

Altruism and Empathy in America:  
Trends and Correlates

Tom W. Smith

National Opinion Research Center/  
University of Chicago

For February 9, 2006 release

## Introduction

Throughout the arts and sciences from philosophy to neuroscience altruistic behaviors and values have been widely studied. Just within the social sciences there have been very diverse research traditions within economics, psychology, political science, sociology, and related disciplines (Batson, 1991; Batson, 1998; Eisenberg, 1986; Kangas, 1997; Penner, 1995; Piliavin and Charng, 1990; Rose-Ackerman, 1996; Sawyer, 1966; Staub, et al., 1984; Underwood, 2002; Wispe, 1978; Wrightsman, 1974). One of the main limitations of social-science research on altruism is that most research has been based on very restricted, small, non-representative samples, mostly of undergraduate students.<sup>1</sup> While work with student, convenience samples can be very useful, especially when experimental designs are utilized, they suffer from serious, external-validity problems and do not tell social scientists and others about the extent of behaviors and values in society-at-large. To expand knowledge about the level, nature, and associates of empathy and altruism in American society, measures of these constructs were placed on a national, full-probability sample of adult Americans.

Four aspects of altruism were examined: altruistic love, altruistic values, altruistic behaviors, and empathy. Altruism is thought of as dealing with both values/preferences and behaviors "motivated mainly out of a consideration for another's needs rather than one's own" (Piliavin and Charng, 1990; p. 30) and that altruism "provides benefits to its recipients but also provides no benefits to the actors and even incurs some costs" (Howard and Piliavin, 2000, p. 114). Empathy was examined in addition to the direct altruism measures because as Batson (1998, p. 300) has noted, "the most frequently proposed source of altruistic motivation has been an other-oriented emotional response congruent with the perceived welfare of another person -- today usually called empathy."

This report first discusses the items that are used to measure empathy, altruistic love, altruistic values, and altruistic behaviors. Second, it describes the five scales that are constructed from the items. Third, it examines trends in empathy and altruism from 2002 to 2004. Third, it analyzes the bivariate associations between these scales and other measures. Specifically it a) considers two validating measures, b) looks at how empathy and altruism vary across socio-demographic groups, and c) tests various hypotheses about how empathy and altruism are related to other measures. The principal hypotheses examined are that empathy and altruism will be greater among:

- 1) those who are socially and civically engaged.
- 2) those who see interpersonal, social obligations between people.
- 3) the religious rather than the non-religious and that among the religious empathy and altruism will rise with level of involvement.

---

<sup>1</sup>Some prosocial behaviors, such as giving and volunteering to organized groups, have been examined in large-scale, national studies such as the Giving and Volunteering Surveys by Independent Sector and on the 1996 General Social Survey. But most research on empathy and altruism has been restricted to small samples of students. For example, in the bibliography by Post and others (2002), 43 studies were exclusively based on students, 3 on students plus some others, 8 on people in various types of voluntary associations, 3 on twins, 3 on other convenience samples, and two on state-wide probability samples. Their sample sizes were less than 100 (21), 100-199 (19), 200-499 (13), and 500+ (9).

- 4) those with higher psychological and physical well-being.
- 5) those who are not misanthropic.
- 6) those less fearful of crime and victimization and with a less punitive attitude towards crime and criminals.
- 7) those supporting more spending for social-welfare programs and the expansion of government policies to assist disadvantaged groups.

Finally, a series of multivariate models are tested to see how the socio-demographics and other variables work controlling for the others.

## **Data**

The empathy and altruism items were administered on random halves of the 2002 and 2004 General Social Surveys (GSSs). The GSSs are in-person, full-probability samples of adults living in households in the United States. The 2002 GSS had a response rate of 70.1% and 1366 completed cases and the 2004 GSS had a response rate of 70.4% and 1329 completed cases. For a full description and methodology of the 2002 and 2004 GSSs see Davis, Smith, and Marsden, 2005.

The GSS is supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation. The altruism and empathy module was supported by the Fetzer Institute in 2002 and the expanded module in 2004 was funded by the Institute for Research on Unlimited Love.

## **Levels of Empathy and Altruism**

### Empathy

Empathy is measured by the seven-item Davis Empathy Scale (Davis, 1994). As Table 1 shows, a solid majority of Americans indicates that the empathic response to each item describes themselves: 81% say they feel protective of someone being taken advantage of, 76% describe themselves as "a pretty soft-hearted person," 74% are often touched by things that happen, and 74% often have tender, concerned feelings for the less fortunate. In addition, 75% say not feeling pity for the unfairly treated does not describe them, 62% that not being disturbed by the misfortunes of others is not typical, and 58% indicate that not feeling sorry for people having problems does not describe them. Full item wordings are given in Appendix A: 1.

The Davis Empathy Scale has seven items with values running from 7 (for someone giving the least empathic response to all items) to 35 (for the most empathic). The mean for the total population is 28.0 and the sample size is 2635. The inter-item correlations average .296 and Cronbach's reliability coefficient is .75.<sup>2</sup>

### Altruistic Love

Four items measure inter-personal, altruistic love or agape (Appendix A: 2). Agape is one of six types of love measured by the Love Attitudes Scale (Butler et al., 1995; Davies, 2001; Hendrick and Hendrick, 1986, 1987, 1991; Montgomery and Sorell, 1997; Murthy, Rotzien, and Vacha-Haase, 1996; Sorokin, 1950; Taraban and Hendrick, 1995; Yancey and Eastman, 1995). Based on analysis

---

<sup>2</sup>Items a, c, f, and g were reversed coded to give the empathic responses the high scores.

of past studies (Butler et al., 1995; Hendrick and Hendrick, 1986; Montgomery and Sorell, 1997; Yancey and Eastman, 1995) and a GSS pretest, four of seven original items were selected. As Table 3 shows, altruistic love is widely endorsed. 90% agree that they would suffer themselves rather than let their loved one suffer, 81% agree that they usually put their loved one's wishes above their own, 79% agree that they would "endure all things for the sake of the one I love," and 72% agree they cannot be happy unless they place their loved one's happiness first. The agape scale runs from 4 for someone who strongly disagreed with each statement (the lowest on altruistic love) to 20 for someone who strongly agreed with each (the highest on altruistic love). The mean for the total population is 16.6 and the sample size is 1316 (having been asked only in 2004). The inter-item correlations average .52 and Cronbach's reliability coefficient is .81.

### Altruistic Values

Four items measure altruistic values (Nickell, 1998; Webb, Green, and Brashear, 2000). As Table 2 shows, 90% agreed that people should be willing to help the less fortunate with 2% disagreeing, 77% agreed that assisting those in trouble is personally important and only 5% disagreed, 49% disagreed that people "need to look after themselves and not overly worry about others" with 29% agreeing, and 23% disagreed that the needy should help themselves rather than depend on others with 51% agreeing with this sentiment. Items wordings are given in Appendix A: 3.

With the items reverse coded as needed, the four-item altruistic values scale runs from 4 (for someone giving the least altruistic response to all items) to 20 (for the most altruistic). The mean for the total population is 14.2 and the sample size is 2660. The inter-item correlations average .24 and Cronbach's reliability coefficient is .55.<sup>3</sup>

### Altruistic Behaviors

There are two altruistic behavior batteries. The first consists of 11 items asked as part of the empathy and altruism study. These items were based on various baseline studies (Amato, 1990; Johnson, et al., 1989; Khanna, et al., 1992; Rushton, Chrisjohn, and Fekker, 1981a; 1981b; Smith, 2000). The second consists of a similar set of four items asked as part of the International Social Survey Program (ISSP) module on social networks. These 15 items are presented together in Table 4. It shows that a majority of Americans performed 10 of the 15 altruistic acts during the last year, that 4 actions were carried out by 42-47%, and only one activity was relatively infrequent with only 17% giving blood. In terms of estimated number of times an activity was done in the last year, talking to a depressed person was the most common of these altruistic behaviors (24 times per annum). This was followed by helping others with housework (16 times), allowing someone to cut ahead in line (12 times), giving directions (11 times), giving money to charity (10 times), volunteering (7 times), helping the homeless (6.5 times), assisting someone find a job (5 times), taking care of things for someone away (4 times), giving up a seat (4 times), lending money (3 times), carrying belongings (4 times), loaning items (3.5 times), returning extra change (2 times), and giving blood (less than 1 time). The item wordings are given in Appendix A: 4.

Two scales were made from these behavioral items. The first scale uses the 11 items that were part of the empathy and altruism study. Values range from 0 (for someone who did none of the altruistic acts during the last 12 months) to

---

<sup>3</sup>Items a and c were reversed coded to give the altruistic responses high values.

825 (for someone who did all acts more than once a week during the last year). The mean for the total population is 64.1 and the sample size is 2623. The inter-item correlations on the original response scale average .126 and Cronbach's reliability coefficient is .61.<sup>4</sup> The second scale consists of the 11 items plus four similar items from the ISSP module. These four items differ from the other 11 items because a) they refer to things done "for people you know personally, such as relatives, friends, neighbors, or other acquaintances" which the former does not and b) in 2002 they were asked only of people doing the ISSP supplement which reduced the sample size as indicated below. Values range from 0 (for someone who did none of the altruistic acts during the last 12 months) to 1125 (for someone who did all acts more than once a week during the last year). The mean for the total population is 114.3 and the sample size is 2418. The inter-item correlations average .127 and Cronbach's reliability coefficient is .68.

### **Trends in Empathy and Altruism**

Several changes occurred on empathy and altruism between 2002 and 2004 (Table 5). Three of the seven empathy items show statistically significant change. People were more like to describe themselves as having tender, concerned feelings towards the less fortunate in 2004 than in 2002 (+ 5.2 percentage points at 4 or 5 on the scale) and as more soft-hearted (+4.0 points), but as less "touched by things that I see" (- 0.9 points). Looking at the empathy scale showed no statistically significant change (27.9 in 2002 and 28.0 in 2004). Two of the four altruistic value measures showed increases. Agreement that people have to take care of themselves and not depend on others dropped by 5.3 points and those saying that "people need to look after themselves and not overly worry about others" fell by 7.0 points. Overall, altruistic values rose from 14.0 to 14.3 (prob.=.002). Likewise, 9 of the 15 altruistic behaviors showed gains (returning change, allowing cutting in, giving up a seat, helping someone away, carrying something, loaning an item, helping with housework, lending money, and taking to someone). However, there were statistically significant increases in the means for only 3 actions (allowing cutting in, carrying something, and returning change). Overall, the 11-item scale showed an increase in the mean number of altruistic behaviors from 58.8 to 69.4 (prob.=.000) and the 15-item scale had gains from 109.3 to 118.6 (prob.=.029). Altruistic love was measured only in 2004 so no trend is available.

### **Inter-Correlations of Empathy, Altruistic Values, and Altruistic Behaviors**

As anticipated, the empathy and altruistic scales are significantly associated to each other (Batson, 1998; Eisenberg, et al., 1989; Morgan, Goddard, and Givens, 1997; Piliavin and Charng, 1990; Post, et al., 2002; Romer, Gruder, and Lizzadro, 1986). Empathy is strongly related to altruistic values ( $r=.458$ , prob.=.000). They are more moderately associated with altruistic behaviors (.126/prob.=.000 with the 11-item scale and .152/.000 and with the 15-item scale). Altruistic values are moderately related to altruistic behaviors: by .142 (.000) for the 11-item scale and .17 (.000) for 15-item scale. Agape has the lowest associations, but is positively related to empathy (.141/.000), altruistic values (.183/.000), and altruistic behaviors (11-items=.083/.003; 15-items=.074/.008).

The somewhat higher inter-scale correlations for the 15-item scale compared to the 11-item scale suggests that on average the longer version has somewhat less measurement error and more reliability.

---

<sup>4</sup>See Table 3 on the coding of these items.

