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| Empathy Quotient | 1375 family members  (658 with an autism spectrum condition analysis) | Questionnaire Likert- style | Contains a 26 item questionnaire. (This has been reduced from the original 40) There is some support showing that the 15 item can measure three factors. | Appropriate measure for one single dimension of empathy | Has convergent validity (correlates with ‘Reading the Mind in the Eyes’ Test ([Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, Hill, Raste, & Plumb, 2001](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191886911003308#b0030)) and the Toronto [Alexithymia](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191886911003308#200002815) Scale (TAS) ([Lombardo et al., 2009](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191886911003308#b0125)) | Greater than .90  omega (ω) of .779 as calculated by the Revelle and Zinbarg’s Test  Also done the Rasch and Confomrity Factor Analysis (CFA) | 39 | Allison, C., Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S. J., Stone, M. H., & Muncer, S. J. (2011). Psychometric analysis of the Empathy Quotient (EQ). *Personality and Individual Differences*, *51*(7), 829–835. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.07.005> |
| Active Empathic Listening Scale (AELS) | 416 College student volunteers (165 men and 250 women with average age of 20.0) | Survey | In groups of twenty, participants were given a computer-based survey. Asked participants to indicate how frequently perceived 11 statements across a scale. Used to measure if the participant was able to listen and be able to actively participate in conversation. | Containing missing data of less than 5%  Second set of data had Goodness-of-fit index of 0.95 | Has construct and discriminant validity | Correlation with 0.65 alpha using a set that determined that are greater than 0.50 has large affects | 35 | Bodie, G. D. (2011). The Active-Empathic Listening Scale (AELS): Conceptualization and evidence of validity within the interpersonal domain. *Communication Quarterly*. 59(3), 277-295. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2011.583495> |
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| Perceived Empathy Self-Efficacy Scale (PESE) & Perceived Social Self-Efficacy Scale (PSSE)  ( measured together because the data was collected on basis on how these two instruments are able to work together in order to reach a comprehensive diagnosis) | 323 young adults aged 20 to 24 years from various geographic areas of Italy (73% female) | Questionnaire/Survey in Likert-style | Participants rated the frequency in which experienced empathy on four items from the Prosocialtiy Scale. Correlating personal self-esteem with the expression of empathy.  Based on 12 items | Different variables can be influencing the agreeableness on prosociality to determine the low correlation between PESE and PSSE in comparison  Needs to gain greater generalizability across populations | Supported construct and incremental validity  Correlation between PESE and PSSE was lower than the correlations between PESE and empathy  (r-0.64, p< 0.01) | High correlation of the four empathy related items and empathetic concern with | 23 | Di Giunta, L., Eisenberg, N., Kupfer, A., Steca, P., Tramontano, C., & Caprara, G. V. (2010). Assessing perceived empathic and social self-efficacy across countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *26*(2), 77–86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000012> |
| Empathy Assessment Index (EAI) | 312 undergraduate and graduate students for first administration of index then 232 of the 312 students responded to the second retest of the index | Self-reported questionnaire/survey format | To analyze the three-component empathy framework of: affective response (AR), perspective taking (PT), self-awareness (SA), emotion regulation (ER), and empathic attitudes (EA). Measured by the five-point Likert-type scale. 54 items | Concerns raised when measuring the multiple dimensions of empathy especially in regards to SA (self-awareness) and ER (emotional regulation) items in the context of empathy | Yes  Has concurrent validity but needs more support for construct validity | Yes  Has internal consistency but the SA subscale of (0.299) does not approach acceptable levels of reliability due to lack of content validity | 34 | Gerdes, K. E., Lietz, C. A., & Segal, E. A. (2011). Measuring empathy in the 21st century: Development of an empathy index rooted in social cognitive neuroscience and social justice. *Social Work Research*, 83–94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/swr/35.2.83> |
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| Cambridge Quality Checklist | 60 studies with Disrupted families | Checklist | Using the Cambridge quality checklist to the relationship with disrupted families to see how the rates of empathy are affected. 5 items based (but can be expanded to be more comprehensive with eight items) | Adequate but information allowed in order to prevent from offending caused missing information with differential attrition | Yes  With a p <0.001 | Yes  Inter-rater reliability since studies were randomly selected and independent of each other with a large sample size | 36 | Jolliffe, D., Murray, J., Farrington, D., & Vannick, C. (2012). Testing the Cambridge Quality Checklists on a review of disrupted families and crime. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, *22*(5), 303–314. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cbm.1837> |
| Quiet Ego Scale | 303 psychology students in Midwestern United States (54% females and 35% males, 11% did not report; ranging from 18 to 52 years old) | Questionnaire/Survey in scale format | Given a range in order to determine the different characteristics of “quiet ego”. These characteristics were awareness, inclusive identity, perspective taking, and growth. 14 items. | Determined that is possible to empirically demonstrate quiet ego which is the highest loading factor to lead to compassion/empathy | Yes  With content validity | Adequate reliability with the standardized coefficient alpha as 0.78 | 36 | Wayment, H. A., Bauer, J. J., & Sylaska, K. (2014). The Quiet Ego Scale: Measuring the compassionate self-identity. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16(4), 999-1033. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10902-014-9546-z> |