included, Wilks' Lambda was 0.670 (F = 3.17, p ≤ .0001). Based on this result, null hypothesis 1 was rejected. Additionally, since Wilks' Lambda represents the variance unexplained by the model, 1-Wilks' Lambda yields the full model effect size in an $r^2$ metric (Sherry & Henson, 2005). Thus for the set of the five canonical functions, the $r^2$ type effect size was 0.330 which indicated that the full model explained about 33% of the variance shared between the variable sets.

The dimension reduction analysis allows the researcher to test the hierarchal arrangement of functions for statistical significance and evaluate which functions should be considered meaningful (Sherry & Henson, 2005). With all five canonical correlations included, Wilks' Lambda was 0.670 (F = 3.17, p ≤ .0001). With the first canonical correlation removed Wilks' Lambda was 0.824 (F = 2.09, p ≤ .0002). Each reduction after this was not statistically significant. Functions 1 and 2 are considered meaningful and explain 18.68% and 10.19% of the variance in the variable sets. These two canonical functions accounted for the significant relationships between the two sets of variables.
Table 3
Canonical Correlation Analysis 1 (FIC and FES-R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigen Value</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p ≤</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.1868</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.1019</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.0407</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.1052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.0231</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.2583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.0205</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.2406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 presents the standardized canonical coefficients and structure coefficients for the first and second function of this canonical correlation analysis. The squared structure coefficients and communalities (h²) across the two functions are also given. Those variables with structure coefficients greater than or equal to .30 were considered meaningful contributors when interpreting the relationships between the variable sets (Pedhazur, 1997).

The variables in the family environment set that correlated with the first canonical variate were Achievement (0.363), Intellectual-Cultural Orientation (-0.570) and Moral-Religious Emphasis (0.406). Among the feminist identity development set Passive Acceptance (0.835) and Embeddedness-Emanation (-0.554) correlated with the first canonical variate. This function suggested that family environments that emphasized competition and religious values but not cultural, political and intellectual events were associated with an endorsement of traditional gender roles for women, lack of awareness of sexism and less engagement in female-centered spaces.

The variables in the family environment set that correlated with the second canonical variate were Cohesion (0.375), Conflict (-0.357), Independence (0.338),
Achievement (0.557), Intellectual-Cultural Orientation (0.722), Active-Recreational Orientation (0.377), Moral-Religious Emphasis (0.475) and Organization (0.310). Among the feminist identity development set Passive Acceptance (0.375), Embeddedness-Emanation (0.477), Synthesis (0.554) and Active Commitment (0.514) correlated with the second canonical variate. This function suggested that family environments where members were connected to one another, encouraged to make decisions, competitive with one another, attended cultural, political and intellectual events and social activities, demonstrated religious values, had high levels of structure at family events and did not openly express conflict were associated with endorsement of traditional gender roles for women, seeking affirmation of womanhood through female-centered spaces, participating in social justice activism and valuing the positive aspects of being female.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Function 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coef</td>
<td>$r_s$</td>
<td>$r_s^2$ (%)</td>
<td>Coef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICPAscale</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>69.72</td>
<td>0.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICRscale</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>-0.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICEEscale</td>
<td>-0.489</td>
<td>-0.554</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>0.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICSscale</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICACscale</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESCOHscale</td>
<td>-0.227</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESEXPscale</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESCFTscale</td>
<td>-0.480</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESINDscale</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESACHscale</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>0.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESICOscale</td>
<td>-0.938</td>
<td>-0.570</td>
<td>32.49</td>
<td>0.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESAROscale</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESMREscale</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>0.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESORGscale</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESCTLscale</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>-0.162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R_s^2$: 18.68 10.19

Note: FIC subscales: FICPAscale= Passive Acceptance, FICRscale= Revelation, FICEEscale= Embeddedness-Emanation, FICSscale= Synthesis, FICACscale= Active Commitment; FES-R subscales: FESCOHscale= Cohesion, FESEXPscale= Expressiveness, FESCFTscale= Conflict, FESINDscale= Independence, FESACHscale= Achievement, FESICOscale= Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, FESAROscale= Active-Recreational Orientation, FESMREscale= Moral-Religious Emphasis, FESORGscale= Organization, FESCTLscale= Control

Research Question 2: What is the nature of the relationship between family environment and White racial consciousness attitudes for undergraduate White women?

Null hypothesis 2: The canonical correlation analysis between the family environment variables and the White racial consciousness attitude types will indicate that all squared canonical correlation coefficients, $R_s^2$: are equal to zero.

To consider the second research question and test null hypothesis 2, a canonical correlation analysis was performed between the ten subscales of the FES-R and the three subscales of the ORAS-R. Table 5 presents the results of this canonical correlation analysis.
analysis. The analysis yielded three canonical functions. The first squared canonical correlation was 0.1209 and the other two represented less than 10% of the variance and were not considered significant. With all three canonical correlations included, Wilks' Lambda was 0.830 (F = 2.45, p < .0001). Based on this result, null hypothesis 2 was rejected. The full model effect size (r² type) for the set of the three canonical functions was 0.170 which indicated that the full model explained about 17% of the variance shared between the variable sets. After conducting the dimension reduction analysis of the functions for statistical significance only the first canonical function was found to be significant (F = 2.45, p < .0001). Each reduction after this was not statistically significant. Function 1 was considered meaningful as it explained 12.09% of the variance shared by the variable sets. This function accounted for the significant relationships between the two sets of variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigen Value</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p ≤</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.1209</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.0457</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.2226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.0107</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.8419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 presents the standardized canonical coefficients, structure coefficients and squared structure coefficients for the first function of this canonical correlation analysis. The variable of the family environment set that was correlated with this canonical variate was Intellectual-Cultural Orientation (0.831). Among the White racial consciousness variables Dominative-Integrative (0.815) and Conflicutive (-0.817) correlated with the
corresponding canonical variate. This canonical function suggested that family environments that emphasized cultural, political and intellectual events were associated with higher levels of expressed acceptance of people of color and disagreement with the belief that efforts to assist people of color in society discriminate against White people.