The comparatively modest associations between both empathy and altruistic values and altruistic behaviors reflect both the imperfect connection between values and attitudes on the one hand and behaviors on the other hand that prevails in general and the particular difficulties in reliably measuring altruistic behaviors. First, for the many of the 15 activities doing the behavior depends on the specific opportunity to act occurring (e.g. being asked for directions, getting extra change, being asked to help when someone is away) or knowing someone who needs the help needed (e.g. finding a job, depressed, needing a loan). One has to have an opportunity for doing these good deeds before one can act altruistically and it is likely that exposure to such opportunities is largely unrelated to a person's likelihood to assist, so this is essentially a random factor that would attenuate associations with other variables (e.g. empathy and altruistic values). Second, many of the incidents asked about are relatively minor and difficult to recall and report accurately. Both forgetting and misestimating the occurrence of good deeds would also tend to reduce correlations. Third, altruistic acts are dependent to a notable degree on situational and contextual factors (Piliavin and Charng, 1990; Romer, Gruder, and Lizzadro, 1986). For example, the presence or absence of others, time pressures, and framing will all influence whether a particular individual will or will not engage in an altruistic behavior.

The even more modest associations of agape with both the attitudinal and behavioral measures probably indicates that one's altruistic attachment towards a loved one has only limited association to more generalized empathy and altruism which either involve people in general or often strangers. The low association with behaviors reflects the factors delineated in the previous paragraph.

### **Distribution of Empathy and Altruism**

Overall the five empathy and altruism scales were associated with 54 other variables. Of a total of 259 comparisons 154 or 59.5% were statistically significant (Table 6). The number of statistically significant associations were similar for the empathy (related to 35 variables), altruistic values (40), and the 15-item altruistic behaviors scale (36), but the altruistic love and 11-item behavioral scales were related to fewer variables (respectively 21 and 22).

First, we consider two validation variables that measure cooperation and helpfulness independent of self-reports (Table 6A). The first is interviewer's ratings of how helpful and cooperative respondents were. We would expect the cooperative to be more empathic and altruistic. The analysis shows that for four variables empathy and altruism rose with rated level of cooperation and that in each case the association was largely linear.<sup>5</sup> Altruistic love was not significantly associated with cooperation, but showed a similar, monotonic relationship. The second validation variable is whether respondents reported their household income to interviewers. Altruistic behavior was associated with

---

<sup>5</sup>The statistical analysis first tested for whether there is statistically significant variation in empathy and altruism across the categories of the other variables. If not, no model is listed. If significant and the other variable is nominal, then the model is not constant (NC). If significant and the other variable is ordinal or interval, then the possible models are: linear (L) - no significant variation from the best linear fit; significant linear component (SLC) - linear fit is significant, but also significant variation from the best linear fit; and not constant, not linear (NCNL) - linear fit is not significant and deviation from best linear fit is significant.

reporting income (but significant only for the 15-item scale), but the attitudinal measures showed no association.

Second, we look at the demographic profile of empathy and altruism (Table 6B):

The literature is very inconsistent on gender's relationship to empathy (Chou, 1998; Giesbrecht, 1998; Gilligan and Attanucci, 1998; Piliavin and Charng, 1990; Davis, 1994; Post, et al., 2002) and altruism (Amato, 1990; Batson, 1998; Howard and Piliavin, 2000; Johnson, et al., 1989; Khanna, et al., 1992; Penner et al., 2005). Batson's (1998, p. 289) summary of research is that "sometimes men help more than women, sometimes women help more than men, and sometimes the sex of the helper makes no difference." Similarly, Howard and Piliavin (2000, p. 117) observe that in regards to men and women "who helps depends heavily on the nature of the help required." Here gender is strongly associated with empathy and altruistic values with women besting men on both. Likewise, the 15-item altruistic behaviors scale showed more helping by women, but there was no difference on the 11-item scale. Altruistic love showed the counter results of men outscoring women.

Few studies have examined age since most research involves students with little variation in age. Some research suggests that altruism may be greater among the middle-aged and less for the young and old (Penner et al., 2005; Rushton, et al., 1989). There are some signs of such a relationship here. Empathy rises with age, but perhaps falls among those 65+. A similar pattern exists for altruistic values. Altruistic love however shows no drop-off among the elderly and basically increases across age groups. Both altruistic behavior scales show that helping declines with age. The decline among the elderly probably reflects less exposure to requests for assistance because of both less social interaction and because more are physically less able to render the needed help (e.g. giving blood, carrying articles, offering a seat).

Stratification variables in general and education in particular have not been extensively examined in the main empathy and altruism literature, but other research indicates that the better educated are more supportive of social-welfare policies and more likely to be volunteers (Berkowitz and Lutterman, 1968; Penner et al., 2005; Webb, 2000). Here the association are mixed and generally weak. Empathy does not relate to the stratification variables. Altruistic values increase with education and income, but the income relationship is statistically significant only because of the lower altruism of those refusing to give their income. Altruistic love does not vary by income, but is higher among the less educated (the reserve pattern to altruistic values). The 11-item behavioral measure is unrelated to education or income and the 15-item scale is not associated with education, but helping is higher among those with lower incomes.

Marital status has rarely been considered as a predictor variable. Here empathy and altruistic values are greater among the married and widowed (in the later case because there are more widows than widowers) and lowest among the separated and never married. Altruistic behaviors are not consistently related, but the scores on the 15-item scale are highest among the never married and lowest among the married and widowed.

Research on helping, neighborliness, and inter-personal relations finds these to be stronger in less densely-populated area (Howard and Piliavin,

2000). Here empathy, altruistic love, and altruistic values are greater in the more rural areas, but altruistic behavior tends to be greater in the largest central cities and least in the most rural areas, counter to both the prior research and the empathy and attitudinal measures. The higher level of assistance in large cities may largely reflect greater opportunities to render assistance as one is likely to come into contact with more people and certain situations may be more common in urban areas (e.g. being approached by a homeless person, encountering strangers with various needs).

Regional differences appear, but they are somewhat scattered and mostly modest in size. The South Atlantic tends to lead overall being first on altruistic love and the 11-item altruistic behavior scale, second on empathy and the 15-item altruistic behavior scale, and tied for second on altruistic values. No region consistently anchors the opposite end.

Ethnicity and race have been little examined in the empathy and altruism literature although some cross-cultural differences have been found (Johnson, et al., 1989).<sup>6</sup> Here Hispanic ethnicity is unrelated to empathy or altruism except for non-Hispanics having marginally higher altruistic values and race is only related to altruistic love being higher for Whites and altruistic behaviors being higher for Blacks on both scales.

Labor-force status has not been examined by most empathy and altruism research. In this study empathy is highest among homemakers (because they are overwhelmingly female), lowest among students and then the unemployed. The lower empathy among the unemployed may reflect the negative impact of hardships on people's world views, but there are too few unemployed respondents to seriously examine this hypothesis. Similarly, altruistic values are highest among the others (mostly disabled people) and homemakers and lowest among students and the unemployed. Altruistic love was highest among the others (disabled) and retired (both older groups) and then among homemakers. The higher level among homemakers was surprising given that almost all homemakers are women and women have lower scores than men do. Looking at labor-force differences by gender showed that among men altruistic love did not vary by labor-force status, but among women those in the labor force had lower scores than homemakers or the retired (full time=15.8; part time=15.5; homemaker=17.0; retired=17.2). This suggests that women in traditional roles have higher expressions of altruistic love than women in more modern roles. Altruistic behaviors do not vary on the 11-item scale, but are highest among students, part-time workers, and the unemployed and lowest among the retired (due to their greater age) on the 15-item scale.

Family of origin may be related to empathy (Piliavin and Charng, 1990). As Table 7 shows, empathy is highest for those raised in two-parent families, almost as high for those raised by females only, and lowest for those raised by males. This pattern holds overall and for being raised by one's own parents, parents and step-parents, and other relatives. Consistent with the large gender differences discussed above, these results suggest that mothers and other female guardians are more likely to engender empathy in their off-spring and charges than father/male care givers are. Moreover, if one looks at the child's gender (i.e. the gender of

---

<sup>6</sup>Race of helper and helped interactions have been examined (Batson, 1998).



respondents in the GSS), it appears that empathy is lowered more for females than for males when a mother/mother substitute is missing (Table 7B). This suggests that the development of empathy is reduced more for females than for males when a maternal model is absent. However, even when raised by fathers/father substitutes, females still have more empathy than males do.

Third, we consider the hypothesis that social and civic engagement will be associated with empathy and altruism (Bolle, 1991) (Table 6C). Regarding social engagement, empathy, altruistic love, and altruistic values have little relationship. For altruistic behaviors, helping generally declines as the level of socializing decreases. Going to bars on the other hand is unrelated to altruistic behaviors while empathy, altruistic love, and altruistic values tend to be highest among those rarely going to bars. Having more friends is associated with more empathy, altruistic values, and altruistic behaviors. Altruistic love could not be compared to number of friends.

On civic engagement, empathy and altruistic values are greater among people who voted, but altruistic love and altruistic behaviors are unrelated. Empathy and altruism are higher among those active in voluntary associations on all four, relevant scales (altruistic love could not be compared).

Fourth, we thought that empathy and altruism would be higher among those seeing obligations between various socially-related groups (Table 6D). Empathy proved to have a more complex relationship. The two items on the duty of children to their parents showed inconsistent patterns, no association for one and a curvilinear association for the other. Empathy was unrelated to a general measure about putting self and family first. It was higher among those reporting that friends and family often made demands on them and those feeling that the better-off should help their friends. Altruistic values are somewhat stronger among those believing children have a duty to elderly parents, but the association is not strong. It is also higher among those who disagree that one should help their family and selves first. Altruistic values are also greater among those believing that the better-off should help their friends. Altruistic behaviors are somewhat more frequent among those saying elderly parents should live with their children, but is unrelated to the other parental variable. They are also unrelated to the self/family first variable. The 11-item measure is unrelated to demands on people from family and friends and on friends helping friends, but the 15-item measure, which includes items referring to family and friends, is higher among those getting demands from other and among those favoring friends helping friends. Altruistic love could not be meaningfully related to this dimension.

Fifth, we tested the idea that empathy and altruism would be greater among the religious (Amato, 1990; Dillon, 2002; Morgan, Goddard, and Givens, 1997; Penner et al., 2005; Post, et al., 2002; Smith, Fabricatore, and Peyrot, 1999) (Table 6E). First, we looked at whether these constructs vary by the religious tradition in which one was raised or which one currently practices. Most of the variation across religious groups was due to the lower empathy and altruistic values of those with no religion. Secondarily, Protestants tend to outscore Catholics and other religious adherents. Altruistic behaviors however do not meaningfully vary by major religious groups. On empathy, altruistic love, altruistic values, and the 15-item altruistic behavior scale, fundamentalists showed higher scores than moderates and liberals did both with the non-religious included and excluded from the analysis.

Next, we looked at religiosity. In terms of all three indicators (self-rated strength of religious attachment, frequency of attending church, frequency of praying), more religious involvement was associated with greater empathy and more altruism on all five scales. The relationships were strong and linear or nearly linear.

The strong and consistent relationship of praying with empathy and altruism

compared to the much more modest associations with religious adherence or religious attendance suggests that a person's personal spiritual engagement rather than participation in organized religion may be of greater importance. On the 2004 GSS the Daily Spiritual Experience (DSE) scale was asked (Underwood, 1999). The 15-items ask about how often one has these spiritual experiences.<sup>7</sup> The total, 15-item scale correlates significantly with all of the empathy and altruism measures (empathy=.245/.000; altruistic love=.171/.000; altruistic values=.249/.000; 11 behaviors=.183/.000; 15 behaviors=.219/.000). If the DSE scale is divided into thirds and each empathy and altruism scale is broken down by DSE, strong and mostly linear associations are revealed (Table 8).

