

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND CRIMINOLOGY

THE HEART OF INVOLVEMENT: EMPATHY IN SERVICE AND
PHILANTHROPIC ORGANIZATIONS ON THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE
UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

ALEXANDRA WALSH
SPRING 2014

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for a baccalaureate degree
in Sociology
with honors in Sociology

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Jeffrey Ulmer
Professor of Sociology and Criminology
Thesis Supervisor

Stacy Silver
Associate Professor of Sociology and Human Development
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

How empathetic are the leaders of philanthropic and service organizations on the Penn State campus? This study sought to quantify the empathy levels of the leadership in service and philanthropic organizations in order to compare these levels and see if there is a significant difference in how empathetic leaders of philanthropies are in comparison to leaders of service organizations. The hypothesis was that service organization leaders would be more empathetic than leaders of philanthropic organizations. This was formulated in accordance with the idea that those who self-select themselves into positions that require more “hands on” work with affected populations will require a depth of understanding and a desire for closeness with others (key factors of empathy), while those who self-select into organizations that require less “hands on” work and instead focus more on fundraising will focus less on empathy. 44 participants from service organizations and 20 participants from philanthropic organizations provided responses to an online survey, which was slightly edited from the Toronto Empathy Questionnaire. The responses were quantified and calculated into means. The results did not confirm the hypothesis, instead affirming that service leaders are no more correlated toward empathy than leaders of philanthropic organizations. While organization type is not correlated to empathy score, gender was shown to be correlated with empathy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review.....	3
Chapter 3 Methodology.....	9
Chapter 4 Data and Analysis.....	13
Chapter 5 Discussion.....	18
Index of Tables.....	21
Appendix A Edited Toronto Empathy Questionnaire: Adapted for KwikSurvey.....	28
Appendix B Participant Recruitment and Information Collection: Google Spreadsheet.....	32
Appendix C First Survey Email: Contacting Participants.....	33
Appendix D Second Survey Email: Reminder for Participants.....	34
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	35

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Ethnicity, Executive Position, Gender, College in which Major is Housed, Organization Type, and Political Affiliation	21
Table 2: Mean Empathy Scores for Organization Type.....	23
Table 3: Regression Analysis of Organization Type and Empathy Score	23
Table 4: Correlations between Gender, Organization Type, and Empathy Score	23
Table 5: Multivariate Regression of Organization Type and Gender with Regard to Empathy Score	24
Table 6: Multivariate Regression of Gender and Empathy Score with Regard to Organization Type.....	24
Table 7: Correlations between College, Mean Empathy Score, and Organization Type	25
Table 8: Crosstabulation of Gender and Engineering	25
Table 9: Crosstabulation of Gender and Health and Human Development.....	26
Table 10: Crosstabulation between Gender and the Liberal Arts	26
Table 11: Multivariate Regression of College and Gender with Regard to Mean Empathy Score.....	26
Table 12: Multivariate Regression of College, Gender, and Organization Type with Regard to Mean Empathy Score.....	27

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without the powerful interpersonal experiences made possible at the World in Conversation Center for Public Diplomacy, I would not have been shown the ability of empathy to shape an individual's experience. Thank you to my coaches, colleagues, and mentors for showing me the profound effects of a tiny act.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Everyone has seen it – the ASPCA commercial, Sarah McLachlan crooning quietly in a minor key in the background, images of malnourished and mistreated animals flashing onto the screen, each image worse than the one before it. Responses to this commercial range from hurried searching for the remote through eyes clouded with tears, desperately needing to change the channel to stoic indifference, breaking the hearts of the public relations professionals who crafted the commercial for the intention of breaking through the outer shell and pulling on the heartstrings. Take another example, one that has happened to me and countless others. You are perusing through your social media account when a “friend” posts about a survey required for a class. They implore their virtual audience to please fill it out, it only takes 5 minutes! Does the distance affect us? Will my inability to see her face, hear her voice asking me to participate affect how much I connect with her, feel her experience? Take the earlier example for a different perspective. Will seeing the plight of a struggling animal, his life flashed before me in a short video clip, connect me to my own idea of pets and pet ownership and motivate me to act?

Those who are empathetic are said to have a lot of heart – I seek to find the heart behind Penn State philanthropic and service organizations. While both types of organizations seek to better their world by helping others, I grew curious about which type of organization might come out a bit ahead with regard to how much heart they have. Philanthropy leaders generally have less intimate connections to the population they are working to help due to fundraising efforts, event coordination which provides a space for the population, or other similar “at a distance” type

functions. Service organizations require more hands on efforts from its constituents, putting the leaders on the same level as the population they are trying to help through direct services and side-by-side working together. It would be assumed that service leadership would require greater empathy due to more direct interaction with those they are helping. I sought to explore if this is a reality on Penn State's campus by assessing the levels of empathy in leaders of philanthropies and service organizations.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

In order to have a grasp on the basis of exploring empathy in the leadership of Penn State philanthropy and service organizations, I will break down relevant literature into a number of subcomponents. I will begin by describing empathy - its definition and social and psychological constructs. Empathy will then be broken down into its affective and cognitive dimensions in order to review the breadth of which we experience empathy. This will be followed by a review of leadership styles. I chose to focus my review of leadership on three types in particular: charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leadership. Each leadership style embodies particular modes of conduct for the “executive” and the expected response of the leader’s constituents. I will outline each leadership style, paying particular attention to the degree to which empathy is incorporated into the style’s mission. I will then explain the differentiation between philanthropy and service, followed by scientific data supporting the power of seeing and interaction personally in creating empathy.