Table 6  
*Summary of Canonical Correlation Analysis 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>r^2 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODIscale</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>66.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCscale</td>
<td>-0.631</td>
<td>-0.817</td>
<td>66.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORscale</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESCOHscale</td>
<td>-0.440</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESEXPscale</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESCFTscale</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESINDscale</td>
<td>-0.173</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESACHscale</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESICOscale</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>69.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESAROscale</td>
<td>-0.252</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESMREscale</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESORGsacle</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESCTLscale</td>
<td>-0.351</td>
<td>-0.162</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R^2 = 12.09

*Note: ORAS-R subscales: ODIscale= Dominative-Integrative, OCscale= Conflictive, ORscale= Reactive; FES-R subscales: FESCOHscale= Cohesion, FESEXPscale= Expressiveness, FESCFTscale= Conflict, FESINDscale= Independence, FESACHscale= Achievement, FESICOscale= Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, FESAROscale= Active-Recreational Orientation, FESMREscale= Moral-Religious Emphasis, FESORGsacle= Organization, FESCTLscale= Control*

Research Question 3: What is the nature of the relationship between White racial consciousness attitudes and feminist identity development for undergraduate White women?
Null hypothesis 3: The canonical correlation analysis between the White racial consciousness attitude types and the feminist identity development variables will indicate that all squared canonical correlation coefficients, $R^2_c$, are equal to zero.

To consider the third research questions and test null hypothesis 3, a canonical correlation analysis was performed between the three subscales of the ORAS-R and the five subscales of the FIC. Table 7 presents the results of this canonical correlation analysis. The analysis yielded three canonical functions. The first squared canonical correlation was 0.2399; the second was 0.1530. The last squared canonical correlation represented less than 10% of the variance and was not considered significant. With all three canonical correlations included, Wilks’ Lambda was 0.632 ($F = 12.87, p \leq .0001$). Based on this result, null hypothesis 3 was rejected. The full model effect size ($r^2$ type) for the set of the three canonical functions was 0.368 which indicates that the full model explained about 36.8% of the variance shared between the variable sets.

With all three canonical correlations included in the dimension reduction analysis, Wilks’ Lambda was 0.632 ($F = 12.87, p \leq .0001$). With the first canonical correlation removed Wilks’ Lambda was 0.831 ($F = 9.39, p \leq .0001$). The final reduction was not statistically significant. Functions 1 and 2 are considered meaningful and explain 23.99% and 15.30% of the variance in the variable sets. These two canonical functions accounted for the significant relationships between the two sets of variables.
Table 7

Canonical Correlation Analysis 3 (ORAS-R and FIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigen Value</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p ≤</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.2399</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.1530</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.0189</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.0594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 presents the standardized canonical coefficients and structure coefficients for the first and second function of this canonical correlation analysis. The squared structure coefficients and communalities ($h^2$) across the two functions are also given. The variables in the White racial consciousness set that correlated with the first canonical variate were Dominative-Integrative (0.712), Conflictive (-0.878) and Reactive (0.405). Among the feminist identity development variables Passive Acceptance (-0.831), Embeddedness-Emanation (0.712) and Active Commitment (0.610) correlated with the first canonical variate. This canonical function suggested that expressed racial acceptance, endorsement of White privilege and disagreement with the belief that efforts to assist people of color in society discriminate against White people were associated with a rejection of traditional gender roles for women, acknowledgement of sexism, moving into female-centered spaces and participating in social justice activism.

The variables in the White racial consciousness set that correlated with the second canonical variate were Dominative-Integrative (-0.483) and Reactive (0.879). Among the feminist identity development variables Revelation (0.955) and Active Commitment (0.399) correlated with the second canonical variate. This function suggested negative and stereotypical views of people of color and a belief in White privilege were associated
with an emerging understanding of discrimination against women in society and a commitment to social justice.

Table 8
Summary of Canonical Correlation Analysis 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th>Function 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coef</td>
<td>Coef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODIscale</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>-0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCscale</td>
<td>-0.647</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORscale</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICPAscale</td>
<td>-0.638</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICRscale</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
<td>0.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICEEscale</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICSscale</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICACscale</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$r_x^2$ (%)</th>
<th>$r_x^2$ (%)</th>
<th>$h^2$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODIscale</td>
<td>50.69</td>
<td>-4.83</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCscale</td>
<td>77.09</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORscale</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>77.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICPAscale</td>
<td>69.06</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICRscale</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>91.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICEEscale</td>
<td>50.69</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICSscale</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICACscale</td>
<td>37.21</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>15.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R_x^2 = 23.99$  
$R_x^2 = 15.30$

Note: ORAS-R subscales: ODIscale= Dominative-Integrative, OCscale= Conflictive, ORscale= Reactive; FIC subscales: FICPAscale= Passive Acceptance, FICRscale= Revelation, FICEEscale= Embeddedness-Emanation, FICSscale= Synthesis, FICACscale= Active Commitment

Research Question 4: What is the nature of the relationship between family environment, and White racial consciousness attitudes and feminist identity development variables considered together for undergraduate White women?

Null hypothesis 4: The canonical correlation analysis between the set of family environment variables, and the combined set of White racial consciousness attitude types and feminist identity development variables will indicate that all squared canonical correlation coefficients, $R_x^2$, are equal to zero.

To consider the fourth research question and test null hypothesis 4, a canonical correlation analysis was performed between the ten subscales of the FES-R and the combined eight subscales of the ORAS-R and the FIC. Table 9 presents the results of this canonical correlation analysis. The analysis yielded eight canonical functions. The first
squared canonical correlation was 0.1945; the second was 0.1514. The last six squared canonical correlations represented less than 10% of the variance and were not considered significant. With all eight canonical correlations included, Wilks’ Lambda was 0.583 (F = 2.65, p ≤ .0001). The full model effect size (r² type) for the set of the eight canonical functions was 0.417 which indicates that the full model explained about 41.7% of the variance shared between the variable sets.