Moreover, when one looks at only the 10-items that are explicitly religious (with seven mentioning God and three mentioning spirituality or spirituality and religion) vs. the five items less explicitly religious (items b, f, l, m, and n), the religion DSE sub-scale correlates as high as or higher than the whole scale does (e.g. .241/.000 with altruistic love and .245/.000 with empathy). The not-explicitly religious items have notably lower associations (e.g. .110/.000 with altruistic love and .076/.000 with empathy). This occurs despite the fact that they still have a strong implicit spiritual component (e.g. references to "inner peace or harmony" and being "thankful for my blessings") and two items have strong empathic/altruistic elements ("accept others even when they do things I think are wrong" and "selfless caring for others"). Thus, it especially seems to be the explicitly religious and/or God-centric elements that establish the connection to empathy and altruism. Coupled with the association of praying with empathy and altruism this indicates that one's personal religious feelings and daily practice play important roles in promoting empathy and altruism.

Sixth, we examined whether better health and psychological-well being were associated with more empathy and altruism (Table 6F). The relationship of these measures to empathy and altruism was mixed. Empathy was only irregularly related to job satisfaction. Altruistic love was associated with greater happiness in general and especially with more marital happiness. Altruistic values are modestly associated with more excitement and more overall happiness. More

---

<sup>7</sup>Wording: The list that follows includes items you may or may not experience. Please consider if and how often you have these experiences and try to disregard whether you feel you should or should not have them. A number of items use the word "God." If this word is not a comfortable one, please substitute another idea to mean the divine or holy for you.

Many times a day/Every day/Most days/Some days/Once in a while/Never or almost never

a. I feel God's presence. b. I experience a connection to all of life. c. During worship or at other times when connected to God I feel joy which lifts me out of my daily concerns. d. I find strength in by religion or spirituality. e. I find comfort in my religion or spirituality. f. I feel inner peace or harmony. g. I ask God's help in the midst of daily activities. h. I feel guided by God in the midst of daily activities. i. I feel God's love for me, directly. j. I feel God's love for me, through others. k. I am spiritually touched by the beauty of creation. l. I feel thankful for my blessings. m. I feel a selfless caring for others. n. I accept others even when they do things I think are wrong. o. I desire to be closer to God or in union with Him.

altruistic behaviors were done by those who are happier and living more exciting lives.

Seventh, we tested the hypothesis that the misanthropic would be less empathic and altruistic (Table 6G). The misanthropy measures showed rather weak and scattered relationships, but where statistically significant associations emerged, they were in the hypothesized direction. Empathy and altruistic love are not meaningfully related to misanthropy, but altruistic values are higher among those with low misanthropy. The measures of altruistic behaviors are not consistently related to the misanthropy items.

Eighth, we considered whether concern about crime or punitive attitudes towards crime and criminals would be related to lower empathy and altruism (Table 6H). We found that counter to expectations that empathy was higher among those fearful of crime. The two measures of punitive attitudes showed opposite results with empathy higher for those wanting tougher courts, but also among those opposed to capital punishment. This may be partly related to the fact that women are both more fearful and less punitive than men are and more empathic than men are. Altruistic love was also higher among those thinking courts are too lenient, but was greater among the fearless than the fearful. Altruistic values are higher among those fearful of crime (counter to expectations), unrelated to whether courts should be tougher or the police should hit people, and higher among those opposed to the death penalty (as expected). Altruistic behaviors are unrelated to fear of crime or capital punishment, but more frequent among those who find courts too harsh.

Finally, we examined the hypothesis that those who were empathic and altruistic would also be liberal on social-welfare policies (Table 6I). In general these expectations were supported. Empathy was higher among those backing more government spending for health care, Blacks, children, social security, and welfare/the poor. It was also higher among those for more government efforts to help the elderly, the poor, the sick, and Blacks, for reducing inequality in wealth, and for more government action in general. It was not related to expanding government aid to children. Altruistic values were higher among those for more social-welfare spending, more government assistance to the old, the poor, the sick, and Blacks, equalizing wealth, and more government action in general. It was not related to more assistance for children. Altruistic love was not related to any of these social-welfare measures. The 11-item scale was unrelated to support for most of these social-welfare programs and the two relationships that did appear were irregular. The 15-item scores were higher among those favoring more social-welfare spending, wanting the government to assist children, Blacks, and the poor more, backing more government action in general, and supporting the equalization of wealth, but most of these associations were not linear

Looking at the results that are statistically significant, consistent across the empathy and altruistic scales, and generally consistent across measures within each of the domains, we find the following main patterns. Empathy is greater among women than men and for the widowed and homemakers because of the gender of these groups. It is higher among the connected - those with more friends and those belonging to more voluntary associations. It is higher those who see more obligations between groups of people and among those who get more demands from others. It is greater among the religious than the non-religious and greater among those actively engaged in their religion (by self-assessment and frequency of prayer and church attendance). Counter to expectations empathy is higher among those who think courts are too easy and who are afraid of crime, but as expected it is greater among those opposed to the death penalty. Empathy is higher among those for increased social-welfare spending and for expanded governmental programs for the disadvantaged.

Altruistic love is greater among groups that tend to be mainstream and traditional (the married vs. the never married, older adults, Whites, residents

of the South Atlantic states). The traditionalist connection is also evident by the higher scores that women who are homemakers have vs. women who are working outside the home. It is also higher for men than women. This may be because there is an element of heroic stoicism and being a protector rather than passive, self-sacrifice in this construct. It is higher among the religious than the non-religious, among those following evangelical Protestantism rather than other religious traditions, and among those actively engaged in religion as measured by self-evaluation, attending church, praying, and daily spiritual experiences. Agape is greater among those who are happy and especially among those in happy marriages. In differences that may reflect the gender difference and traditionalist tendencies noted above, agape is greater among those thinking courts are too easy and who are not fearful of crime.

Altruistic values are related to many of the same factors as empathy is. Values are higher among women, the widowed, the better educated, and those living outside central cities. The more connected (those with friends and members of groups) have more altruistic values as do those seeing obligations across social groups (but more weakly than for empathy). The religious and the religiously involved have more altruistic values. Those scoring low on misanthropy also are more altruistic. As with empathy, altruistic values are higher among those fearful of crime (counter to expectations) and among those against the death penalty (as expected). Those with liberal position on social-welfare spending and programs also have more altruistic values.

Altruistic behaviors show relatively few notable relationships. Altruistic acts occur more frequently among the never married than among the married or widowed (counter to the pattern on empathy and altruistic values) and among Blacks (race is unrelated on empathy and altruistic values). As with the other constructs, altruistic behaviors are related to having more friends and belonging to more groups (and also with socializing more often). Helping is also more frequent among the religious and the religiously involved.

### **Multivariate Models of Empathy and Altruism**

Table 9 presents a series of multi-variate models corresponding to the group of variables discussed above. First, Table 9A shows the basic demographic model. Second, Tables 9b-9h add variables to the basic model for the groups of variables in Table 4.<sup>8</sup>

For the empathy scale only one demographic variable consistently mattered, women have more empathy than men do. Gender is also by far the strongest demographic predictor. In the demographics-only model and two of the demographics + models, empathy moderately increases with age. Likewise, in three models empathy moderately rises with income. The only other demographic to show up in at least two models is size-of-place with empathy being somewhat higher in more rural areas. In the various demography + models, empathy was also greater among those rated as more cooperative by interviewers, those belonging to voluntary associations, those thinking that one should help friends, those praying more frequently, the less misanthropic, those opposed to the death penalty, but those

---

<sup>8</sup>One group, psychological well-being, was omitted because the bivariate analysis indicated that this dimension was unpromising. Not all individual variables used in Table 4 are employed in Table 9. Because some GSS items appear on different, random sub-samples, it is not possible to simultaneously use all variables. Analysis of the bivariate results and preliminary multi-variate analyses were conducted to identify the best variables to use in the multi-variate models.

for tougher courts, and those for more social-welfare spending. With the exception of the positive association between supporting tougher courts and being more empathic, these all follow expected directions.

Expressions of altruistic love are greater among men, the less educated, those who are not divorced/separated or never married, rural residents, and non-Blacks. The absence of a difference between the currently married and the widowed indicates that it is not the mere lack of a spouse that depresses altruistic love sentiments among the divorced/separated and never married. Being a homemaker shows up as related to more altruistic love in two models. Given the extreme gender skew for this variable, gender-specific models would probably better capture this relationship. In the demographic + models greater altruistic love is expressed by those rated as cooperative, those who pray more and are more religious, the more misanthropic, those for tougher courts, and those for more social spending. The associations with misanthropy and courts were counter to expectations.

Given the strong association with marital status and the bivariate association with marital happiness discussed above, a model (not shown in Table 9) was tested with agape as a predictor variable and marital happiness as the dependent variable. It showed that with controls for the same demographics utilized in Table 9, that altruistic love was related with more marital happiness ( $\beta = .155$ ,  $\text{prob.} = .000$ ).

For the values scale, altruism is greater among women for all models. The basic demographic model and most other models also show more altruism among older adults and the college educated. The basic demographic model and some of the other models also show more altruism among the ever married and rural residents. Almost all of the non-demographic correlates of empathy are also related to altruistic values: being rated as cooperative by interviewers, belonging to groups, agreeing that one should help friends, praying, attending church, being less misanthropic, opposing the death penalty, and favoring social-welfare spending.<sup>9</sup>

Models differ for the two altruistic-behaviors scales. For the shorter scale nothing was a consistently statistically significant predictor across models. Being Black was associated with more helping in four models, more education in two models, men were more helpful than women in the religion model, and rural residents were less helpful in the engagement model. Helping was also greater among the cooperative, those belonging to groups, those opposed to the death penalty, more frequent church attenders, more frequent prayers, and those disagreeing that one has a duty to assist ones parents. The last is counter to expectations.

The fuller 15-item helping scale that added items referring to assisting relatives, friends, and others close to you, is also not consistently related to any demographics. In four models helping is greater among younger adults, the never married, and being Black. In the basic demographic and engagement models help is greater in larger cities. In the engagement model alone more helping is associated with less education. Among non-demographics helping is also more frequent among the cooperative, those with more friends, those belonging to more groups, those who believe one should help friends, those who receive heavy demands from others, the more misanthropic (counter to expectations), those

---

<sup>9</sup>All of these are treated as independent predictors of empathy and altruism, but in some cases the causal order is unclear. For example, it probably makes more sense to say that empathy predicts social spending than the other way around. However, to facilitate comparisons across models, we have consistently made empathy and altruism the dependent variables in the models in Table 9

opposed to capital punishment, and those those who pray more.

Looking across the empathy, altruistic love, altruistic values, and altruistic behaviors shows the following patterns.

Women are more empathic than men are and have higher altruistic values, but men are more likely to express altruistic-love sentiments. Gender is not notably related to altruistic behaviors.

Age is largely unrelated to empathy, but older adults tend to have more altruistic love and altruistic values. On the longer altruistic-behaviors scale the young show more acts of helping, at least in some models, but age is unrelated to the shorter scale.

Income is unrelated to empathy and altruism.

Marital status has little relationship to empathy, but altruistic love is higher among the married than among the divorce/separated or never married and altruistic values greater among the married than the never married. The never married are more likely to engage in altruistic acts on the longer scale, but marital status does not differentiate on the shorter scale.

Living in a more rural areas is weakly related with more empathy, modestly associated with more altruistic values, and most consistently related to more sentiments of altruistic love. But altruistic behavior on a few models is associated with living in more urban areas.

Race is largely unrelated to empathy or altruistic values, but Blacks are less likely to endorse altruistic love. On both the short and long altruistic-behaviors scales Blacks report more helping in several models.

Labor-force status is essentially unrelated to empathy or altruism.

Empathy and altruism are generally greater among people rated as cooperative respondents, among those belonging to groups, those agreeing that one should help friends, those actively involved in religion (especially frequent prayers), and those opposed to the death penalty.