Empathy Defined

To be able to empathize with another, two things are required. First, there must be another person with which to empathize. This individual must be experiencing some particular emotional state, and the other must be able to experience that state *with* that person (Snow 2000). Experiencing empathy is entirely dependent on the presence of a perceived other. Perceiving the emotional state of another can be seen along a psychological or sociological purview. When

looked at from a psychological perspective, it is called social perception. Social perception is when an individual seeks to figure out another's emotion accurately. Feeling that emotion or connecting with the individual on that emotional level is not necessitated with social perception. The sociological perspective turns its focus toward how a person *feels* or *experiences* another person. Take the example of seeing a person who you can tell is experiencing deep sadness. A person empathizing with the other individual would not only notice the sadness, but feel compelled to acknowledge the weight of the sadness and feel the drive to support that experience. (Hobart & Fahlberg 1965). The study of empathy may fall under the realm of behavioral sociology, an approach that emphasizes interpersonal relationships and puts focus on how an individual interprets experiences in society and how that individual experiences relationship with close others (Duncan, Schnore, and Rossi 1959). George Herbert Mead saw individuals as the result of social experience, and that these experiences are integral in shaping and developing the individual, and on a grander level, society. A central tenet of symbolic interactionism is being able to take on the roles of many different others (Forte 1997).

Dual Dimensions of Empathy

Empathy has two different dimensions. Cognitive empathy and affective empathy emphasize particular facets of the perspective-taking element. Cognitive empathy relates to a person's ability to acknowledge, understand, and appreciate the thoughts of another. Affective empathy is the ability to have awareness and care for another person's feelings and emotion. Thoughts, which are best understood through cognitive empathy, are more concrete and rational. Emotions are more challenging to decipher and relate to, making affective dimension a better indicator of an individual's empathetic capacity. This was demonstrated in a study that asked participants to view videotapes then assess how effective these videos were at recruiting nonprofit

volunteers. The video focused equally on affective and cognitive empathy. Participant groups were broken down into those that focused on feelings, those that focused on thoughts, and those that focused on neither (control group). Afterwards participants filled out an empathy assessment. Once the questionnaire was completed, the participants were asked if they would volunteer time to help prospective students. Analysis of the questionnaire and responses to the volunteer questions showed that those who were asked to focus on the affective measures of empathy while watching the video were 220 percent more likely to volunteer than those who focused only on cognition – a significant difference in altruistic motivation (Oswald 1996). While an individual may be told to focus on one particular element of empathy over another in a controlled environment, cognitive and affective empathy work in tandem – individuals often do not operate solely from one empathy dimension. To be a fully empathetic person, one must be aware then interpret the thoughts of another in addition to a caring, supportive disposition.

Leadership Styles

There are particular leadership styles that enhance its constituents, overpower them, or perhaps use them as only cogs in a greater machine. These leadership styles, as defined and explained by Michael Mumford (2006) are charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic. To what degree does empathy play a role in style? Each leadership style will be described, paying particular attention to how empathy takes part in each style.

Leaders using a well-articulated vision of the future as encouragement for followers are leaders who fall in line with charismatic leadership. Motivation of followers through the use of an emotional pull is part of the core that defines a charismatic leader. Beyond this core component is a charismatic leader's ability to use the vision as a bargaining piece for sacrifices – followers are made to see why the sacrifice is necessary for a greater goal. Centering a group of people around

a common goal creates a sense of shared identity. This shared identity allows followers to experience and embrace things together, making them excited and engaged in the future success of the organization. Beyond creating a shared identity among followers, charismatic leaders make the future goal accessible. The leader makes the goal appear firmly in the grasp of the followers, making group members feel they have a hand in changing their world. It takes a leader who is engaging, willing to talk openly with organization members, and showing genuine interest in their personal experience general members that crafts a charismatic leader. This type of leader is not found in one particular field. Numerous studies have shown support for the ability of organizations led by a charismatic leader to have stronger follower performance, indicating greater motivation to work hard for a common goal. Understanding the followers' drives, goals, and expectations requires empathy on the part of the leader.

The power and importance of a clear, articulated vision plays a role not only in charismatic leadership. Ideological leaders emphasize vision, yet they do not craft an image of the future. Instead, they describe an idealized past, a way of life that should be recaptured in present day. Often the past is seen as more just. Ideological leaders do generate the "group think" that charismatic leaders create. This is due to the focus on what is wrong as opposed to what will be made right. Also, the idealized past is seen as the epitome, negating the weight of followers' views if they are divergent from the vision. This causes followers of ideological leaders to either be very committed to bringing back the glory previous day due to traditional beliefs, or for them to shy away and remove themselves from the group. Historically, ideological leaders tended to be found in nonprofit or political organizations. This leadership style shows some empathy, but it is not connected to the followers. Empathizing with the past, feeling and understanding the power and "right" way of living motivates an ideological leader.