With all eight canonical correlations included in the dimension reduction analysis, Wilks’ Lambda was 0.583 (F = 2.65, p ≤ .0001). With the first canonical correlation removed Wilks’ Lambda was 0.724 (F = 1.99, p ≤ .0001). Each reduction after this was not statistically significant. Functions 1 and 2 are considered meaningful and explain 19.45% and 15.14% of the variance in the variable sets. These two canonical functions accounted for the significant relationships between the two sets of variables.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigen Value</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p ≤</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.1945</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.1514</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.0546</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.0381</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.2863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.0312</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.4442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.0190</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.6683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.7798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.9381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 presents the standardized canonical coefficients and structure coefficients for the first and second function of this canonical correlation analysis. The squared structure coefficients and communalities (h²) across the two functions are also
given. The variable in the family environment set that correlated with the first canonical variate was Intellectual-Cultural Orientation (-0.743). Among the White racial consciousness and feminist identity development variable set Dominative-Integrative (-0.544), Conflicitive (0.564), Passive Acceptance (0.702), Embeddedness-Emanation (-0.621) and Synthesis (-0.300) correlated with the first canonical variate. This canonical function suggested that family environments that did not engage in cultural, political and intellectual events were associated with negative and stereotypical views of people of color, a belief that the systems of society benefit people of color over Whites, endorsement of traditional gender roles for women, denial of sexism, less engagement in female-centered spaces and less celebration of the feminine.

The variables in the family environment set that correlated with the second canonical variate were Conflict (-0.352), Achievement (0.561), Intellectual-Cultural Orientation (0.509), Active-Recreational Orientation (0.341) and Moral-Religious Emphasis (0.600). Among the White racial consciousness and feminist identity development variable set Dominative-Integrative (0.389), Passive Acceptance (0.562), Synthesis (0.343) and Active Commitment (0.323) correlated with the second canonical variate. This canonical function suggested that families low in expressed conflict but stressing competition, cultural, political and intellectual events, social activities and religious values were associated with higher expressed comfort with people of color, endorsement of traditional gender roles for women, emphasis on valuing the positive aspects of being female and a commitment to social justice.
### Table 10
**Summary of Canonical Correlation Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coef</th>
<th>( r_s )</th>
<th>( r_s^2 ) (%)</th>
<th>Coef</th>
<th>( r_s )</th>
<th>( r_s^2 ) (%)</th>
<th>( h^2 ) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODIscale</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>-0.544</td>
<td>29.59</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>44.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCscale</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>31.81</td>
<td>-0.291</td>
<td>-0.262</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>38.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORscale</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICPAscale</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>49.28</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>80.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICRscale</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICEEscale</td>
<td>-0.502</td>
<td>-0.621</td>
<td>38.56</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>43.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICSscale</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>20.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICACscale</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>-0.238</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>16.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESCOHscale</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.506</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESEXPscale</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESCFTscale</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.518</td>
<td>-0.352</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>12.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESINDscale</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESACHscale</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>31.47</td>
<td>37.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESICOscale</td>
<td>-1.107</td>
<td>-0.743</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>81.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESAROsce</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>12.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESMREscale</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>42.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESORGscale</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.131</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FESCTLscale</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-0.193</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R_c^2 \) 19.45 15.14

Note: ORAS-R subscales: ODIscale = Dominative-Integrative, OCscale = Conflictive, ORscale = Reactive; FIC subscales: FICPAscale = Passive Acceptance, FICRscale = Revelation, FICEEscale = Embeddedness-Emanation, FICSscale = Synthesis, FICACscale = Active Commitment; FES-R subscales: FESCOHscale = Cohesion, FESEXPscale = Expressiveness, FESCFTscale = Conflict, FESINDscale = Independence, FESACHscale = Achievement, FESICOscale = Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, FESAROsce = Active-Recreational Orientation, FESMREscale = Moral-Religious Emphasis, FESORGscale = Organization, FESCTLscale = Control

### Summary

In Chapter IV, the results of this study were presented. The primary focus of this chapter was to outline the relationships found between White racial consciousness attitude types, feminist identity development and family environment for undergraduate
White women. The descriptive statistics reflecting the Pearson's $r$ correlations, means and standard deviations of the ORAS-R, FIC and FES-R subscales were presented. Additionally, the findings from the four canonical correlation analyses were reported. The first canonical correlation analysis, examining the relationships between the FES-R and FIC, yielded two significant canonical functions. The second canonical correlation analysis, examining the relationships between the FES-R and ORAS-R, yielded one significant function. The third canonical correlation analysis, examining the relationships between the ORAS-R and FIC, yielded two significant canonical functions. The fourth canonical correlation analysis, examining the relationships between the FES-R and a combined variable set of the ORAS-R and FIC, yielded two significant canonical functions. Based on the results, the four null hypotheses were rejected. The following chapter will discuss the results of this study.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of the current study was to explore the relationships between family of origin environment, feminist identity development and White racial consciousness for White undergraduate women. The following chapter will include a discussion of the results organized according to the four research questions. Each of the relationships identified by the four canonical correlation analyses described in Chapter IV are explored in the context of the previous research literature. After this the implications and limitations of the study will be presented. Finally, a summary of the chapter will be offered.

Family and Feminist Identity Development

The first research question explored how family environment might be related to feminist identity development. The results of the canonical correlation analysis indicated that two significant functions best described the relationships between these sets of variables. The first canonical function can be characterized as “traditional worldviews”. In this function the pair of canonical variates indicated that family environments emphasizing competition and religious values with less importance placed on events that introduced outside or divergent ways of thinking, i.e. intellectual, cultural and political activities, were associated with women endorsing traditional gender roles and unquestioningly participating in a patriarchal society.
This relationship between family environment and feminist identity variables appears to be describing a relationship for White undergraduate women who aren’t questioning their family’s worldview and are accepting traditional gender roles and expectations. Previous research has found that the conservative beliefs regarding feminism described by this relationship are held by a relatively small number of college women (Liss et al., 2000). Additionally, previous research has shown that a higher endorsement of these conservative beliefs is related to less development in the personal growth dimension of measures of psychological well being and lower scores of collective self-esteem (Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Carpenter & Johnson, 2001). It appears that women who endorsed traditional views about gender and women’s roles were also more likely to describe family environments that had strong religious and moral values, emphasized competition, and placed less emphasis on activities that may have introduced outside or divergent perspectives, i.e. intellectual, cultural and political activities.