Other non-demographic variables are related to some, but not all or almost all, scales. Empathy, altruistic love, and altruistic values are higher among those favoring more governmental social spending, but altruistic behavior is unrelated to attitudes on governmental social spending. Attitudes about obligations towards parents is related to the shorter behavior scale in one model only. The more misanthropic have lower empathy and altruistic values, but greater altruistic love and on the 15-item scale, more altruistic behaviors.

### **Conclusion**

The 2002 and 2004 GSSs provide basic data on the prevalence and structure of empathy and altruism in contemporary American society. They indicate that empathic feelings, altruistic-love sentiments, altruistic values, and helping behaviors are all common. Moreover, over this two year span there was an increase in altruistic values and behaviors.

Empathy is closely related to altruistic values, but both empathy and altruistic values are only moderately, positively associated with altruistic behaviors. Moreover, they are better predictors of helping behaviors involving those close to the helper rather than more "random acts of assistance" directed mostly towards those without ties to the helper. Altruistic love is less related to the other constructs primarily because of its personal rather than general reference.

Among demographics gender has the main impact on empathy. Moreover, gender plays an important role in socializing empathy in children with those raised without a mother or female care giver tending to be less empathic as adults. Empathy also tends to be greater among older adults, the well-to-do, and, to a lesser extent among rural residents. Among non-demographics empathy was also greater among those rated as more cooperative by interviewers, those belonging to voluntary associations, those thinking that one should help friends, those

praying more frequently, those with more frequent daily spiritual experiences, the less misanthropic, those opposed to the death penalty, but those for tougher courts (counter to expectations), and those for more social-welfare spending.

Expressions of altruistic love are greater among men, the less educated, those who are not divorced/separated or never married, rural residents, and non-Blacks. Many of these group are more traditionalist and the association with homemakers also supports such a characterization, but the lack of any relationship to age questions this interpretation. The gender difference may reflect an element of protective stoicism that is more prevalent among men and this construct should be examined more closely. The fact that the divorced/separated score lower while the widowed do not indicates that it is not only the absence of a spouse that is associated with fewer expressions of altruistic love. The connection between altruistic-love sentiments and greater marital happiness also establishes another important linkage between marriage and altruistic-love sentiments. Among non-demographics greater altruistic love is expressed by those rated as cooperative, those who pray more and are more religious, those with very happy marriages, the more misanthropic, those for tougher courts, and those for more social spending. The associations with misanthropy and courts were counter to expectations.

Altruistic values are greater among women, older adults, and the college educated. To a lesser extent altruistic values are higher among the ever married and rural residents. Almost all of the non-demographic correlates of empathy are also related to altruistic values: being rated as cooperative by interviewers, belonging to groups, agreeing that one should help friends, praying, attending church, being less misanthropic, opposing the death penalty, and favoring social-welfare spending.

The correlates of altruistic-behaviors depend in good measure on which scale is being used. In general, the 11-item scale shows fewer associations compared to the 15-item scale. For the shorter scale nothing was a consistently statistically significant predictor across models. Both showed that Blacks tended to help more and the 15-item scale showed more helping among the young. Other demographic associations were scattered. Among non-demographics helping was also greater among the cooperative, those belonging to groups and/or having friends, more frequent church attenders and/or more frequent prayers, those with greater misanthropy (counter to expectations), and those opposed to the death penalty.

Overall, empathy and altruism are common values and behaviors in contemporary society. Among their most important and consistent predictors are gender, religious engagement (especially praying and daily spiritual experiences), contact with other people and groups, and interpersonal and social obligations. Likewise, they are tied to and probably causes of such other important facets of society as marital happiness and support for social-welfare policies.

Table 1

## Empathy and Related Values

A. Davis Empathy Scale	Doesn't Describe Well				Describes Well
	1	2	3	4	5
a. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.	4.1	4.5	17.6	28.4	45.4
b. Sometimes I don't feel very sorry for other people when they are had- in problems.	34.1	23.4	24.5	11.5	6.4
c. When I see someone being taken adman- tags of, I feel kind of protective toward them.	3.3	3.9	11.4	34.2	47.1
d. Other people's mis- fortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal.	35.3	26.3	22.2	10.0	6.2
e. When I see someone treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them.	46.6	28.1	13.4	6.5	5.4
f. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.	3.0	4.6	18.0	28.5	45.8
g. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person.	2.9	5.2	16.6	27.8	47.5

Source: 2002/2004 GSSs; N=2,654-2,669

full wordings in Appendix A.



Table 2

## Altruistic Values

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. People should be willing to help others who are less fortunate.	43.4	46.3	8.7	0.9	0.8
b. Those in need have to learn to take care of themselves and not depend on others.	10.5	40.3	26.0	19.4	3.9
c. Personally assisting people in trouble is very important to me.	25.0	51.5	18.7	4.1	0.7
d. These days people need to look after themselves and not overly worry about others.	5.6	23.1	22.8	39.9	8.6

N=2,669-2,676

full wordings in Appendix A.



Table 3

## Altruistic Love

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. I would rather suffer myself than let the one I love suffer.	63.4%	26.4	6.9	2.6	0.7
b. I cannot be happy unless I place the one I love's happiness before my own.	34.8%	37.4	14.9	9.2	3.7
c. I am usually willing to sacrifice my own wishes to let the one I love achieve his/hers.	37.8%	43.5	11.7	5.5	1.6
d. I would endure all things for the sake of the one I love.	42.7%	36.5	10.0	7.6	3.1

N=1321-1323

see Appendix A for full wordings.

Table 4

## Altruistic Behaviors per Annum

Behaviors	Mean Number of Times <sup>a</sup>	% Doing 1 + Times
Talked to Depressed Person	24.0	93.6
Helped Others with Housework	16.1	79.0
Allowed Someone to Cut Ahead	12.3	88.2
Gave Directions	10.8	88.8
Gave Money to Charity	10.0	79.0
Volunteered for Charity	6.9	46.9
Give to Homeless	6.5	64.5
Helped Someone Find Job	4.9	61.0
Helped Someone Who Was Away	4.2	58.9
Gave Up Seat	4.0	47.2
Carried Belongings	3.8	46.5
Loaned Item	3.5	41.7
Lent Money	3.2	51.8
Returned Extra Change	2.2	50.7
Gave Blood	0.6	17.3

N=1329-1357 for 11-item battery and 1138-1140 for 4 items, See Appendix A for full wordings

<sup>a</sup>Original categories converted to get estimated mean number of times per year as follow: Not at all=0; Once=1; At least 2 or 3 times=3; Once a month=12; Once a week=52; More than once a week=75

Table 5

## Trends in Empathy, Altruistic Values, and Altruistic Behavioral

## A. Empathy

		Doesn't Describe Well	2	3	4	Describes Well	5	Prob.
		1						
a.	I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.							
	2002	4.8	4.7	19.3	25.9	45.3		
	2004	3.4	4.3	15.9	30.9	45.5		.010
b.	Sometimes I don't feel very sorry for other people when they are had- in problems.							
	2002	36.7	22.0	23.8	11.1	6.4		
	2004	31.4	24.9	25.3	12.0	6.4		.057
c.	When I see someone being taken adman- tags of, I feel kind of protective toward them.							
	2002	4.1	4.1	12.0	33.0	46.8		
	2004	2.5	3.7	10.8	35.6	47.4		.110
d.	Other people's mis- fortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal.							
	2002	35.7	25.6	22.7	10.3	5.8		
	2004	35.0	27.1	21.7	9.6	6.6		.749
e.	When I see someone treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them.							
	2002	45.7	27.6	14.6	6.7	5.4		
	2004	47.5	28.6	12.3	6.3	5.4		.485

Table 5 (continued)

		Doesn't Describe Well			Describes Well		
		1	2	3	4	5	Prob.
f. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.							
	2002	3.6	3.6	17.8	26.7	48.3	
	2004	2.3	5.7	18.3	30.4	43.3	.002
g. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person.							
	2002	3.7	5.0	18.0	24.8	48.5	
	2004	2.1	5.4	15.2	30.9	46.4	.001

Source: 2002/2004 GSSs; N=2,654-2,669

## B. Altruistic Values

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Prob.
a. People should be willing to help others who are less fortunate.							
	2002	42.8	46.3	9.2	1.1	0.7	
	2004	44.0	46.3	8.1	0.7	0.9	.567
b. Those in need have to learn to take care of themselves and not depend on others.							
	2002	12.0	41.4	23.5	19.2	3.9	
	2004	8.9	39.2	28.5	19.6	3.9	.009
c. Personally assist- in people in trouble is very important to me.							
	2002	25.1	49.5	19.9	4.8	0.7	
	2004	24.9	53.5	17.5	3.4	0.7	.108

Table 5 (continued)

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Prob.
d. These days people need to look after themselves and not overly worry about others.	2002	6.6	25.6	21.8	37.2	8.8	
	2004	4.7	20.5	23.9	42.7	8.4	.001

## C. Altruistic Behaviors per Annum

Behaviors	Mean Number of Times <sup>a</sup>		Prob.
	2002	2004	
Talked to Depressed Person	23.9	24.1	.824
Helped Others with Housework	16.6	15.7	.358
Allowed Someone to Cut Ahead	10.9	13.7	.000
Gave Directions	10.6	11.0	.541
Gave Money to Charity	9.5	10.5	.117
Volunteered for Charity	6.4	7.5	.111
Give to Homeless	6.1	6.9	.162
Helped Someone Find Job	4.6	5.2	.233
Helped Someone Who Was Away	4.2	4.3	.782
Gave Up Seat	3.5	4.5	.052
Lent Money	3.2	3.8	.197
Carried Belongings	3.1	4.4	.003
Loaned Item	2.6	3.8	.197
Returned Extra Change	1.7	2.6	.004
Gave Blood	0.6	0.6	.730

N=1329-1357 for 11-item battery and 1138-1140 for 4 items, See Appendix A for full wordings

<sup>a</sup>Original categories converted to get estimated mean number of times per year as follow: Not at all=0; Once=1; At least 2 or 3 times=3; Once a month=12; Once a week=52; More than once a week=75

Table 6

Altruism and Empathy Scales  
by Other Variables

Variables <sup>a</sup>	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
a. Validation					
Interviewer rated Cooperation (COOP)					
Friendly and eager	28.3	16.7	14.3	67.7	119.0
Cooperative not eager	26.6	16.4	13.7	47.5	89.7
Indifferent/ Hostile	25.7	15.6	12.7	46.7	99.9
Prob.	.000	.068	.000	.000	.000
Model <sup>b</sup>	L	---	L	L	SLC
	(2630)	(1314)	(2655)	(2618)	(2414)
Reported Income (INCOME98)					
Gave	27.9	16.6	14.1	65.3	116.0
Refused	28.6	17.0	13.9	55.9	96.6
Prob.	.107	.165	.126	.101	.032
Model	---	---	---	---	L
	(2499)	(1247)	(2522)	(2490)	(2300)
b. Demographics					
Gender (SEX)					
Men	26.6	17.0	13.6	65.8	109.4
Women	29.2	16.2	14.6	62.4	119.2
Prob.	.000	.000	.000	.223	.021
Model	L	L	L	---	L
	(2635)	(1316)	(2660)	(2623)	(2418)
Age (AGE)					
18-29	26.9	16.2	13.6	71.0	134.5
30-39	27.8	16.8	14.0	60.4	110.7
40-49	28.3	16.4	14.3	65.1	111.9
50-59	28.6	16.6	14.7	66.0	116.1
60-69	28.8	16.9	14.4	61.1	103.1
70+	28.0	17.4	14.2	52.9	88.3
Prob.	.000	.005	.000	.019	.000
Model	NCNL	L	SLC	L	SLC
	(2623)	(1311)	(2648)	(2610)	(2406)



Table 6 (continued)