Pragmatic leadership is a style very different from the previous two styles. Pragmatic leaders do not generate a big vision of what is to be accomplished. Focus is put on understanding

the social system at hand, failings and shortcomings within this structure, then creating a step-wise plan of attack to remedy the problems. Followers are expected to perform their duties well and work to solve the issue at hand, yet the leader does not expect this to be done without question. Conversation about goals and projects is key. Pragmatic leaders tend to be found working in the business field. Being rational is a central component of being a pragmatic leader. This style has the least capacity for empathy in the affective dimension. However, leaders of community service organizations may utilize this type of leadership to empathize cognitively with a group of people then implement the necessary projects to help.

Service, Philanthropy, and the Face to Face Connection

In meetings I attended to recruit participants for this study, I would often sit through the entirety of the meeting after making my thesis presentation, waiting for volunteers to approach me after the meeting. It became clear to me in these meetings that organizations created to serve others find themselves not just in one major “nonprofit” category, but rather along a philanthropy dimension or in a service dimension. I was unable to find any relevant literature that supported this differentiation between service and philanthropy, yet it was made apparent in the meetings I attended that there is a difference on the Penn State campus between them. Service organizations related deeply to the idea of working *alongside* their target demographic. There is very little degree of separation between the organization volunteers and the people they are helping. Philanthropic organizations on the Penn State campus had a supreme focus on fundraising. Events were intended to be opportunities to increase funds. Some interaction between the target demographic was involved, but most members of philanthropies remain more distanced from their target population. In essence, service organizations on the Penn State campus appear to have more face time with the people they are helping. This leads me to make assumptions about

empathy levels within the members of these organizations, particularly executives who are doing the majority of organization and planning, regardless of leadership style. A study by Schulte-Rüther, et al. (2007) assessed the power of mirror neurons in face-to-face interactions by asking participants to observe a person's face and evaluate what emotion the person may be feeling, as well as how the participants themselves felt while observing the person's face. This incorporated perspective taking and social cognition, key components to empathy, rather than pure assessment of a person's emotional state, a distinction that distinguishes social perception (psychological) from empathy (sociological). These neural processes were evaluated using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI). A range of emotional states were depicted on the synthetic faces crafted by computer software, such as happiness and disgust. The study found that parts of the brain responsible for mirroring or experiencing what another is experiencing (mirror neurons) and understanding emotions (emotional processing) are correlated when looking at the face of a person experiencing an emotion. The presence of mirror neurons indicates that we seek to relate to others and understand others on an emotional level in social interactions. Outside of the neural support of empathy, infants have shown to develop empathetic responses through a number of avenues, namely through social referencing, motor mimicry, and classical conditioning. Babies follow the eyes of their caregivers when placed in an unfamiliar situation, getting a feel for how to respond to the situation. This is reinforced by conditioning. If facial and physical manifestations of an anxiety response occur while the infant is being held and can feel them, the anxious experience will also occur in the infant. This then is transposed into experiences when the infant need only see the face of an anxious person to then feel that person's anxiety with them (Snow 2000). Would it follow that individuals who are more often interacting with the people they seek to help (service organization leaders) would demonstrate higher levels of empathy due to increased exposure? This is what I sought to uncover.

Chapter 3

Methodology

In order to gain a current view of empathy in service and philanthropy leadership on the Penn State campus, I chose to collect data via online survey. First, I will describe how I chose the Toronto Empathy Questionnaire (TEQ) as the survey for this thesis. Then, a short explanation of the demographic data added to the pre-existing TEQ will be provided. Next, the process of participant recruitment will be described. Additionally, the online survey software used and the export of this data to appropriate outlets (Excel then SPSS) will be illustrated. Finally, I will detail how I coded the data in SPSS.

I was careful to select a preexisting survey that emphasized feeling the experience of the hypothetical other, and asked participants to reflect on their own responses to this anonymous person. I chose to use the Toronto Empathy Questionnaire (TEQ) in lieu of a few other empathy surveys that have garnered praise due to the other surveys appearing to be more outdated, verbally complex, and lengthier than the TEQ. The TEQ keeps questions concise and easily comprehensible. The questions feel intuitive and realistic – participants would be able to relate well to the situations and circumstances presented in the questions. In addition to the questions being concise, the survey itself asks a number of questions covering both affective and cognitive aspects of empathy, yet does not overbear the participant with too many questions (there are 16 questions in total). When assessed for statistical validity, a study conducted by R. Nathan Spreng, Margaret C. McKinnon, Raymond A. Mar, and Brian Levine indicated that the TEQ has “high internal consistency and convergent validity” (p. 68). The TEQ focuses predominately on affective empathy, relating to findings discussed earlier that have found empathy scores to be

higher when encouraging thought along the affective dimension (Spreng et al. 2009), (Oswald 1996).

Upon choosing the TEQ, I added a number of demographic questions to the survey. These questions included age, gender, political affiliation, college in which the participant's major was housed, position title on the executive board, and, most importantly, whether the participant was in a philanthropy or service organization. These two parties will have their empathy scores compared to each other to see if the hypothesis is correct – that executive members of service organizations are more empathetic than philanthropy executive members. The demographic questions and TEQ questions can be found in Appendix A.