This study furthers previous research by offering a thorough look at undergraduate women who endorse more conservative views than their peers. What is also striking about the relationship described by this function is the finding that family environments with a more insular focus have a positive relationship to feminist identity’s earliest stage, Passive Acceptance. This would seem to connect a naivété regarding sexism, and in some cases active denial of it, with a highly religious family that values competition and success but not engagement with social issues, lectures, concerts, cultural activities and intellectual discussions.

The second canonical function can be described as “multi-faceted worldviews”. In this function the pair of canonical variates indicated that family environments
emphasizing members' connection and competition with one another, independent decision making, structured nature of family events, outside influences (i.e. social and cultural events), and religious values, with less expressed conflict, were associated with women endorsing traditional gender roles, seeking out female centered spaces, participating in social justice activism and celebrating all aspects of being female. The relationship described by this function offers a seemingly more multi-layered view of how White undergraduate women may be sorting through different approaches to the world.

These relationships appear to describe women who value and celebrate the roles traditionally prescribed by society (i.e. wife and mother) while also acknowledging sexism and seeking change through social activism. The related family environment relationships between members also model engagement with a wide range of society (i.e. recreational, cultural and religious activities). This describes a combination of social engagement and seeking social change. What is particularly interesting is that both this function and the first share a common endorsement of the Passive Acceptance scale of the FIC. Given the different variables that loaded on each function it is likely that the meaning of this scale can be interpreted differently on each function. On the first function it appears to correspond to a denial of sexism while on the second it may reflect a common theme of valuing women's roles. In the second function the collective loadings of the Synthesis and Embeddedness-Emanation scales along with the Passive Acceptance scale allow for this alternative interpretation. The current study offers a more complex view of the relationship between feminist identity and family environments for White undergraduate women than previously observed.
Family Environment and White Racial Consciousness

The second research question explored how family environment might be related to White racial consciousness. The results of the canonical correlation analysis indicated one significant function best described the relationships between these sets of variables. This function can be characterized as “racially conscious and accepting worldviews”. In this function the pair of canonical variates indicated that family environments emphasizing interest in cultural, intellectual and political activities were associated with expressed acceptance of people of color and disbelief in reverse racism. This function suggests that a family environment promoting openness to a variety of influences is related to the development of White racial consciousness attitudes that demonstrate personal comfort with people of color and recognize that institutional changes are necessary for equality.

This function suggests that some White undergraduate women have an openness to challenging traditional society’s ways of thinking about race. This is important because believing that programs such as affirmative action economically and socially harm White people has popular support throughout the country, as evidenced by the frequency of anti-affirmative action laws passed in various states during the last few years (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). The relationships described by this function indicate that endorsing integrative and accepting attitudes regarding people of color are associated with family environments promoting engagement with a wide range of perspectives. This relationship may suggest that some White women are not accepting the prejudicial messages about race that the majority culture communicates. This finding seems consistent with Castillo et al’s (2006)
findings that a belief in the institutional components of racism was associated with lower racism scores. It appears that family environments emphasizing outside influences, such as intellectual, cultural and political events are related to expressed personal comfort with people of color and an acknowledgment of the institutional factors involved in racism.

White Racial Consciousness and Feminist Identity Development

The third research question explored how White racial consciousness might be related to feminist identity variables. The results of the canonical correlation analysis indicated that two significant functions best described the relationships between these variables. The first canonical function can be characterized as "feminist and racially aware worldviews". In this function the pair of canonical variates indicated that endorsing racial acceptance and demonstrating an understanding of institutional racism through a belief in White privilege and the need for institutional policies to level an uneven playing field is related to acknowledging sexism, valuing female-centered spaces and social activism while rejecting traditional gender roles for women.

The relationship described by this function demonstrates an integrated worldview with regards to racism and sexism. The acknowledgement of both sexism and racism on individual and institutional levels may also reflect a more flexible and open worldview. This function describes a relationship between increased racial awareness and feminist maturity. This racial awareness is demonstrated by individual acceptance of people of color and acknowledgement of systemic discrimination. The well-developed feminist attitudes are reflected in celebrating the feminine and valuing activism. Previous studies have found mixed results when examining the relationship of gender and race for White
women (Hoffman, 2006; Parks, Carter & Gushue, 1996). While Hoffman (2006) found that ethnic identity was related to feminist identity development for a racially diverse group of women, Parks et al (1996) reported that there was no demonstrated relationship between gender and racial identity development for White women. The relationship described by this function indicates that for some White women racial identity and feminist identity are related which adds a new perspective to the literature and to the findings reported by Hoffman (2006) and Parks et al’s (1996).

The second canonical function can be characterized as an “emerging understanding of privilege and oppression”. The pair of canonical variates in this function describe a relationship in which negative and stereotypical views of people of color, recognizing the existence of White privilege and an emerging understanding of sexism in addition to an expressed commitment to social justice activism are present. The set of variable relationships in this function present a few contradictions. In terms of White racial consciousness there is an acknowledgment that society operates to benefit White people on the basis of their skin color alone as well as endorsement of personal discomfort with people of color. This may reflect the “educated White liberal” phenomenon where individuals are educated on the effects of racism while still expressing personal worldviews that reinforce racist stereotypes (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Bonilla-Silva (2006) describes a similar phenomenon known as “abstract liberalism” where Whites express positive attitudes towards people of color but do not believe in White privilege. The relationships described by this function indicate a similar type of contradiction in that some undergraduate White women appear to recognize the
institutional components of racism while still holding on to negative images of people of color.

Another contradiction is found in the feminist identity variables. The relationships between the variables of this function describe both an early stage of feminist identity development, Revelation and the most advanced stage, Active Commitment. In Revelation, an emerging awareness of sexism is the dominant struggle. In this stage very clear dichotomous thinking shapes women's attitudes and may be expressed as anger at all men. Additionally, women tend to experience anger towards society as wholly patriarchal while perceiving all women as allies regardless of their individual distinctions. This appears inconsistent with the descriptors of the Active Commitment stage where individualism is valued in the context of the larger feminist movement. Also in Active Commitment gender role flexibility and applying a distinct feminist identity to social justice activism are important. Despite the contradictions these findings partially replicate Hoffman's (2006) report that ethnic identity was significantly related to Revelation, Embeddedness/Emanation and Active Commitment.