Degree (DEGREE)	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
LT High Sch.	27.7	17.3	13.9	60.6	119.6
High School	27.9	16.6	14.1	63.8	114.8
Jr. College	27.8	16.6	14.2	64.1	112.2
4-yr. Col.	28.0	16.3	14.3	62.2	105.8
Grad. Sch.	28.2	16.0	14.7	74.8	119.8
Prob.	.769	.006	.001	.166	.407
Model	---	L	L	---	---
	(2634)	(1315)	(2659)	(2622)	(2417)
Income (INCOME98)					
LT 20K	27.7	16.4	14.1	66.9	128.4
20-40K	27.8	16.4	14.1	60.7	115.7
40-75K	28.0	16.9	14.2	66.4	111.5
75K+	28.2	16.4	14.4	67.3	112.4
Refused	28.6	17.0	13.9	55.9	96.6
Prob.	.216	.131	.039	.200	.016
Model	---	---	NCNL	---	L
	(2499)	(1247)	(2522)	(2490)	(2300)
Marital Status (MARITAL)					
Married	28.2	17.2	14.3	63.9	108.0
Widowed	28.9	16.8	14.6	50.8	92.9
Divorced	28.3	15.8	14.4	64.8	118.8
Separated	27.6	15.6	14.1	63.2	118.4
Nev. Married	27.0	15.5	13.6	67.6	131.3
Prob.	.000	.000	.000	.123	.000
Model	NC	NC	NC	---	NC
	(2635)	(1316)	(2660)	(2623)	(2418)
Residence (SRCBELT)					
Big Cities	27.4	15.1	13.8	78.1	141.5
Med. Cities	27.4	16.3	13.7	60.2	111.8
Subs. Big	27.6	16.3	14.1	63.6	114.1
Subs. Medium	28.2	16.6	14.3	64.9	111.6
Other Urban	28.1	16.9	14.3	65.2	114.8
Other Rural	28.4	17.3	14.3	56.3	103.1
Prob.	.026	.000	.001	.029	.001
Model	L	L	L	NCNL	SLC
	(2635)	(1316)	(2660)	(2623)	(2418)

Table 6 (continued)

Region (REGION)	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
New England	28.3	16.4	14.6	66.6	108.0
Mid-Atlantic	27.6	15.9	14.0	65.3	116.4
E. No. Cen.	28.3	16.9	14.3	56.5	107.7
W. No. Cen.	27.5	16.9	13.7	58.0	99.5
So. Atlantic	28.4	17.0	14.4	70.6	125.5
E. So. Cen.	28.5	16.4	14.4	52.1	102.9
W. So. Cen.	28.1	16.6	14.2	67.7	125.7
Mountain	27.8	16.4	14.2	62.7	108.3
Pacific	27.1	16.5	13.8	67.9	115.1
Prob.	.001	.024	.000	.028	.035
Model	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC
	(2635)	(1316)	(2660)	(2623)	(2418)
Race (RACECEN1)					
White	28.1	16.8	14.2	62.3	109.9
Black	27.7	15.0	14.0	76.5	146.1
Prob.	.131	.000	.238	.001	.000
Model	---	L	---	L	L
	(2412)	(1184)	(2432)	(2396)	(2202)
Hispanic (HISPANIC)					
Is Not	28.0	16.6	14.2	64.1	113.2
Is Hisp.	27.7	16.5	13.8	64.4	126.5
Prob.	.365	.714	.007	.947	.072
Model	---	---	L	---	---
	(2634)	(1315)	(2659)	(2622)	(2417)
Labor Force Status (WRKSTAT)					
Full-Time	27.8	16.7	14.1	66.1	116.8
Part-Time	28.1	15.9	14.2	68.0	121.9
Temp. Off	29.0	16.7	14.3	46.6	100.2
Unemployed	26.9	15.3	13.9	62.7	121.5
Retired	28.1	17.2	14.3	54.7	90.4
Student	26.2	15.6	13.6	71.4	122.9
Homemaker	29.3	17.0	14.6	64.8	117.9
Other	28.5	17.6	14.8	54.6	114.3
Prob.	.000	.000	.001	.051	.006
Model	NC	NC	NC	---	NC
	(2635)	(1316)	(2660)	(2623)	(2418)

Table 6 (continued)

	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
c. Social/Civic Engagement					
Socializing with Friends (SOCFRIEND)					
Daily	27.4	16.0	14.1	106.2	181.8
Weekly	28.1	16.3	14.2	69.9	133.5
Monthly+	28.2	16.5	14.2	69.1	124.0
Monthly	28.1	16.5	14.2	64.2	112.3
Sev. Times	27.8	16.8	14.2	60.0	106.2
Yearly	28.0	17.1	14.0	50.9	81.0
Never	28.4	17.2	14.0	47.3	92.9
Prob.	.723	.207	.916	.000	.000
Model	---	---	---	SLC	SLC
	(1767)	( 891)	(1778)	(1749)	(1611)
Socializing with Neighbors (SOCOMMUN)					
Daily	27.0	16.5	13.7	74.7	154.2
Weekly	28.1	16.2	14.3	79.7	143.2
Monthly+	28.6	16.7	14.3	71.5	123.4
Monthly	28.1	16.8	14.4	69.3	117.1
Sev. Times	28.7	16.8	14.4	67.9	109.1
Yearly	27.2	16.4	14.2	54.9	102.6
Never	28.2	16.6	14.0	54.8	104.3
Prob.	.004	.598	.057	.000	.000
Model	NCNL	---	---	L	L
	(1766)	( 891)	(1776)	(1747)	(1609)
Socializing with Relatives (SOCREL)					
Daily	28.6	16.4	14.3	79.4	157.3
Weekly	28.2	16.9	14.2	72.3	133.4
Monthly+	28.2	16.4	14.2	58.4	103.4
Monthly	28.1	16.8	14.3	63.1	107.6
Sev. Times	27.8	16.2	14.2	59.9	101.9
Yearly	27.1	17.0	13.6	57.4	91.6
Never	27.6	15.9	13.9	55.9	107.2
Prob.	.133	.203	.345	.003	.000
Model	---	---	---	L	SLC
	(1768)	( 893)	(1779)	(1750)	(1612)

Table 6 (continued)

	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
Socializing at Bar (SOCBAR)					
Daily	27.7	16.7	14.1	118.4	170.0
Weekly	27.5	16.5	14.1	63.6	120.8
Monthly+	27.2	16.1	13.7	62.8	114.9
Monthly	27.4	16.1	13.6	64.9	120.0
Sev. Times	28.0	16.4	14.2	68.6	118.8
Yearly	27.7	16.1	14.4	62.2	110.1
Never	28.6	17.0	14.3	66.2	119.2
Prob.	.001	.027	.000	.175	.535
Model	L	L	SLC	---	---
	(1768)	( 893)	(1779)	(1750)	(1612)
Friends (COWRKFRD, NEIFRD,OTHFRD)					
None	25.9	---	12.9	56.1	86.5
1	26.5	---	13.3	48.4	99.3
2	27.5	---	13.6	54.6	97.2
5-9	28.2	---	14.2	55.6	99.1
10-19	27.7	---	14.3	63.7	115.0
20-34	29.1	---	14.5	65.4	124.0
35+	28.5	---	14.6	83.5	144.9
Prob.	.001	---	.000	.015	.000
Model	SLC	---	SLC	L	L
	(1118)	---	(1121)	(1105)	(1102)
Vote in 2000 (VOTE00)					
Did	28.2	16.6	14.3	65.8	113.4
Didn't	27.9	16.7	13.9	59.3	112.5
Not Eligible	26.2	16.0	13.6	71.6	131.6
Refused	24.8	19.0	13.7	32.3	50.6
Prob.	.000	.129	.000	.063	.121
Model	NC	---	NC	---	---
	(2621)	(1305)	(1335)	(2608)	(2402)

Table 6 (continued)

	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
Group Activity (GRPPOL, GRPUNION, GRPCHURH, GRPSPORT, GRPCHRTY, GRPNEI, GRPOTH)					
Low (7-9)	26.7	---	13.4	43.1	86.6
Med. (10-13)	28.4	---	14.0	55.4	100.7
High (14+)	28.4	---	14.7	81.9	137.5
Prob.	.000	---	.000	.000	.000
Model	SLC	---	L	L	L
	(1127)	---	(1131)	(1114)	(1110)
d. Obligations					
Adult children duty to care for parents (KIDPARS)					
Agree Str.	28.4	---	14.3	59.5	117.4
Agree	27.6	---	14.0	60.8	102.5
Neither	27.0	---	13.7	59.3	100.5
Disagree	27.8	---	14.3	71.2	119.3
Dis. Str.	30.2	---	13.9	73.8	122.2
Prob.	.003	---	.022	.572	.117
Model	NCNL	---	L	---	---
	(1108)	---	(1112)	(1097)	(1094)
Parents live with Children (AGED)					
Good idea	27.8	16.6	14.3	64.9	116.8
Depends	27.9	16.7	14.0	53.6	98.6
Bad idea	28.0	16.8	14.0	60.1	106.7
Prob.	.649	.641	.055	.036	.018
Model	---	---	---	NCNL	SLC
	(1729)	( 868)	(1747)	(1719)	(1592)

Table 6 (continued)

	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
Help Self, Family First (FIRSTYOU)					
Agree Str.	27.6	---	13.8	59.5	111.0
Agree	28.1	---	14.0	58.4	100.9
Neither	28.2	---	15.0	71.8	124.8
Disagree	28.8	---	14.9	70.7	129.9
Dis. Str.	29.5	---	18.3	101.2	171.0
Prob.	.352	---	.000	.210	.053
Model	---	---	L	---	---
	(1124)	---	(1128)	(1112)	(1110)
Family, Friends Make Demands (DEMANDS)					
No	27.7	---	14.0	58.1	101.2
Yes, seldom	27.4	---	13.9	62.2	106.6
Yes, sometimes	28.4	---	14.1	64.9	117.5
Yes, often	28.5	---	14.2	58.6	129.2
Yes, v. often	30.3	---	15.3	64.9	157.5
Prob.	.006	---	.059	.729	.006
Model	L	---	---	---	L
	(1125)	---	(1127)	(1112)	(1111)
Better should help friends (HELPPFRDS)					
Agree Str.	29.7	---	15.1	70.9	147.9
Agree	27.7	---	14.2	58.0	104.0
Neither	27.3	---	13.5	59.9	99.0
Disagree	27.0	---	13.3	63.9	107.6
Dis. Str.	23.9	---	12.3	40.3	54.6
Prob.	.000	---	.000	.191	.000
Model	SLC	---	L	---	SLC
	(1104)	---	(1105)	(1092)	(1089)
e. Religion					
Religion (RELIG)					
Protestant	28.4	16.9	14.4	62.6	113.1
Catholic	27.8	16.8	14.0	64.7	115.9
Jewish	27.0	14.3	14.3	67.7	119.7
None	26.6	15.5	13.6	63.8	109.6
Other	27.7	16.6	13.9	74.3	126.5
Prob.	.000	.000	.000	.339	.489
Model	NC	NC	NC	---	---
	(2628)	(1313)	(2652)	(2615)	(2411)

Table 6 (continued)