In order to reach a wide range of possible participants at one time, I arranged to do short presentations at meetings, in which a number of executive members would be in the same place at the same time. For example, I organized to present my thesis idea and ask for participation at the Council of Lionhearts executive meeting. At this meeting, the presidents and vice presidents of nationally-founded philanthropy and service organizations meet to discuss their past events and future plans. I spoke about my thesis and described what would be the role of their executive boards – taking an online survey which would require 8 minutes of their time. I sat with my laptop, a Google spreadsheet open, and encouraged those interested to come to me after the meeting, provide me with their email address, organization name, and then I would be in contact with them in order to acquire the email addresses of the remainder of their executive boards. At no point did I ask for their personal names. Identifying information was not collected at any point in the survey or during the recruitment phase. A PDF copy of the Google spreadsheet used to collect participant emails can be found in Appendix B. An email was sent out to the emails collected from the Council of Lionhearts executive meeting. I compiled all additional email addresses sent to me via the pre-existing email addresses collected at the Council of Lionhearts meeting into a draft email. This draft email would become the email in which the survey would

be sent out. One email was sent out to all emails collected. This email contained a message from me and the link to the survey. A copy of the email sent out to the participants can be found in Appendix B. Four days after the initial survey email, a second reminder email was sent out. A copy of this second email can be found in Appendix C. Prior to sending out the emails, I put the TEQ into an online survey using KwikSurvey. I chose to use KwikSurvey due to the lack of restrictions on the number of questions that could be asked. Also, it allowed me to create pages: one for an introduction and informed consent agreement, another for demographic information, one for the TEQ questions, and a final page for a thank you note and my contact information. Looking forward to when data would be collected on the participants' responses, I chose KwikSurvey for the ease of data export so transfer into SPSS would be as uncomplicated as possible.

I allowed for two full weeks of data collection. Once data collection was closed, I transferred the data from KwikSurvey into an Excel spreadsheet. Here I made sure all of the data was lined up and comprehensive, making for an easy transfer to SPSS where the data would be analyzed. The data imported into Excel was in a textual format, making for it to be easily understood in Excel, but (to my surprise) not easily used to analyze data in SPSS: the textual Excel data was identified as string variables in SPSS, making it impossible to run any statistical analysis besides frequency data. I recoded each of the variables, including each of the possible responses for each question in the TEQ, so that were functional in SPSS. Categories with only two variables, such as age (18-24 and 25-43), gender (female and male), and organization type (philanthropic and service) were coded as dummy variables. 18-24 was coded as 0 while 25-34 was coded as 1. Females were coded as 0, and males were coded as 1. Finally, philanthropic organizations were coded as 0 while service organizations were coded as 1. The remainder of categories contained multiple variables, such as colleges within Penn State, race, political

affiliation, and executive position. Each was coded starting with 1 and moving in ascending order from that point.

In the data and analysis section to follow, I will begin by reviewing descriptive statistics of interest. Then I will follow with comparisons between service and philanthropy organizations. Last, gender will be explored in conjunction with organization type and empathy. Colleges within Penn State will also be analyzed in reference to empathy and organization affiliation.

Chapter 4

Data and Analysis

The data collected from the 64 participants was compiled into one SPSS file. Within this file there existed yet untapped comparisons, correlations, and descriptions of relationships. First, descriptive statistics give us a basic understanding of the sample. Next, the relationship between empathy and organization affiliation was explored using mean comparisons, crosstabulation, and one way ANOVA. After this key relationship between empathy and organization type was revealed, I began to explore where other relationships might exist. First, I focused on gender, then the colleges within Penn State. The relationships here were explored using crosstabulations and multivariate regression.

The first step taken in data analysis was running descriptive statistics. I will bring particular attention to only a few of the variables for their relevance to the composition and nature of the sample: ethnicity, gender, college in which major is housed, and organization type. Each of these variables are housed in Table 1. With regard to ethnic composition, white people make up 89.2 percent of the sample. There are no black or Native American people represented in the sample. While not dominating the sample to the same degree as is seen by white people in the description of ethnicity, women make up 67.7 percent of the sample. The colleges in which the participants' respective majors are housed is not evenly spread. The largest concentrations of participants are in the College of Engineering (21.5 percent), The Liberal Arts (20.0 percent), and Health and Human Development (13.8 percent). These three schools will be the focus of the data analysis since they have the most significant percentages of participants. The greater

representation service leaders in the sample as opposed to philanthropy leaders causes a slight skew, with service leaders making up 67.7 percent of the sample.

(Table 1 about here)

To assess the core nature of the research, the mean empathy scores of the two organization types, service and philanthropy, were compared. As seen in Table 2, service organizations had a mean empathy score of 3.0833 while philanthropy organizations had a mean score of 3.0094. However, there is slightly more variance in mean scores in service than philanthropy.

(Table 2 about here)

The significance of this relationship was further explored. This was done using one way ANOVA in an effort to simultaneously uncover the relationship between groups and within each group. Table 12 provides the data. The F ratio is 1.029, indicating that the means of service and philanthropy are nearly equal. The relationship between means is not significant, as demonstrated by the p value of 0.457. Yet, the data shows that between group variance is less than the within group significance.

(Table 3 about here)

Other possible relationships connected to empathy score and organization type will now be analyzed. I will begin with gender. A correlation matrix including gender, organization type, and empathy score showed strong correlations between gender and empathy score. This can be seen in the strong negative relationship, resulting in an r of -0.402 where female equals 0 and male equals 1. This very same relationship showed a significance of 0.001, a strong p value. The relationship between gender and organization type indicated a weak positive relationship, resulting in an r of 0.018 where philanthropy equals 0 and service equals 1. The p value for this relationship was far from significant, equaling 0.887. See Table 4 for details.