The variable relationships of this function describe an association between understanding both institutional racism and sexism while revealing overtly racist beliefs about people of color and demonstrating a commitment to social justice activism. This would seem to be a very contradictory set of worldviews. However, previous authors have noted that women in the Revelation stage of feminist identity development are undergoing a struggle (Downing & Rousch, 1985; Moradi et al., 2002b). They are often encountering the reality of discrimination and sexism for the first time. In many cases that encounter may be caused by a personal experience, which only heightens the
response and engagement with feminist principles. Revelation has also been connected to negative self-esteem levels, lower evaluations of psychological well being and more psychological distress (Carpenter & Johnson, 2001; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Fischer & Good, 2004). It may be that this function is describing the experience of some undergraduate White women whose worldviews about gender are shifting, which leads to a belief in the efficacy of activism around issues of feminism but not around racial identity. It would appear that the variable relationships of this function seem to describe emerging and developing feminist identity with emerging and less mature White racial consciousnesses. This is consistent with previous literature on White women’s experiences of race and feminism. For example, Frankenberg (1993) interviewed White women about their racial views and found that many of them experienced less resistance within themselves to developing a feminist identity than an anti-racist one.

Family Environment, Feminist Identity Development and White Racial Consciousness

The fourth research question explored how family environment might be related to the set of feminist identity development variables and White racial consciousness variables. The results of the canonical correlation analysis indicated that two significant functions best described the relationships between these variables. The first canonical function can be characterized as “conventional worldviews.” In this function the pair of canonical variates indicated that family environments not focusing on intellectual, cultural and political activities were related to feminist identity characteristics reflecting an endorsement of traditional femininity, a denial of sexism, lack of engagement in female-dominated spaces and less celebration of the feminine and racial consciousness.
attitudes reflecting negative views of people of color and a belief that efforts to assist people of color discriminate against Whites.

The relationship of family environments that did not promote intellectual, cultural and political events described in this function correspond to less mature feminist identity development stages and more actively racist worldviews. Similar ideas are reflected in previous writings on White racial identity and White women’s development (Frankenberg, 1993; Rothenberg, 2005; Bonilla-Silva, 2006). In the current study, the relationships described by this function are characterized by a belief system that endorses a patriarchal and race-based society. It appears that accepting the historical messages about race and gender in U.S. society are related to family environments that did not emphasize openness to outside influences.

The variable relationships described by this function appear to reflect the United States’ historical messages about gender and race. Previous research has also found that higher scores in the passive acceptance stage were related to lower feminist consciousness scores, more negative feelings about feminism and warmer feelings about men (Moradi et al., 2002b). Women’s lack of a feminist identity can be interpreted as internalized sexism, where women are not adopting women-centered ideas and instead internalizing the guidelines of patriarchy. This is not surprising given the negative contemporary images of feminism and other female-centered organizations represented in media and society. Generally, undergraduate women tend to internalize these very negative images of feminism (Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). The White racial consciousness attitudes reflecting both the institutional and individual racism found in U.S. society as described by Thompson and Neville (1999) corresponded with less
developed feminist identities and insulated family environments. The variable relationships described by this function associates families that did not promote intellectual, cultural and political events outside of the family, which may have limited experience with divergent points of view with less mature feminist identity development and more overtly racist White racial consciousness attitudes. The variable relationships described by this function reflect worldviews shaped by a denial of two pervasive forms of discrimination in our society.

The second canonical function can be described as “multi-layered worldviews.” The pair of canonical variates in this function describe family environments emphasizing competition, outside influences (social and cultural influences) and religious values with less expressed conflict related to an endorsement of traditional feminine roles, celebration of womanhood and commitment to social justice activism and integrative White racial consciousness attitudes indicating acceptance and comfort with people of color.

The variable relationships described by this function present a complex portrait with regard to feminist identity development, White racial consciousness and family environment. It appears that more maturely developed feminist identities and more actively anti-racist views are related to family environments that emphasized a range of activities and influences. Those influences included religious values, social activities and intellectual, political and cultural engagement. This is a particularly important finding because it appears that some undergraduate White women with complex family environments are rejecting the dominant messages of society with regards to feminism and racism. Understanding how these relationships developed could shed light on how to
encourage the development of more active rejection of sexism and racism in other undergraduate White women.

The variable relationships described by this function demonstrated that complex family environments were related to integrative White racial consciousness attitudes and more advanced feminist beliefs. The only exception to this with respect to feminist identity development was the endorsement of the Passive Acceptance scale, which may be tied to women's increased emphasis on valuing the feminine. It could be that women endorsed those items reflecting their engagement with motherhood and romantic relationships, which may be seen as traditional roles for women. Celebrating these roles may be interpreted as feminist when paired with the endorsement of social justice and emphasis of feminine values. Highly integrative attitudes of White racial consciousness and more mature feminist identity development were also related to multi-dimensional family environments demonstrating a rejection of the negative images of people of color represented in society. While this is hopeful it is also difficult to determine whether these attitudes have an effect on the behavior or beliefs about institutional forms of racism. Overall, the variable relationships of this function described complex family environments that were related to more mature feminist identity development and more integrative views on race.

Main Findings Across Analyses

One major finding of this study is the relationship between a family's engagement with outside influences and an individual's feminist and racial identity development. Based on the relationships described by the variable sets of the canonical correlation
analyses an overall pattern appeared. This pattern was that family environments that promoted engagement with a variety of outside perspectives were related to more actively anti-racist worldviews and well-developed feminist identities. And that those family environments reflecting a more insular focus (i.e. less exposure to divergent opinions) were related to more prejudicial racial attitudes and less feminist identity development. These findings are consistent with Smith and Ross' (2006) conclusions that while casual contact with racially diverse groups does not promote anti-racist attitudes, relationships with people of color and families-of-origin promoting openness towards others may impact attitudes about race and racism. The current findings also offer support for Jones and McEwen’s (2000) model of multiple dimensions of identity by demonstrating the relationships between family environment and two aspects of collective identity development.