Religion Raised In (RELIG16)	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
Protestant	28.3	16.8	14.3	63.7	113.7
Catholic	27.7	16.7	13.0	67.2	118.1
Jewish	26.9	14.5	14.2	60.1	107.9
None	27.3	15.8	13.5	56.5	100.4
Other	26.8	15.8	13.9	65.3	122.5
Prob.	.001	.000	.000	.405	.292
Model	NC	NC	NC	---	---
	(2628)	(1312)	(2650)	(2614)	(2410)
Theology (FUND)					
Fund.	28.6	17.1	14.4	67.0	120.2
Moderate	28.0	16.8	14.1	64.7	116.1
Liberal	27.2	15.9	14.0	60.1	104.8
Prob.	.000	.000	.012	.170	.019
Model	L	SLC	L	---	NCNL
	(2518)	(1272)	(2538)	(2500)	(2310)
Religion (RELIG)					
Has	28.2	16.8	14.2	64.2	115.2
None	26.6	15.5	13.6	63.8	109.6
Prob.	.000	.000	.000	.913	.364
Model	L	L	L	---	---
	(2628)	(1313)	(2652)	(2615)	(2411)
Religion Raised In (RELIG16)					
Had	28.0	16.7	14.2	64.9	115.5
None	27.3	15.8	13.5	56.5	100.4
Prob.	.064	.008	.000	.115	.063
Model	---	L	L	---	---
	(2627)	(1312)	(2650)	(2614)	(2410)
Religiousness (RELITEN)					
Strong	28.9	17.0	14.6	74.6	129.9
Somewhat	28.1	16.6	14.2	63.0	111.3
Not Strong	27.6	16.6	13.9	54.9	102.6
No Religion	26.6	15.5	13.6	63.8	109.6
Prob.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Model	L	SLC	L	SLC	SLC
	(2611)	(1298)	(2634)	(2596)	(2394)

Table 6 (continued)

	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
Attend Church (ATTEND)					
Never	27.1	15.7	13.6	54.2	102.1
LT Yearly	27.0	16.6	13.7	54.6	104.8
Once Year	27.2	16.7	13.8	54.9	96.8
Sev. Times	28.4	16.6	14.3	62.5	116.7
Monthly	27.4	14.4	14.1	58.7	112.0
2-3 Month	27.5	16.8	14.4	66.0	118.4
Al. Weekly	28.3	16.7	14.1	68.0	116.4
Weekly	29.0	16.9	14.4	77.2	128.4
Weekly+	30.0	17.5	15.4	85.1	144.0
Prob.	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000
Model	SLC	L	SLC	L	L
	(2629)	(1314)	(2652)	(2616)	(2412)
Praying (PRAY)					
Daily+	29.3	17.0	14.8	76.7	138.0
Daily	28.5	16.7	14.4	67.2	118.4
Weekly+	27.7	16.9	14.0	60.4	104.7
Weekly	27.0	16.1	13.6	49.6	82.9
LT Weekly	26.1	16.0	13.5	47.0	90.2
Never	25.5	15.6	13.2	60.2	101.6
Prob.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Model	L	L	L	SLC	SLC
	(2617)	(1311)	(2641)	(2606)	(2403)
f. Psychological Well-Being					
Marital Happiness (HAPMAR)					
Very happy	28.4	17.4	14.4	68.0	112.6
Pretty happy	27.9	16.9	14.2	58.2	101.0
Not too hap.	27.7	15.4	14.3	52.5	102.3
Prob.	.088	.000	.516	.020	.121
Model	---	L	---	L	---
	(1461)	( 774)	(1477)	(1453)	(1340)
Life is (LIFE)					
Exciting	28.3	16.5	14.4	74.8	128.8
Routine	27.5	16.5	14.0	57.1	101.3
Dull	28.2	17.1	13.7	51.0	104.5
Prob.	.008	.572	.001	.000	.000
Model	L	---	L	L	L
	(1746)	( 863)	(1763)	(1746)	(1609)



Table 6 (continued)

	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
Health (HEALTH)					
Excel.	28.1	16.4	14.4	70.3	120.6
Good	27.8	14.4	14.9	63.4	110.8
Fair	27.7	16.7	14.2	62.8	113.4
Poor	28.8	17.6	14.5	61.9	122.5
Prob.	.260	.222	.070	.314	.393
Model	---	---	---	---	---
	(1770)	( 869)	(1789)	(1771)	(1629)
Happiness (HAPPY)					
Very happy	28.2	17.0	14.3	72.5	125.2
Pretty happy	27.8	16.4	14.1	58.5	105.9
Not too hap.	28.0	16.5	14.1	65.7	122.6
Prob.	.103	.002	.031	.000	.000
Model	---	SLC	L	SLC	SLC
	(2634)	(1315)	(2659)	(2621)	(2417)
Financial satis- faction (SATFIN)					
Pretty well	27.8	16.6	14.2	65.9	113.5
More or less	27.9	16.5	14.1	62.8	112.2
Not at all	28.1	16.7	14.2	64.3	119.2
Prob.	.606	.604	.271	.635	.403
Model	---	---	---	---	---
	(2629)	(1312)	(2653)	(2616)	(2413)
Job satisfaction (SATJOB)					
Very sat.	28.2	16.6	14.3	65.9	119.6
Mod. sat.	27.6	16.5	14.0	61.4	107.5
Little dis.	28.1	16.2	13.9	73.3	131.1
Very dis.	29.0	16.8	14.2	69.6	131.1
Prob.	.013	.586	.083	.196	.015
Model	NCNL	---	---	---	NCNL
	(2045)	(1023)	(2066)	(2043)	(1899)

Table 6 (continued)

	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
g. Misanthropy					
Rosenberg Scale (TRUST, FAIR, HELPFUL)					
3 (Low)	28.5	16.6	14.7	60.9	105.3
4	27.8	15.7	14.3	60.8	97.5
5	27.9	16.4	14.1	51.2	91.8
6	27.8	17.1	13.9	70.8	120.0
7	27.7	16.8	14.1	63.3	114.9
8	27.6	16.8	14.0	57.9	105.6
9 (High)	27.5	16.9	13.8	67.6	128.6
Prob.	.155	.313	.000	.044	.000
Model	---	---	L	NCNL	SLC
	(1724)	( 867)	(1744)	(1718)	(1589)
Trust Few People (TRUSTED)					
Agree Str.	27.9	---	14.0	64.6	116.3
Agree	27.7	---	14.0	55.3	100.1
Neither	27.7	---	13.9	62.1	111.8
Disagree	28.6	---	15.1	70.8	117.5
Dis. Str.	29.3	---	14.2	67.0	117.8
Prob.	.378	---	.000	.152	.136
Model	---	---	SLC	---	---
	(1118)	---	(1122)	(1105)	(1104)
People take Ad- vantage (ADVANTAGE)					
Agree Str.	27.9	---	14.0	62.8	128.1
Agree	27.9	---	13.8	58.3	101.6
Neither	27.3	---	13.9	62.1	100.6
Disagree	28.5	---	15.1	64.0	107.6
Dis. Str.	27.9	---	15.4	101.2	161.2
Prob.	.336	---	.000	.229	.001
Model	---	---	SLC	---	NCNL
	(1116)	---	(1119)	(1103)	(1102)

Table 6 (continued)

	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
People Want Best for You (WANTBEST)					
Agree Str.	28.6	---	15.0	65.0	132.4
Agree	28.0	---	14.0	60.6	105.9
Neither	27.3	---	13.9	61.6	105.1
Disagree	27.6	---	13.7	62.1	107.9
Dis. Str.	29.2	---	14.7	46.8	102.7
Prob.	.050	---	.000	.811	.046
Model	NCNL	---	SLC	---	NCNL
	(1113)	---	(1116)	(1100)	(1099)
h. Crime					
Courts are... (COURTS)					
Too Harsh	27.1	15.6	14.4	77.8	138.9
About Right	27.3	16.4	14.2	61.9	107.2
Too Easy	28.2	16.8	14.1	62.7	113.0
Prob.	.000	.000	.291	.007	.001
Model	L	L	---	SLC	SLC
	(2481)	(1234)	(2498)	(2468)	(2284)
Fear Walk at Night (FEAR)					
Yes	28.4	16.2	14.4	64.1	117.5
No	27.7	16.7	14.1	65.3	112.7
Prob.	.005	.036	.003	.742	.399
Model	L	L	L	---	---
	(1764)	( 866)	(1785)	(1765)	(1624)
Capital Punishment (CAPPUN)					
Yes	27.7	16.7	13.9	62.2	109.4
Don't Know	28.2	16.5	13.9	53.8	99.0
No	28.6	16.3	14.7	70.5	128.4
Prob.	.000	.118	.000	.008	.000
Model	L	---	L	L	---
	(2616)	(1303)	(2639)	(2602)	(2403)

Table 6 (continued)

	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
Police Hitting (POLHITOK)					
Approve	27.8	16.7	14.2	62.9	108.6
Disapprove	28.1	16.4	14.2	60.9	117.5
Prob.	.334	.235	.758	.593	.129
Model	---	---	---	---	---
	(1639)	( 820)	(1649)	(1629)	(1511)
i. Social Welfare					
Govt. Social Spending <sup>c</sup>					
Low	27.2	16.6	13.5	66.0	113.6
Middle	28.1	16.7	14.2	61.5	111.4
High	28.6	16.3	14.6	70.1	129.0
Prob.	.000	.223	.000	.062	.007
Model	L	---	L	---	SLC
	(2211)	(1282)	(2230)	(2212)	(2041)
Govt. Aid to Old (AIDOLD)					
Def. should	28.8	---	14.4	62.7	117.6
Prob. should	27.3	---	13.8	57.7	105.9
Prob. not	26.8	---	13.9	68.2	105.1
Def. not	27.7	---	13.7	55.5	80.7
Prob.	.000	---	.001	.386	.056
Model	SLC	---	L	---	---
	(1081)	---	(1084)	(1069)	(1066)
Govt. Aid to Children (AIDKIDS)					
Def. should	28.3	---	14.3	66.5	133.1
Prob. should	28.0	---	14.1	57.5	107.7
Prob. not	27.7	---	14.1	61.3	105.0
Def. not	28.0	---	14.0	61.0	100.7
Prob.	.686	---	.678	.647	.007
Model	---	---	---	---	L
	(1032)	---	(1033)	(1021)	(1019)

Table 6 (continued)

	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
Equalize Wealth (EQWLTH)					
Govt should	28.8	16.5	14.5	71.9	127.4
2	28.4	16.8	14.6	55.6	105.2
3	27.6	16.8	14.3	55.5	98.7
4	27.6	16.8	13.9	57.0	108.7
5	27.7	16.9	14.1	59.7	107.4
6	27.6	16.7	13.8	61.0	103.3
Govt shldn't	27.2	16.1	13.5	66.1	115.0
Prob.	.001	.506	.000	.035	.026
Model	L	---	L	NCNL	NCNL
	(1718)	( 862)	(1735)	(1709)	(1581)
Govt. Help Poor (HELPPOOR)					
Govt help	28.6	16.9	14.9	68.1	128.4
2	28.3	16.9	14.6	59.7	103.3
3	27.9	16.6	14.1	58.4	106.1
4	27.1	16.2	13.6	61.7	103.4
Help self	27.3	17.1	13.2	66.0	115.3
Prob.	.001	.229	.000	.268	.017
Model	L	---	L	---	NCNL
	(1699)	( 857)	(1715)	(1692)	(1567)
Govt. do more (HELPNOT)					
Govt do more	28.7	16.5	14.6	69.7	133.0
2	27.4	16.6	14.6	56.3	96.7
3	27.8	16.7	14.0	56.2	102.9
4	27.6	16.9	14.1	65.0	112.1
Govt do less	27.7	16.6	13.7	70.6	120.7
Prob.	.041	.891	.000	.007	.000
Model	NCNL	---	L	NCNL	NCNL
	(1694)	( 852)	(1709)	(1688)	(1560)
Govt. help sick (HELPSICK)					
Help sick	28.7	16.9	14.6	62.1	115.7
2	27.6	16.4	14.3	60.7	102.6
3	27.6	16.8	13.9	60.6	111.1
4	27.5	16.2	13.9	62.9	109.3
Not help	26.6	16.8	13.2	63.0	108.9
Prob.	.000	.364	.000	.991	.486
Model	L	---	L	---	---
	(1716)	( 862)	(1732)	(1707)	(1580)

Table 6 (continued)

	Davis Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
Govt help Blacks (HELPBLK)					
Help Blks	29.1	15.8	14.4	70.5	134.2
2	28.2	16.6	14.9	59.5	108.3
3	28.0	16.6	14.2	64.3	113.3
4	27.8	16.8	14.3	55.7	98.7
Not help	27.5	17.0	13.7	61.4	110.7
Prob.	.018	.063	.000	.228	.023
Model	L	---	SLC	---	NCNL
	(1703)	( 855)	(1722)	(1697)	(1570)

<sup>a</sup>The GSS variables names are in parentheses and their wordings can be found in Davis, Smith, and Marsden, 2005.