(Table 4 about here)

To further explain the significance of gender in conjunction with either empathy or organization type, two multivariate regressions were conducted: one in which empathy score was the dependent variable, and the other with organization type as the dependent variable. Table 5 describes the relationships that occur when organization type is controlled for gender, and vice versa, and their respective relationships with empathy. When controlled for organization type, gender remains statistically significant with a p-value of 0.001. The same cannot be said for organization type when controlled for gender, which has a p-value of 0.511.

(Table 5 about here)

When the dependent variable was switched to organization type, there were no significant relationships to be found – even when the constant, organization type, was compared to itself. This can be seen in Table 6.

(Table 6 about here)

The next variable of interest to be explored in relation to empathy score and organization type was college in which majors of the participants are housed. As was done with gender, correlations were calculated. The three largest colleges represented in the sample, Engineering, the Liberal Arts, and Health and Human Development, were correlated with empathy score and organization type. This can be seen in Table 7. Both Health and Human Development and Engineering showed statistically significant correlations with empathy score. Engineering had a moderate negative correlation to empathy with an r value of -0.317, while Health and Human Development reported an r value of 0.261, a weak positive correlation. A correlation between the Liberal Arts and organization type was the only statistically significant relationship seen regarding organization type. The r value of 0.257 shows a weak positive relationship where 0 equals philanthropy and 1 equals service.

(Table 7 about here)

With Engineering and Health and Human Development indicating a correlated statistical significance with regard to empathy score, colleges were then broken down further to see what might be dictating the connection between empathy scores (Engineering negatively correlated and Health and Human Development positively correlated). Tables 8, 9, and 10 show gender crosstabulated with Engineering, Health and Human Development, and the Liberal Arts. With regard to Engineering, its relationship with gender crosstabulated in Table 8, 0 equals all other majors while 1 equals Engineering. There is an even split between males and females in Engineering.

(Table 8 about here)

Health and Human Development tells a different story. When crosstabulated with gender, as seen in Table 19, it is clear that men are outnumbered by women 8 to 1.

(Table 9 about here)

Despite not having statistical significance, Liberal Arts major was crosstabulated with gender as well to get a perspective on the gender distribution of other colleges. Table 20 shows that while not extremely outnumbered like with Health and Human Development, the Liberal Arts has a larger proportion of women (8) compared to men (5).

(Table 10 about here)

These tables indicate that engineering has the largest number of males proportionally to the sample size. To then further explore the relationship between engineering, gender, and empathy score, Liberal Arts, Health and Human Development, Engineering, and gender were analyzed using mean empathy score as the dependent variable in multivariate regression, as seen in Table 11. Table 11 shows that when controlling for gender, the statistical significance between engineering and empathy no longer exists. The only statistically significant relationship that remains is that between gender and empathy, which has p-value of 0.006.

(Table 11 about here)

When the additional control of organization type is introduced to the multivariate analysis containing the top three colleges, gender, and empathy as the dependent variable, gender is the only variable that remains significant yet again with a p-value of 0.007. This can be seen in Table 12.

(Table 12 about here)

Chapter 5

Discussion

In order to interpret the data and provide a more significant analysis, I will focus on a few particularly relevant points: These data points are: (1) the relationship between empathy and organization affiliation, (2) the big three colleges and their connection to empathy, (3) the influence and impact of gender. While discussing these data points, new perspectives and topics for future research will be introduced. Finally, the limitations of this study will be discussed, two major points of which are gender and race.

The difference between philanthropic and service mean empathy scores was analyzed using one way ANOVA. No significant relationship between organization type and empathy levels emerged. There was only the slight difference in empathy score means between the groups, which was not significant, and was possibly created by the larger sample of service organization leaders than philanthropy organization leaders. These findings do not support my hypothesis that service organization leaders at Penn State are more empathetic than philanthropy organization leaders. This result indicates that the power of working “hands on” with the population being helped does not play a significant role in empathetic drive. Instead, it seems to support the idea that those who can understand and appreciate the experience of another, on both cognitive and emotional levels, will be engaged in experiences that allow them to connect with others in some way. There was, however, a difference *within* groups – there was more variation within the service leaders than between the service leaders and philanthropy leaders. What is causing this difference within organizations? A possible factor to be introduced to the equation is power. Future research would do well to explore the intersection of empathy and power as motivators. Pre-existing research on leadership styles and an analysis of the empathy and power dynamics

that lie within them would provide a strong base. The executive position of the participants would play a greater role in this type of analysis.

The three colleges with the largest percentages of participants, Engineering, the Liberal Arts, and Health and Human Development, covered a spectrum of skillsets. Engineering, traditionally known for hard skills and analytical thought, balanced the soft skills and human elements well known in Liberal Arts and Health and Human Development. Engineering, seemed to be set up for low empathy scores while the Liberal Arts and Health and Human Development would be assumed to report higher levels of empathy. This relationship was seen in the data, yet the negative relationship between empathy and engineering was the only statistically significant result. A possible factor in helping to create this relationship was introduced into the analysis: gender, a factor that was highly correlated to empathy. Engineering was found to have more males proportionately than the other two colleges. After controlling for gender in multivariate regression, the relationship between engineering and empathy score disappeared, while gender controlled for the three major colleges remained highly related to empathy score. It can be deduced that there is a spurious relationship between the mean empathy score and engineering college, caused by the indirect influence of gender.