Another major finding of this study is the multiple relationships between White racial consciousness and feminist identity development. Based on the relationships described by the variable sets of the canonical correlation analyses two dominant connections appeared. The first finding was that more advanced stages of feminist identity development were related to more anti-racist White racial consciousness attitudes. The second finding was that emerging understandings of both sexism and racism appear to be related to each other. Two previous studies, Miville et al. (2005), and Hoffman (2006) both demonstrated some of the varying connections between race and gender for White women while the current study articulated the nature of those relationships in particular for White racial consciousness and feminist identity development.
Implications

The major findings of this study demonstrate that family environments have several relationships to identity development and that White racial consciousness and feminist identity development also have at least two distinct relationships to each other. These findings have implications for further understanding the process of individual growth and development as well as how development might occur in the context of the family.

This study illuminates how different identity characteristics, such as racial consciousness and feminist identity, are related for White undergraduate women. There were two sets of variable relationships that best described the connections between White racial consciousness and feminist identity development for White undergraduate women. The first set of variable relationships described a connection between anti-racist perspectives and a well-developed feminist identity. The second set of variable relationships connected both more prejudicial racial views and endorsement of White privilege with an emerging understanding of sexism and a commitment to social justice activism. These two findings suggest that for White undergraduate women there may be different ways in which racial conscious attitudes and feminist identity development are related. The finding that White racial consciousness attitudes and feminist identity development have complex relationships for White undergraduate women can help clinicians, educators and researchers better consider how race and gender are interacting.

Previous research has also demonstrated the connection between a feminist identity and positive self-esteem, assertiveness, self-control and psychological well being.
for women (Fischer & Good, 2004; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Carpenter & Johnson, 2001). Given the benefits of a feminist identity this study helps to decipher what factors are related to the development of that identity for undergraduate White women. Similarly, understanding how White women have internalized sexism provides an opportunity for programs and policies designed to promote feminist and equalitarian perspectives. Feminist organizations can use this to frame their messages in ways that might counteract the negative images that White undergraduate women are coming in contact with.

These findings have implications for psychologists in variety of roles including education, training and clinical work. Based on previous research it appears that family environments promoting engagement with intellectual, political and cultural events were related to less psychological distress and greater psychological hardiness which demonstrates an important clinical reason for increased attention to these factors (Bopaiya & Prasad, 2004). Understanding how family environment helps to shape identity development for undergraduate White women can offer an additional lens for conceptualizing the presentation of clinical issues.

Based on this and previous research psychologists can begin to identify which White racial consciousness attitudes are related to anti-racist actions and the dismantling of White privilege (Castillo et al, 2006). Further, the discoveries about the development of White racial consciousness attitudes offer insight into how White women’s attitudes about race might be shaped. This is important information for the promotion of anti-racist attitudes and behaviors. From a social justice perspective psychologists cannot be neutral on issues of race and racism (Sue, Bingham, Porche-Burke & Vasquez, 1999). An
expressed goal of multicultural psychology is helping people to move from places of racism into attitudes that reflect racial justice (Vera & Speight, 2003). As psychologists we recognize that racism, both personal and systemic, oppresses groups of people and cannot be passively ignored. While White people are not oppressed by racism they are certainly socialized into White privilege and the dominant culture of Whiteness, which perpetuates discrimination.

It is important to note an additional implication of these findings with regards to the relationship between family environment and identity development. Some families may choose to be insular intentionally in order to preserve various aspects of the family (i.e. culture, religious beliefs, etc) (Olson & Gorall, 2003). The relationship between family environments that do not promote intellectual, cultural and political engagement, and more actively prejudicial racial views and less developed feminist identities that was found in this study may reflect the desire of some families to maintain a particular perspective. For psychologists emphasizing engagement with a variety of divergent perspectives due to a social justice and multiculturally informed worldview this desire to be a more insularly focused family may present a conflict. It may be important to further examine how this type of family environment may be both functional and have difficulty operating in a multicultural environment.

In terms of psychology training these findings offer support for the belief that exposure to differing perspectives are related to the development of a more multiculturally diverse worldviews. Counseling psychology’s commitment to multiculturally competent practice is woven throughout the history of the profession and evidenced by the continuing work of psychologists in this field (Heppner, Casas, Carter,
& Stone, 2000; Vera & Speight, 2003). The publication of the Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice and Organizational Change for Psychologists (2003) demonstrates a part of that commitment. A major emphasis throughout these guidelines is placed on understanding the self in the context of socio-cultural factors such as oppression and privilege (Arredondo et al., 1996; Constantine, Miville & Kindaichi, 2008). The current study’s findings regarding family environment, racial consciousness and feminist identity contribute to an understanding of how psychology trainees might need to reflect on their development within the context of socio-cultural factors such as race and gender.

An additional focus of the multicultural counseling and training movement within psychology is the belief that individual growth in areas of multiculturalism results from engagement with diverse perspectives (Arredondo et al., 1996). The relationship between family environments that promote engagement with intellectual, cultural and political activities, anti-racist White racial consciousness attitudes and well-developed feminist identities found in this study supports this perspective. It would seem that the emphasis on exposure to a variety of different worldviews is well placed in the multicultural counseling and training movement. This study may also be useful in helping psychologists-in-training to reflect on how their own family of origin’s level of emphasis on divergent points of view is related to their identity development.

This research may inform psychologists and professionals practicing and providing services in clinical and educational settings as they work with White undergraduate women dealing with emotional distress on an individual level. In addition this could also be useful in prevention and outreach where psychologists may be able to
intervene with groups of undergraduates learning about racial identity development and its role in perpetuating systemic and personal racism. Further research should attempt to replicate the findings of this study and begin to explore how a family’s engagement in intellectual, cultural and political events might be related to other aspects of White women’s identity development.