<sup>b</sup>NC= not constant; L= linear; SLC= significant linear component; NCNL= not constant, not linear

<sup>c</sup>This is a five-item scale based on support for government spending for health (NATHEAL, NATHEALY), blacks (NATRACE, NATRACEY), children (NATCHLD), social security (NATSOC), and welfare/the poor (NATFARE, NATFAREY). Scores range from 5 for someone who thought the was spending too much on all areas to 15 for someone who thought the government was spending too little in each case. Low is 5 to 10, middle is 11 to 13, and high is 14 to 15.

Table 7

## Empathy Scale by Family of Origin

## A. Respondents

	Both Genders	Female	Male
Parents	28.0	27.6	26.1
Parent/Step Parent	----	28.4	26.5
Relatives	29.3	28.8	24.1
All	28.0	27.9	26.0

Parents=raised by both parents or one parent alone

Parent/Step Parent=raised by parent of specific gender plus step parent

Relatives=raised by one or more relatives of both or one gender

All=raised by parents, parent+step parent, or relatives of both or one gender

## B. Respondents by Gender

	Both Genders	Parent(s)	
Child		Female	Male
Male	26.6	26.6	25.1
Female	29.4	28.6	26.6

Table 8

Daily Spiritual Experience (DSE) and Empathy and Altruism

DSE	Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behavior 15-items
Low	26.8	16.0	13.7	57.5	98.2
Medium	28.2	16.7	14.2	60.1	103.6
High	29.0	17.0	15.0	90.5	154.3
Prob.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Model	L	L	L	SLC	SLC
	(1220)	(1227)	(1230)	(1221)	(1218)



Table 9

## Multivariate Models of Altruism and Empathy Scales

(beta/prob.)

Variables/ High Value	Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
A. Demographics					
Gender/Female	.260/.000	-.203/.000	.182/.000	-.035/.105	.034/.132
Age	.062/.032	-.060/.119	.086/.003	-.036/.229	-.069/.025
Education	.034/.117	-.151/.000	.089/.000	.047/.040	.009/.686
Income	.049/.041	-.019/.572	-.001/.976	-.003/.899	-.031/.237
Marital/Wid.	-.003/.899	-.014/.645	-.004/.844	-.012/.613	-.015/.538
Marital/DivSep	.021/.325	-.161/.000	.005/.821	-.005/.840	.020/.385
Marital/Never	-.023/.355	-.214/.000	-.076/.003	-.006/.828	.033/.232
Reside/Rural	.045/.029	.069/.016	.047/.026	-.008/.697	-.025/.262
Race/Black	-.016/.430	-.152/.000	.004/.845	.058/.008	.072/.001
Work/Ret.	-.003/.915	.053/.210	-.048/.122	.010/.764	-.003/.587
Work/At Home	.027/.300	.071/.050	-.015/.562	.033/.211	.024/.379
Work/Worker	.009/.760	.039/.335	-.052/.082	.030/.329	.028/.375
	(2326)	(1147)	(2344)	(2315)	(2151)
B. Demographics + Validation					
Gender/Female	.252/.000	-.188/.000	.182/.000	-.039/.062	.032/.142
Age	.079/.004	-.037/.316	.088/.002	-.026/.372	-.061/.040
Education	.023/.240	-.152/.000	.079/.000	.050/.017	.007/.742
Income	---/---	---/---	---/---	---/---	---/---
Marital/Wid.	-.020/.357	-.011/.696	-.007/.730	-.012/.584	-.010/.652
Marital/DivSep	.007/.745	-.146/.000	.003/.888	.001/.959	.026/.234
Marital/Never	-.031/.184	-.192/.000	-.072/.002	.002/.943	.050/.049
Reside/Rural	.034/.083	.075/.007	.054/.007	-.011/.605	-.021/.319
Race/Black	-.014/.475	-.114/.000	.012/.554	.078/.000	.091/.000
Work/Ret.	-.001/.981	.037/.375	-.054/.076	-.001/.972	-.017/.591
Work/At Home	.034/.737	.066/.066	-.018/.469	.029/.264	.016/.538
Work/Worker	-.014/.167	.018/.639	-.040/.162	.025/.400	.016/.602
Coop./Not	-.134/.000	-.065/.018	-.101/.000	-.098/.000	-.085/.000
Inc. Info/Ref.	.040/.036	.041/.134	-.014/.490	-.012/.584	-.013/.529
	(2482)	(1240)	(2504)	(2473)	(2285)

Table 9 (continued)

Variables/ High Value	Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
C. Demographics + Engagement					
Gender/Female	.276/.000	----	.170/.000	-.031/.338	.041/.192
Age	.033/.461	----	.082/.069	-.051/.262	-.107/.017
Education	-.033/.328	----	.039/.263	-.032/.368	-.075/.029
Income	.022/.568	----	.009/.810	-.014/.713	-.065/.086
Marital/Wid.	-.002/.964	----	.014/.687	.007/.838	.005/.891
Marital/DivSep	.008/.811	----	.026/.440	.001/.981	.028/.400
Marital/Never	-.014/.728	----	-.017/.665	.056/.162	.100/.011
Reside/Rural	.009/.788	----	.029/.369	-.072/.026	-.089/.005
Race/Black	-.021/.505	----	.012/.708	.014/.660	.028/.377
Work/Ret.	-.026/.585	----	-.092/.051	.023/.623	-.008/.856
Work/At Home	-.008/.826	----	-.063/.095	.011/.782	-.025/.510
Work/Worker	-.042/.334	----	-.062/.156	-.005/.910	-.031/.476
Friends	.049/.123	----	.033/.300	.059/.070	.111/.001
Group Members	.118/.001	----	.177/.000	.227/.000	.231/.000
	(1018)		(1020)	(1009)	(1006)
D. Demographics + Obligations					
Gender/Female	.266/.000	----	.171/.000	-.041/.229	.034/.303
Age	.048/.285	----	.090/.045	-.053/.263	-.085/.070
Education	.013/.692	----	.101/.003	.043/.224	.009/.803
Income	.058/.122	----	.066/.082	.027/.502	-.015/.697
Marital/Wid.	.008/.811	----	.021/.534	.013/.726	.002/.951
Marital/DivSep	.029/.384	----	.047/.168	-.012/.726	.012/.738
Marital/Never	-.008/.851	----	-.012/.772	.047/.263	.095/.022
Reside/Rural	.028/.389	----	.059/.066	-.054/.114	-.069/.039
Race/Black	-.031/.332	----	.026/.413	.031/.357	.040/.226
Work/Ret.	-.025/.595	----	-.065/.164	.002/.961	-.018/.716
Work/At Home	-.025/.500	----	-.086/.022	-.023/.558	-.052/.184
Work/Worker	-.054/.214	----	-.064/.141	-.034/.456	-.042/.350
Care Pars/Dis.	-.013/.679	----	.001/.974	.095/.005	.058/.083
Demands/Lots	.054/.082	----	.036/.255	.037/.261	.081/.012
Help Frds/Dis.	-.207/.000	----	-.252/.000	-.052/.115	-.126/.000
	( 992)		( 993)	( 985)	( 984)

Table 9 (continued)

Variables/ High Value	Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
E. Religion					
Gender/Female	.222/.000	-.227/.000	.146/.000	-.069/.002	-.006/.778
Age	.047/.099	-.071/.063	.073/.011	-.050/.098	-.0803.007
Education	.034/.118	-.141/.000	.079/.000	.043/.060	.008/.731
Income	.061/.011	-.021/.528	.011/.640	.000/.991	-.024/.360
Marital/Wid.	.001/.979	-.004/.885	-.001/.934	-.009/.701	-.011/.648
Marital/DivSep	.036/.095	-.134/.000	.022/.299	.017/.450	.030/.097
Marital/Never	.009/.723	-.186/.000	-.045/.081	.023/.392	.062/.025
Reside/Rural	.034/.102	.060/.034	.033/.109	-.020/.359	-.036/.101
Race/Black	-.052/.013	-.189/.000	-.033/.125	.027/.220	.041/.073
Work/Ret.	-.001/.964	.044/.295	-.047/.128	.013/.676	-.003/.916
Work/At Home	.020/.425	.048/.156	-.022/.397	.032/.229	.022/.416
Work/Worker	.011/.712	.030/.464	-.052/.079	.034/.273	.030/.330
Religiousness/ None	-.014/.588	-.085/.026	-.041/.121	.013/.637	-.011/.695
Attend/Weekly+	.032/.244	.037/.349	.052/.059	.093/.001	.054/.069
Pray/Never	-.161/.000 (2300)	-.090/.010 (1134)	-.111/.000 (2316)	-.106/.000 (2289)	-.129/.000 (2127)
F. Misanthropy					
Gender/Female	.267/.000	-.190/.000	.187/.000	-.026/.331	.040/.152
Age	-.004/.915	-.068/.164	.047/.183	-.041/.275	-.051/.182
Education	.005/.854	-.152/.000	.042/.123	.056/.052	.031/.296
Income	.019/.534	-.004/.925	-.026/.382	.003/.923	-.042/.196
Marital/Wid.	.022/.416	-.004/.913	-.004/.891	.009/.745	-.012/.687
Marital/DivSep	.000/.989	-.180/.000	.037/.159	.004/.881	.025/.384
Marital/Never	-.081/.009	-.215/.000	-.113/.000	.007/.830	.041/.224
Reside/Rural	.037/.145	.060/.084	.027/.295	.000/.988	-.010/.710
Race/Black	-.006/.804	-.148/.000	-.011/.668	.013/.631	.021/.447
Work/Ret.	.046/.213	.087/.085	-.023/.535	.001/.979	-.019/.636
Work/At Home	.033/.278	.105/.015	-.011/.716	.030/.352	.014/.680
Work/Worker	.036/.315	.055/.261	-.055/.126	-.011/.764	-.010/.802
Misanthropy/High	-.057/.033 (1539)	.084/.024 ( 760)	-.098/.000 (1554)	.040/.150 (1531)	.064/.028 (1423)

Table 9 (continued)

Variables/ High Value	Empathy	Altruistic Love	Altruistic Values	Altruistic 11-items	Behaviors 15-items
G. Crime					
Gender/Female	.231/.000	-.210/.000	.171/.000	-.030/.187	.036/.128
Age	.056/.061	-.034/.401	.077/.010	-.023/.457	-.058/.070
Education	.037/.098	-.147/.000	.067/.003	.026/.278	-.008/.735
Income	.041/.103	-.021/.541	.003/.905	.001/.954	-.025/.354
Marital/Wid.	-.003/.885	-.020/.521	-.010/.668	-.021/.391	-.025/.305
Marital/DivSep	.021/.352	-.165/.000	-.003/.891	-.006/.780	.016/.498
Marital/Never	-.038/.155	-.208/.000	-.069/.000	-.013/.643	.027/.341
Reside/Rural	.045/.036	.066/.026	.057/.007	.002/.944	-.015/.501
Race/Black	-.012/.579	-.144/.000	-.024/.282	.062/.007	.075/.001
Work/Ret.	-.005/.867	.039/.370	-.039/.228	.007/.834	-.007/.843
Work/At Home	.032/.228	.065/.085	-.010/.718	.037/.180	.026/.347
Work/Worker	.011/.710	.043/.317	-.036/.241	.030/.351	.023/.475
Courts (Harsher)	.078/.000	.060/.044	-.029/.177	-.023/.303	-.014/.551
Death Pen. (Anti)	.083/.000	.039/.198	.130/.000	.047/.038	.053/.022
	(2187)	(1072)	(2198)	(2176)	(2030)
H. Social Welfare					
Gender/Female	.253/.000	-.205/.000	.172/.000	-.027/.253	.033/.170
Age	.064/.042	-.067/.108	.073/.019	-.030/.349	-.061/.067
Education	.034/.147	-.151/.000	.075/.002	.048/.051	.010/.694
Income	.056/.035	-.007/.840	.012/.652	-.016/.568	-.046/.101
Marital/Wid.	-.014/.567	-.012/.712	-.006/.792	-.013/.599	-.026/.328
Marital/DivSep	.014/.546	-.157/.000	-.010/.652	-.006/.821	.022/.371
Marital/Never	-.013/.622	-.211/.000	-.060/.500	.006/.843	.042/.153
Reside/Rural	.045/.074	.100/.001	.050/.025	-.018/.441	-.036/.131
Race/Black	-.036/.115	-.173/.000	-.040/.083	.058/.017	.063/.011
Work/Ret.	-.003/.937	.060/.180	-.033/.336	.013/.711	.007/.833
Work/At Home	.006/.835	.050/.202	-.020/.460	.041/.156	.033/.262
Work/Worker	-.011/.736	.034/.440	-.048/.133	.046/.170	.045/.187
Social Spend	.091/.000	.082/.010	.174/.000	-.010/.652	.004/.861
	(1991)	( 970)	(2005)	(1992)	(1848)