Focusing more specifically on gender, there is a connection between higher empathy scores and being female. This relationship is reflected in the relationship between gender and empathy alone, and when gender was used as a control for colleges. While this was not an anticipated connection and is not discussed in the literature presented, the power of gender in relation to empathy raises a number of interesting questions. Women are often lauded in gender literature as being more empathetic than men. Questions lie in what shapes this empathy. How do women become more empathetic than men? The argument of nature versus nurture may be a point of exploration. How does the socialization of men and women in society generate empathy levels that differentiate along a gender line?

There were a number of limitations to this research that make it challenging to apply to a broader population. First and foremost, there was the challenge of acquiring a representative sample. The selection of the participants was nonrandom due to the requirement that they be a leader of a service or philanthropy organization. Another factor contributing to the nonrandom nature of participant selection was that the students must be current Penn State students over 18 years old. Also, with the sample size of the survey, 64 participants, it was challenging to conduct adequate statistical analysis. Having too few cases runs the risk of compromising the validity of the regression relationships due to too much interrelationship among the variables.

Some limitations arose due to the nature of the participants. Predominately female and overwhelmingly white, this sample was not polling a spectrum of lifestyles. This calls into question what the breakdown of gender and race/ethnicity compositions are in philanthropy and service organizations on other college campuses, or even outside of the collegiate setting – does this gender and race composition exist in social service professions? Those who are white and exploring professions in social services are often told to be cognizant of the “white savior” complex. How does whiteness influence participation in community service organizations? Are there different motivators for service and philanthropy involvement for different races? Does white privilege and possibly guilt come into play? These are questions worth exploring in future research.

Index of Tables

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Ethnicity, Executive Position, Gender, College in which Major is Housed, Organization Type, and Political Affiliation

Variable (General)	Variable (Specific)	Frequency	Percent
Ethnicity	White	58	89.2
	Hispanic or Latina/o	1	1.5
	Asian/Pacific Islander	5	7.7
	Missing	1	1.5
Executive Position	President/Co-President	15	23.1
	Vice President	5	7.7
	Secretary	1	1.5
	Treasurer	5	7.7
	Other	38	58.5
	Missing	1	1.5
Gender	Female	44	67.7
	Male	20	30.8
	Missing	1	1.5
College in which Major is Housed	Agricultural Sciences	1	1.5
	Smeal College of Business	2	3.1
	Communications	3	4.6
	Education	3	4.6

	Engineering	14	21.5
	Health and Human Development	9	13.8
	Information Sciences and Technology	2	3.1
	The Liberal Arts	13	20.0
	College of Nursing	1	1.5
	Eberly College of Sciences	6	9.2
	Division of Undergraduate Studies	2	3.1
	Missing	9	13.8
Organization Type	Philanthropy	20	30.8
	Service	44	67.7
	Missing	1	1.5
Political Affiliation	Democrat	34	52.2
	Republican	11	16.9
	Libertarian	6	9.2
	Green	1	1.5
	Other	12	18.5
	Missing	1	1.5
Total (for each general variable)		65	100

Table 2: Mean Empathy Scores for Organization Type

Organization Type	Mean	Number of Cases	Standard Deviation	Variance
Philanthropy	3.0094	3.0833	0.37240	0.139
Service	3.0833	42	0.43338	0.188
Total	3.0595	62	0.41310	0.717

Table 3: Regression Analysis of Organization Type and Empathy Score

ANOVA: Comparing Organization Type and Mean Empathy Score					
Organization Type	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.201	23	0.226	1.029	0.457
Within Groups	8.348	38	0.220		
Total	13.548	61			

Table 4: Correlations between Gender, Organization Type, and Empathy Score

Correlations				
		Gender	Organization Type	Mean Score
Pearson Correlations:	Gender	1	0.018	-0.402
	Organization Type	0.018	1	0.084
	Mean Score	-0.402	0.084	1

Table 5: Multivariate Regression of Organization Type and Gender with Regard to Empathy Score

Coefficients					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	3.118	0.092		34.063	0.000
Organization Type	0.069	0.104	0.078	0.661	0.551
Gender	-0.362	0.107	-0.401	-3.372	0.001

Table 6: Multivariate Regression of Gender and Empathy Score with Regard to Organization Type

Coefficients					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	0.344	0.516		0.666	0.508
Gender	0.024	0.146	0.023	0.162	0.872
Mean Score	0.107	0.162	0.094	0.661	0.511

Table 7: Correlations between College, Mean Empathy Score, and Organization Type

Correlations						
		Engineering	Health and Human Development	Liberal Arts	Organization Type	Mean Score
Pearson Correlations:	Engineering	1	-0.210	-0.262	-0.133	-0.317
	Health and Human Development	-0.210	1	-0.200	-0.212	0.261
	Liberal Arts	-0.262	0.200	1	0.257	0.41
	Organization Type	-0.133	-0.212	0.257	1	0.084
	Mean Score	-0.317	0.261	0.41	0.84	1

Table 8: Crosstabulation of Gender and Engineering

		Engineering		
		.00	1.00	Total
Gender	Female	37	7	44
	Male	13	7	20
Total		50	14	64

Table 9: Crosstabulation of Gender and Health and Human Development

		Health and Human Development		Total
		.00	1.00	
Gender	Female	36	8	44
	Male	19	1	20
Total		55	9	64