Limitations of the Current Study

There are several potential limitations to the current study. The first possible limitation is that since the research design was correlational no causal relationships could be inferred from the findings. This leaves questions about causality unanswered. Future studies could explore these constructs from a longitudinal and experimental perspective and determine with more certainty how attitudes about race and feminism are being formed. While this study describes a set of relationships among feminist identity, White racial consciousness and family environment it does not give answers on how these relationships develop.

A second limitation is the makeup of the current study’s sample. While large, the sample is drawn from a single university in the Midwest. It may be that the attitudes reflected would be different were this study replicated in the Eastern, Southern or Western parts of the United States. Additionally, a large majority of the participants identified as Christian, non-disabled and heterosexual. If this sample were more diverse with respect to religion, ability status and sexual orientation a different collection of relationships might be represented in the canonical correlation analyses.
A third possible limitation may be related to the specific measures used to assess White racial consciousness, feminist identity development and family environment. It is possible that other measures that operationalize these variables differently may produce varying results. For example, this study did not explicitly ask participants about their feminist identification. Given the depth of the literature exploring why undergraduate women do not tend to use the label feminist this may have added scope to the findings on White racial consciousness and family environment. Further research could explore these constructs. It is recommended that further studies employ a variety of different measures as a way of comparing and expounding on the current results.

Summary

Chapter V included a discussion of the results of the findings of the present study. Major results included the finding that family environments that promote engagement with political, cultural and intellectual events are associated with more mature development with regards to feminist and racial identity development. Additionally, the multiple complex relationships between feminist identity and White racial consciousness were discussed. The implications of these findings with regard to educational, clinical and research interventions were presented. Finally, possible limitations of the study were discussed.
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Anonymous Survey Consent Forms
Anonymous Survey Research Consent Form
(For courses offering extra-credit)

Principal Investigator: Patrick Munley, Ph.D. Student Investigator: Kara Wolff

Study Title: Understanding the relationships between attitudes, identity and perceptions among White American undergraduate women.

You are invited to participate in a research project titled "Understanding the relationships between attitudes, identity and perceptions among White American undergraduate women" which is designed to explore how White female undergraduates describe social attitudes, women’s identity and family perceptions. Dr. Patrick Munley and Kara Wolff from Western Michigan University, specifically the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology are conducting this study. This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation requirements for Kara Wolff.

These research questionnaires will take approximately 20-25 minutes to complete. The questionnaires request anonymous information concerning demographic data, social attitudes, thoughts on being female and perceptions about your family. We anticipate minimal risk to you as a result of your participation in this study other than the loss of the time required to complete the survey. While there may be no immediate benefit to you as a result of your participation in this study, it is hoped that we may gain valuable information about social attitudes, identity development and family perceptions that will be of future value to society. Your replies will be completely anonymous; so do not put your name anywhere on the form. You may choose to not answer any question and simply leave it blank. You may discontinue your participation at any time. If you choose to not participate in this survey, you may either return the blank survey or you may discard it in the box provided. Returning a completed survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply. You can return this survey through the mail by placing it in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope or you can hand it in when Kara Wolff returns to your class one week after the survey was distributed. Whichever way you choose to return the survey your name will not be connected to your participation.

As part of your participation in this research study extra-credit in your current class is available. In order to receive the extra-credit you will need to return the completed survey packet when Kara Wolff returns to your class in order to collect your surveys and hand out the extra-credit voucher. This will take place one week after the surveys are distributed.

You also have the opportunity to participate in a raffle, which includes four $50 dollar gift cards to Meijer. If you would like to have your name entered into the raffle please complete and mail the self-addressed, stamped postcard enclosed in the packet. Your name will not be tied to your completed packet. Winners will be notified when survey collection is complete.

If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Patrick H. Munley at 269-287-5100 or Kara Wolff at 269-267-4979. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (269-387-8293) or the Vice President for Research (269-387-8298) if questions or problems arise during the course of the study. This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year. Please keep this copy of this Anonymous Consent Form.
Anonymous Survey Research Consent Form

(For courses not offering extra-credit)

Principal Investigator: Patrick Munley, Ph.D. Student Investigator: Kara Wolff
Study Title: Understanding the relationships between attitudes, identity and perceptions among White American undergraduate women.

You are invited to participate in a research project titled "Understanding the relationships between attitudes, identity and perceptions among White American undergraduate women" which is designed to explore how White female undergraduates describe social attitudes, women's identity and family perceptions. Dr. Patrick Munley and Kara Wolff from Western Michigan University, specifically the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology are conducting this study. This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation requirements for Kara Wolff.

These research questionnaires will take approximately 20-25 minutes to complete. The questionnaires request anonymous information concerning demographic data, social attitudes, thoughts on being female and perceptions about your family. We anticipate minimal risk to you as a result of your participation in this study other than the loss of the time required to complete the survey. While there may be no immediate benefit to you as a result of your participation in this study, it is hoped that we may gain valuable information about social attitudes, identity development and family perceptions that will be of future value to society. Your replies will be completely anonymous; so do not put your name anywhere on the form. You may choose to not answer any question and simply leave it blank. You may discontinue your participation at any time. If you choose to not participate in this survey, you may either return the blank survey or you may discard it in the box provided. Returning a completed survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply. You can return this survey through the mail by placing it in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope or you may hand it in when Kara Wolff returns to your class one week after the survey was distributed. Whichever way you choose to return the survey your name will not be connected to your participation.

You also have the opportunity to participate in a raffle, which includes four $50 dollar gift cards to Meijer. If you would like to have your name entered into the raffle please complete and mail the self-addressed, stamped postcard enclosed in the packet. Your name will not be tied to your completed packet. Winners will be notified when survey collection is complete.

If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Patrick H. Munley at 269-287-5100 or Kara Wolff at 269-267-4979. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (269-387-8293) or the Vice President for Research (269-387-8298) if questions or problems arise during the course of the study. This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year. Please keep this copy of this Anonymous Consent Form.
Research Project: Understanding the relationships between attitudes, identity and perceptions among White American undergraduate women.

Invitation Script: Research questionnaires to be distributed to an undergraduate class where extra-credit is being offered. This invitation script will be presented to potential participants in various undergraduate classes at Western Michigan University.