## References

- Amato, P. R. (1990). "Personality and Social Network Involvement as Predictors of Helping Behavior in Everyday Life." Social Psychology Quarterly **53**(1): 31-43.
- Batson, D. C. (1991). The Altruism Question: Toward A Social-Psychological Answer. Hillsdale: New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Batson, D. C. (1998). Altruism and Prosocial Behavior. Handbook of Social Psychology. Susan T. Fiske, Daniel T. Gilbert, and Gardner Lindzey. Boston, McGraw-Hill. 2: 282-316.
- Berkowitz, L. and K.G. Lutterman. (1968) "The Traditional Socially Responsible Personality." Public Opinion Quarterly, 32: 169-185.
- Bolle, Friedel, "On Love and Altruism," Rationality and Society, 3 (1991), 197-214.
- Butler, Robin, et al., "Age and Responses to the Love Attitudes Scale: Consistency in Structure, Differences in Scores," International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 40 (1995), 281-296.
- Chou, K.-L. (1998). "Effects of Age, Gender, and Participation in Volunteer Activities on the Altruistic Behavior of Chinese Adolescents." The Journal of Genetic Psychology 159: 195-201.
- Davies, Martin F., "Socially Desirable Responding and Impression Management in the Endorsement of Love Styles," Journal of Psychology, 135 (2001), 562-570.
- Davis, James A., Tom W. Smith; and Peter V. Marsden. (2005). General Social Survey, 1972-2004: Cumulative Codebook. Chicago: NORC.
- Davis, Mark H. (1994). Empathy: A Social Psychological Approach. Madison: WCB Brown & Benchmark.
- Dillon, Michele, "Religion, Cultural Change, and Altruism in American Society," Paper presented to the American Sociological Association, Chicago, August, 2002.
- Eisenberg, N. (1986). Altruistic Emotion, Cognition, and Behavior. Hillsdale, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eisenberg, N., Miller, Paul A., Schaller, Mark, Fabes, Richard A., Fultz, Jim, Shell, Rita, and Cindy L. Shea (1989). "The Role of Sympathy and Altruistic Personality Traits in Helping: A Reexamination." Journal of Personality 57: 41-67.
- Giesbrecht, N. (1998). "Gender Patterns of Psycho social Development." Sex Roles: 463-478.
- Gilligan, C., and Attanucci, J. (1988). "Two moral orientations: Gender differences and similarities." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly 34: 223-237.
- Hendrick, Clyde and Hendrick, Susan S., "Dimensions of Love: A Sociobiological Interpretation," Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 10 (1991),

206-230.

- Hendrick, Clyde and Hendrick, Susan S., "A Theory and Method of Love," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50 (1986), 392-402.
- Hendrick, Susan S. and Hendrick, Clyde, "Love and Sex Attitudes and Religious Beliefs," Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 5 (1987), 391-398.
- Howard, Judith A. and J. A. Piliavin. (2000), "Altruism," in Encyclopedia of Sociology, edited by Edgar F. Borgatta. New York: Macmillian.
- Johnson, R. C., George P. Danko, Thomas J. Darvill, Stephen Bochner, John K. Bower, Yau-Huang Huang, Jong Y. Park, Vid Pecjak, Anwar R. A. Rahim and Dirk Pennington. (1989). "Cross-Cultural Assessment of Altruism and its Correlates." Personality and individual differences 10: 855-868.
- Kangas, O. E. (1997). "Self-Interest and the Common Good: The Impact of Norms, Selfishness and Context in Social Policy Opinions." Journal of Socio-Economics 26: 475-494.
- Khanna, R., Poonam Singh and J. Philippe Rushton (1993). "Development of the Hindi version of a Self-Report Altruism Scale." Personality and Individual differences 14: 267-270.
- Montgomery, Marilyn J. and Sorell, Gwendolyn T., "Differences in Love Attitudes across Family Life Stages," Family Relations, 46 (1997), 55-61.
- Morgan, M.M.; H. Wallace Goddard; and Sherri Newton Givens (1997), "Factors that Influence Willingness to Help the Homeless." Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless 6: 45-56.
- Murthy, Kavita; Rotzien, Andrea; and Vacha-Haase, Tammi, "Second-Order Structure Underlying the Hendrick-Hendrick Love Attitudes Scale," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 56 (1996), 108-121.
- Nickell, G. S. (1998). "The Helping Attitude Scale." Paper presented to the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.
- Penner, P. S. (1995). Altruistic Behavior: An Inquiry into Motivation. Amsterdam, Atlanta, GA.
- Penner, Louis A.; Dovidio, John F.; Piliavin, Jane A.; and Schroeder, David A., "Prosocial Behavior: Multivariate Perspectives," Annual Review of Psychology, 56 (2005), 365-392.
- Piliavin, J. A. and H-W Charng (1990). "Altruism: A Review of Recent Theory and Research." Annual Review of Sociology 16: 27-65.
- Post, Stephen G., Unlimited Love: Altruism, Compassion, and Service. Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press, 2003.
- Post, Stephen G.; Underwood, Lynn G.; Schloss, Jeffrey P., and Hurlbut, William B., eds. (2002). Altruism & Altruistic Love: Science, Philosophy, and Religion in Dialogue. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Romer, D., Gruder, C. L., Lizzadro, T. (1986). "A person-situation approach to altruistic behavior." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 51.

- Rose-Ackerman, S. (1996). "Altruism, Nonprofits, and Economic Theory." Journal of Economic Literature 34(2): 701-728.
- Rushton, J. P., Roland D. Chrisjohn and G. Cynthia Fekken. (1981a). "The Altruistic Personality and the Self-Report Altruism Scale." Personality and individual differences 2: 293-302.
- Rushton, J. P., Ed. (1981b). Altruism and Helping Behavior: Social, Personality, and Developmental Perspectives. Hillsdale, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rushton, J. P., David W. Fulker, Michael C. Neale, David K. B. Nias and Hans J. Eysenck (1989). "Ageing and the relation of aggression, altruism and assertiveness scales to the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire." Personality and individual differences 10: 261-263.
- Sawyer, J. (1966). "The Altruism Scale: A Measure of Co-operative, Individualistic, and Competitive Interpersonal Orientations." American Journal of Sociology 71: 407-416.
- Smith, L. H., Anthony Fabricatore, Mark Peyrot (1999). "Religiosity and Altruism among African American Males: The Catholic Experience." Journal of Blacks Studies 29: 579-597.
- Smith, Tom W., (2000). "The Informal Helping Scale on the 1996 General Social Survey," NORC unpublished report.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A., Altruistic Love: A Study of American 'Good Neighbors' and Christian Saints. Boston: Beacon Press, 1950.
- Staub, E., Daniel Bar-Tal, Jerzy Karylowski, and Janusz Reykowski, Ed. (1984). Development and Maintenance of Prosocial Behavior. New York, Plenum.
- Taraban, C.B. and Hendrick, Clyde, "Personality Perceptions Associated with Six Styles of Love," Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 12 (1995), 453-461.
- Underwood, L.G. (1999). "Daily Spiritual Experience." in Fetzer NIA Multidimensional Measurement of Religiousness/Spirituality for the Use in Health Research. Kalamazoo: Fetzer Institute.
- Underwood, Lynn G. (2002). "The Human Experience of Compassionate Love: Conceptual Mapping and Data From Selected Studies," in Altruism and Altruistic Love: Science, Philosophy, and Religion in Dialogue, edited by Stephen G. Post, et al. London: Oxford University Press.
- Webb, Deborah J., et al. (2000). "Development and Validation of Scales to Measure Attitudes Influencing Monetary Donations to Charitable Organizations." Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science 28: 299-309.
- Wispe, L., Ed. (1978). Altruism, Sympathy, and Helping: Psychological and Sociological Principles. New York: Academic Press.
- Wrightsmann, L.S. (1974). Assumptions about Human Nature: A Social-psychological Analysis. Monterey, CA: Brooks, Cole.

Yancey, George B. and Eastman, Raymond L., "Comparison of Undergraduates with Older Adults on Love Styles and Life Satisfaction," Psychological Reports, 76 (1995), 1211-1218.

## Appendix A: Question Wordings

### 1. Empathy

The following statements ask about your thoughts and feelings in various situations. For each item indicate how well it describes you by choosing the number on the showcard where 1 indicates that it does not describe you very well and 5 means that it does describe you very well. Of course numbers 2-4 indicate that how well it describes you are in between these points.

- a. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.
- b. Sometimes I don't feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems.
- c. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective toward them.
- d. Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal.
- e. When I see someone treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them.
- f. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.
- g. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person.

### 2. Altruistic Love/Agape

Some of the following items refer to a specific love relationship, while others refer to general attitudes and beliefs about love. Whenever possible, answer the questions with your current partner in mind. If you do not have a current partner, answer the question with your most recent partner in mind. If you have never been in love, answer in terms of what you think your response would most likely be.

Do you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or strongly disagree with the following statements?

- a. I would rather suffer myself than let the one I love suffer.
- b. I cannot be happy unless I place the one I love's happiness before my own.
- c. I am usually willing to sacrifice my own wishes to let the one I love achieve his/hers.
- d. I would endure all things for the sake of the one I love.

### 3. Altruistic Values

Please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements:

- a. People should be willing to help others who are less fortunate.
- b. Those in need have to learn to take care of themselves and not depend on others.
- c. Personally assisting people in trouble is very important to me.
- d. These days people need to look after themselves and not overly worry about others.



Appendix A (continued)

4. Altruistic Behaviors

During the past 12 months, how often have you done each of the following things:  
CARD: More than once a week/Once a week/Once a month/At least 2 or 3 times in the past year/Once in the past year/Not at all in the past year

- a. Donated blood
- b. Given food or money to a homeless person
- c. Returned money to a cashier after getting too much change
- d. Allowed a stranger to go ahead of you in line
- e. Done volunteer work for a charity
- f. Given money to a charity
- g. Offered your seat on a bus or in a public place to a stranger who was standing
- h. Looked after a person's plants, mail, or pets while they were away
- i. Carried a stranger's belongings, like groceries, a suitcase, or shopping bag
- j. Given directions to a stranger
- k. Let someone you didn't know well borrow a item of some value like dishes or tools

During the past 12 months, how often have you done any of the following things for people you know personally, such as relatives, friends, neighbors, or other acquaintances?

SAQ: More than once a week/Once a week/Once a month/At least 2 or 3 times in the past year/Once in the past year/Not at all in the past year

- a. Helped someone outside your household with housework or shopping
- b. Lent quite a bit of money to another person
- c. Spent time talking with someone who was a bit down or depressed
- d. Helped somebody to find a job