Table 10: Crosstabulation between Gender and the Liberal Arts

		Liberal Arts		Total
		.00	1.00	
Gender	Female	36	8	44
	Male	15	5	20
Total		51	13	64

Table 11: Multivariate Regression of College and Gender with Regard to Mean Empathy Score

	Coefficients				
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	3.154	0.075		42.029	0.000
Engineering	-0.206	0.127	-0.205	-1.630	0.109
Liberal Arts	0.041	0.128	0.039	0.319	0.751
Health and Human Development	0.199	0.143	0.171	1.394	0.169
Gender	-0.303	0.107	-0.336	-2.836	0.006

Table 12: Multivariate Regression of College, Gender, and Organization Type with Regard to Mean Empathy Score

Coefficients					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	3.102	0.108		28.706	0.000
Organization Type	0.072	0.107	0.082	0.672	0.504
Engineering	-0.194	0.128	-0.193	-1.510	0.137
Liberal Arts	0.026	0.131	0.025	0.200	0.842
Health and Human Development	0.219	0.147	0.188	1.493	0.141
Gender	-0.301	0.108	-0.334	-2.802	0.007

Appendix A

Edited Toronto Empathy Questionnaire: Adapted for KwikSurvey

From the following drop down menu, please select that option that best represents your consent to participate in this survey. If you choose to consent to participate, please continue onto the following pages. If you do not consent to participate, please close out of the survey window at your convenience.

- Yes, I agree to participate in this survey
- No, I do not agree to participate in this survey

What is your age?

- 18-24 years old
- 25-34 years old
- 35 years or older

Please specify your ethnicity

- White
- Hispanic or Latino
- Black or African American
- Native American or American Indian
- Asian / Pacific Islander
- Other

What position do you hold within the organization that is asking you to complete this survey?

- President/Co-President
- Vice President
- Secretary
- Treasurer
- Other

Please specify your gender:

- Male
- Female
- Transgender

What political party most closely aligns with your personal ideologies?

- Democrat
- Republican
- Libertarian
- Green
- Other

Under what category does your organization fall under? If there are aspects of both within your organization, please select the one that is most prominent.

- Philanthropy
- Service

Please select the college under which your major is housed. If you have more than one major, please select each of the colleges that house your respective majors.

- Agricultural Sciences
- Arts and Architecture
- Smeal College of Business
- Communications
- Earth and Mineral Sciences
- Education
- Engineering
- Health and Human Development
- Information Sciences and Technology
- The Liberal Arts
- College of Medicine
- College of Nursing
- Eberly College of Sciences
- School of Law
- Division of Undergraduate Studies

Below is a list of statements. Please read each statement carefully and rate how frequently you feel or act in the manner described. There are no right or wrong answers or trick questions. Please answer each question as honestly as you can.

For the following questions, please provide one of the answers on the below scale:

- A. Never
- B. Rarely
- C. Sometimes
- D. Often
- E. Always

1. When someone else is feeling excited, I tend to get excited too
2. Other people's misfortunes do not disturb me a great deal
3. It upsets me to see someone being treated disrespectfully
4. I remain unaffected when someone close to me is happy
5. I enjoy making other people feel better
6. I have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me
7. When a friend starts to talk about his/her problems, I try to steer the conversation towards something else
8. I can tell when others are sad even when they do not say anything
9. I find that I am "in tune" with other people's moods
10. I do not feel sympathy for people who cause their own serious illnesses
11. I become irritated when someone cries
12. I am not really interested in how other people feel
13. I get a strong urge to help when I see someone who is upset
14. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I do not feel very much pity for them
15. I find it silly for people to cry out of happiness

16. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards him/her

Scoring

Never = 0; Rarely = 1; Sometimes = 2; Often = 3; Always = 4.

- Item responses are scored according to the following scale for positively worded items

1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 16.

- The following negatively worded items are reverse scored:

2, 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15.

Scores are summed to derive total for the Toronto Empathy Questionnaire.

Appendix B

Participant Recruitment and Information Collection: Google Spreadsheet

Organization Name	Email address
Alpha Phi Omega	alj5172@psu.edu
STATERs	clh5253@psu.edu
Rotaract	rad5326@psu.edu
Student Red Cross Club	npf5017@psu.edu
Paws of Friendship	sif5205@psu.edu, nqa5132@psu.edu seb5665@psu. edu,
On My Honor	mii5045@psu.edu crp5203@psu.edu rec5248@psu.edu Jap5546@psu. edu,
Student United Way	Car5474@psu.edu nwa5113@psu. edu sam5924@psu. edu slh5554@psu.edu zwi5004@psu.edu sgz5012@psu.edu ams6669@psu. edu
Circle K	egk5043@psu.edu
Council Of LionHearts	zkd5001@psu.edu
National Society of Collegiate Scholars	ecg5075@psu.edu mpd5181@gmail. com philip.evan. brown@gmail.com shemdog123@gmai erin. ryan2014@gmail. com gage@outlook. com jablake127@gmail. com sbw5091@gmail. com precious707@gmai lbacque1292@gmai kwe5054@psu. edu lsw5086@psu.edu bvh5114@psu.edu
Engineering House	tl5183@psu.edu
Gamma Sigma Sigma	nqs5160@psu.edu

Appendix C

First Survey Email: Contacting Participants

THIS SURVEY IS HERE! - please complete by March 7 (this Friday!)   