Hello, my name is Kara Wolff. I am a doctoral student in counseling psychology here at Western Michigan University in the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology. Dr. Patrick Munley and I are conducting a research project on the possible relationships between social attitudes, thoughts about being female and the perceptions individuals have about their families. This study involves completing several brief questionnaires that request anonymous demographic information, social attitudes, thoughts about being female and ways in which you perceive your family. Undergraduate students who identify as White American, female and age 18 or older are eligible to participate in this research project. We anticipate minimal risk to you as a result of your participation in this study other than the inconvenience of the time to complete the survey. While there may be no immediate benefit to you as a result of your participation in this study, it is hoped that we may gain valuable information about social attitudes, identity development and family perceptions that will be of future value to society.

These research questionnaires will take approximately 20-25 minutes to complete. The questionnaires request anonymous information concerning demographic data, social attitudes, thoughts on being female and perceptions about your family. Your replies will be completely anonymous; so do not put your name anywhere on the forms. If you choose to not participate in this survey, you may either return the research materials blank or you may discard them in the box provided. Returning a completed survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply.

If you choose to participate you can return this survey one of two ways, first through the mail by placing it in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope or second, you can hand it in when I return to your class in one week. Whichever way you choose to return the survey your name will not be connected to your participation.

As part of your participation in this research study extra-credit in your current class is available. In order to receive the extra-credit you will need to return the completed survey packet to me one week from today. I will return to class in order to collect your surveys and hand out the extra-credit voucher.

You also have the opportunity to participate in a raffle, which includes four $30 dollar gift cards to Meijer. If you would like to have your name entered into the raffle please complete and mail the self-addressed, stamped postcard enclosed in the packet. Your name will not be tied to your completed packet. Winners will be notified when survey collection is complete.

Do you have any questions? Thank you. We appreciate your participation in this research project.
Invitation Script: Research questionnaires to be distributed to an undergraduate class where extra-credit is being offered. This invitation script will be presented to potential participants in various undergraduate classes at Western Michigan University.

Hello, my name is Kara Wolff. I am a doctoral student in counseling psychology here at Western Michigan University in the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology. Dr. Patrick Munley and I are conducting a research project on the possible relationships between social attitudes, thoughts about being female and the perceptions individuals have about their families. This study involves completing several brief questionnaires that request anonymous demographic information, social attitudes, thoughts about being female and ways in which you perceive your family. Undergraduate students who identify as White American, female and age 18 or older are eligible to participate in this research project. We anticipate minimal risk to you as a result of your participation in this study other than the inconvenience of the time to complete the survey. While there may be no immediate benefit to you as a result of your participation in this study, it is hoped that we may gain valuable information about social attitudes, identity development and family perceptions that will be of future value to society.

These research questionnaires will take approximately 20-25 minutes to complete. The questionnaires request anonymous information concerning demographic data, social attitudes, thoughts on being female and perceptions about your family. Your replies will be completely anonymous; so do not put your name anywhere on the forms. If you choose to not participate in this survey, you may either return the research materials blank or you may discard them in the box provided. Returning a completed survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply.

If you choose to participate you can return this survey one of two ways, first through the mail by placing it in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope or second, you can hand it in when I return to your class in one week. Whichever way you choose to return the survey your name will not be connected to your participation.

You also have the opportunity to participate in a raffle, which includes four $30 dollar gift cards to Meijer. If you would like to have your name entered into the raffle please complete and mail the self-addressed, stamped postcard enclosed in the packet. Your name will not be tied to your completed packet. Winners will be notified when survey collection is complete.

Do you have any questions? Thank you. We appreciate your participation in this research project.
Appendix C

Demographic Questionnaire
Background Information Form

Please answer all of the following questions by filling in the blank or circling the choice that best describes you.

A. Gender (please circle)
1. Male
1. Female
2. Transgendered

B. Race/Ethnicity (Please circle the letter and specify ethnicity as appropriate)

1. American Indian or Alaskan Native
   (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintains cultural identification through community recognition or tribal affiliation)
   Specify tribal affiliation: ________________________________

2. Asian or Pacific Islander
   (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, South Asia, the Indian subcontinent, or the Pacific islands. This area includes, for example, China, India, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, and Samoa.)
   Specify ethnicity: ________________________________

3. African-American/Black - not of Hispanic origin
   (A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa. Does not include persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish cultures or origins – see Hispanic).
   Specify ethnicity: ________________________________

4. Hispanic
   (A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish cultures or origins.)
   Specify ethnicity: ________________________________

5. White, not of Hispanic origin
   (A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East. Does not include persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish cultures or origins)
   Specify ethnicity: ________________________________

6. Bi-racial/ Multi-racial
Specify ethnicity: ____________________________

C. Age __________________

D. Disability (Please Circle)

1. None – No Disability
2. Physical/Orthopedic Disability
3. Blind/Visually Impaired
4. Deaf/Hard of Hearing
5. Learning/Cognitive Disability
6. Developmental Disability
7. Serious Mental Illness
8. Other – Please Specify: ______________________

E. Education: Please enter the number of years of schooling completed _______.

Please circle your current year in college:

1. first year undergraduate
2. second year undergraduate
3. third year undergraduate
4. fourth year undergraduate
5. fifth year undergraduate
6. Other: ________________

F. Religious Affiliation (Please circle)

1. Agnosticism 6. Islam
2. Atheism 7. Judaism
3. Buddhism 8. Sikhism
4. Christianity 9. Other (specify: _______________)
5. Hinduism
G. Sexual Orientation (Please circle)

1. bisexual
2. gay male
3. heterosexual
4. lesbian

H. Social Class (Please circle)

1. lower class
2. lower middle class
3. middle class
4. upper middle class
5. upper class

I. Childhood neighborhood: Please circle the type of neighborhood that you lived in for the majority of your childhood.

1. Rural
2. Suburban
3. Urban
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HSIRB Approval
HSIRB Approval

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Date: July 26, 2007

To: Patrick Munley, Principal Investigator
   Kara Wolff, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number: 07-07-06

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "Understanding the Relationships between Attitudes, Identity and Perceptions among White American Undergraduate Women" has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.
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