Thesis x



Alexandra Walsh <arw5241@gmail.com>

Mar 3 ☆



to alj5172, clh5253, rad5326, npf5017, sif5205, nqa5132, seb5665, Madeline, crp5203, r

Greetings, everyone!

Thank you for your interest in taking my survey! Just to reiterate its purpose, the survey will be asking you questions about how empathetic you are in addition to some basic demographic information. **Once you complete the survey (5 minutes of your time maximum), your job is done!** I will be sending out reminder emails throughout the week to be sure that as many people as possible participate. **Please complete the survey by March, 7 (this Friday!)** Also, if you happen to be curious about your particular empathy score, please do not hesitate to contact me at arw5241@gmail.com and I will tell you your score.

Here is the survey! WOOHOO!! -- <http://kwiksurveys.com/s.asp?sid=g8xro95e1fz67rw276591>

Again, thank you very much for making this become a reality! Have a great week!

Best,
Lexie Walsh

Appendix D

Second Survey Email: Reminder for Participants



Alexandra Walsh <arw5241@gmail.com>

Mar 7 ☆



to Abigail, clh5253, rad5326, npf5017, sif5205, nqa5132, seb5665, Madeline, crp5203, r ▾

Hello there, everyone!

Just a reminder that today is **last day** to complete the survey! If you have not forwarded the survey to your executive board yet, please do so today and be sure to request that they complete it ASAP. To all that have participated - **thank you so, so, so much!!!** I am extremely appreciative of your time and your ability to be empathetic to my needs as a stressed out senior trying to finish up everything!

I have put the link to the survey here: <http://kwiksurveys.com/s.asp?sid=g8xro95e1fz67rw276591>

Please do not hesitate to contact me with questions or concerns!

Thank you and have a great spring break!
Lexie



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hobart, Charles W. and Nancy Fahlberg. 1965. "The Measurement of Empathy." *American Journal of Sociology*. 70(5): 595-603.
- Snow, Nancy E. 2000. "Empathy." *American Philosophical Quarterly*. 37(1): 65-78.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley, Leo F. Schnore, and Peter H. Rossi. 1959. "Cultural, Behavioral, and Ecological Perspectives in the Study of Social Organization." *American Journal of Sociology*. 65(2): 132-153.
- Mumford, Michael D. 2006. *Pathways to Outstanding Leadership: A Comparative Analysis of Charismatic, Ideological, and Pragmatic Leaders*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Schulte-Rüther, Martin, Hans J. Markowitsch, Gereon R. Fink, and Martina Piefke. 2007. "Mirror Neuron and Theory of Mind Mechanisms Involved in Face-to-Face Interactions: A Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Approach to Empathy." *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*. 19(8): 1354-1372.
- Oswald, Patricia A. 1996. "The Effects of Cognitive and Affective Perspective Taking on Empathic Concern and Altruistic Helping." *Journal of Social Psychology*. 136(5): 613-623.
- Forte, James A. "Calling Students to Serve the Homeless: A Project to Promote Altruism and Community Service." *Journal of Social Work Education*. 33(1): 151-166.
- Spreng, R. Nathan, Margaret C. McKinnon, Raymond A. Mar, and Brian Levine. 2009. "The Toronto Empathy Questionnaire: Scale Development and Initial Validation of a Factor-Analytic Solution to Multiple Empathy Measures." *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 91(1): 62-71.

ACADEMIC VITA

Alexandra Walsh

346 Jamestown Circle, Eagleville, PA 19403

arw5241@psu.edu

Education

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

B.A., Sociology

Minor in Human Development and Family Studies

May 2014

Honors and Awards

Sociology Student Marshal

Evan Pugh Scholar

Member of Phi Beta Kappa

Association Memberships/Activities

Facilitator at the World in Conversation Center for Public Diplomacy

Fall 2013-Spring 2014

- Engage in radically open 90-minute dialogues on contentious issues such as U.S. race relations, gender, and West/Middle East relations four to five times per week

Vice President of the Liberal Arts Undergraduate Council (LAUC)

Fall 2013-Spring 2014

- Plan, organize, and execute events relevant to the Liberal Arts experience
- Connect current council members to LAUC alumni and clubs/organizations relevant to the Liberal Arts through Spotlight program

Professional Experience

Internal Development Intern at Special Olympics Pennsylvania (SOPA)

Norristown, PA and University Park, PA

Summer 2013-Spring 2014

- Expand and develop student engagement for the Beaver Stadium Run through founding of Special Olympics Club (fall/spring)
- Planned, staffed, and organized a "Thank You" letter writing campaign, allowing four athletes to reach out to twenty volunteers and corporate sponsors with messages of appreciation (summer)

Editorial Assistant at *Contemporary Sociology*

University Park, PA

Spring 2012-Spring 2014

- Catalog a minimum of 15 books to be reviewed per week into seven major sociological themes so appropriate scholars can be contacted for review
- Copy-edit a minimum of 20 book review manuscripts per week, written by top scholars

We approve the thesis of Alexandra Walsh

Date of Signature

Jeffrey Ulmer
Professor of Sociology and Criminology
Thesis Supervisor

Stacy Silver
Associate Professor of Sociology and Human Development
Honors Adviser