An Annotated Bibliography of Research
on Personality and Individual Differences in Altruism

Shelley Dean Kilpatrick and Michael E. McCullough

"Spread love everywhere you go: first of all in your own house. Give love to your children, to your wife or husband, to a next door neighbor... Let no one ever come to you without leaving better and happier. Be the living expression of God's kindness; kindness in your face, kindness in your eyes, kindness in your smile, kindness in your warm greeting."
        -Mother Theresa

"Kindness in words creates confidence
Kindness in thinking creates profoundness
Kindness in giving creates love."
        -Lao-tzu

        Altruism is a concept that is infused with goodness and positivity, yet great conflict exists over its definition. Is altruism who you are, a set of personality traits and inborn characteristics, or is it simply a learned prosocial behavior pattern? Does altruism require sacrifice on the part of the giver, or can giving from abundance also constitute altruism? Must the motivations of altruistic behavior be free from any benefit to the giver or should it only be free of direct return for goods and services? The goal of this annotated bibliography is to provide a broad overview of the literature concerning personality characteristics and individual differences associated with altruism – traditional personality characteristics, gender, socio-demographics, and other individual differences are all included. It does not seek to settle philosophical issues concerning the true nature of altruism. Furthermore, it does not settle the debate about whether the source of altruism is "nature" or "nurture". Its
        The researchers in the studies presented use multiple operationalizations of altruism. Emergency helping, prosocial behavior, positive societal behavior, and charity are all represented. Among the topics covered are the altruistic personality, altruistic behavior, empathy, empathic concern, helping behavior, organizational behavior, religiosity, social responsibility, and volunteerism. A list of articles by topic is provided at the end of this work. Methodologies are as diverse as the operationalizations. Studies include experiments, quasi-experiments, local surveys, national surveys, naturalistic observation, and combinations of these.
        Although the goal of the bibliography was to be broad, representing approaches from sociology, social psychology, developmental psychology, education, and business, it was not designed to be comprehensive. An emphasis was placed on more current research from the 1980s and 1990s along with the inclusion of a few "classics". Because social psychology has contributed much to empirical work on altruism, the articles represent social psychological work more than other areas. Also, only empirical research was chosen for the annotated bibliography. Review articles, books, and book chapters fall outside the scope of the annotated bibliography.
        The most predominant theme which arose in the preparation of the annotated bibliography is the clear evidence that altruistic behavior is multiply determined. Personality characteristics such as inclination to be empathic toward others or general

agreeableness provide the building blocks on which altruism is based. These are combined with differences in gender, culture, religion, and other socio-demographic variables that affect a *learned* general inclination to behave altruistically. In the midst of the situation, the type of appeal of the needy person or charity, the physical distance of the person from the potential giver, and a multitude of other factors affect whether an altruistically inclined person will actually enact the altruistic behavior. As is evident in the life and words of Mother Teresa and the word of Lao-Tzu, altruism involves kindness in thought, word, and deed which extends beyond the love of those who love you in return.

Personality and Individual Differences in Altruism
Annotated Bibliography

Archer, R. L., Diaz-Loving, R., Gollwitzer, P. M., Davis, M. H., & Foushee, H. C. (1981). The role of dispositional empathy and social evaluation in the empathic mediation of helping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 786-790.

Objective: To determine the role that individual differences in empathy and situationally induced evaluation play in helping

Design: Experiment

Setting: University of Texas at Austin

Participants: Participants were 123 female students participating in partial fulfillment of course requirements. Participants were chosen who were above or below the median on a pre-test measure of dispositional empathy.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants completed a measure of dispositional empathy (Mehrabian-Epstein, 1972) in a pre-testing session. Upon arrival at the laboratory, participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions. Two variables were manipulated: potential evaluation from others (demand) and false feedback indicating level of arousal (high or low). In the demand condition participants were told that the experimenter would be aware of their level of autonomic arousal as measured by the Galvanic Skin Response meter attached to their fingers. In the no demand condition, the participants were told that the machine recorded the information privately and the experimenter would not know their level of autonomic arousal. All participants then watched two videotaped recordings. During the second videotape, concerning a graduate student who needed volunteers for her experiment, half of the participants saw the Galvanic Skin Response meter needle increase to between +12 and +15 on a 30-point scale indicating high arousal. The other half of the participants saw the needle range from –3 to +3 throughout the recording indicating low arousal.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: All participants were given the opportunity to respond to the request for help from the graduate student by indicating how much time they would be willing to volunteer for her study in 30 minute increments. Reponses were placed in sealed envelopes so that the participant believed that the experimenter would be unaware of whether the participant volunteered. Participants also filled out a questionnaire addressing the amount of empathic concern they felt for the needy graduate student and the amount of personal distress they felt for themselves.

Main Results: A multiple regression of demand, arousal, and dispositional empathy on *empathic concern* for the student revealed a three way interaction ($\underline{F}$ (1, 112) = 4.20, $\underline{p}$ < .05). There was an interaction of arousal and demand for high

dispositional empathy participants (F (1, 112) = 3.7, p < .056), but not for low dispositional empathy participants (F < 1, ns). For participants with high dispositional empathy, high arousal was related to higher reports of empathic concern for the graduate student for high demand participants (F (1, 112) = 5.90, p < .02). There was no significant effect for low demand participants on empathic concern. On self reports of personal distress there were main effects of dispositional empathy (F (1, 112) = 5.2, p < .03) and demand (F (1, 112) = 4.17, p < .05), such that participants with high empathy and high demand reported more personal distress than participants with low empathy and low demand.

A multiple regression of demand, arousal, and dispositional empathy on *number of hours volunteered* revealed a main effect for dispositional empathy (F (1, 112) = 5.01, p < .03) and a three way interaction (F (1, 112) = 6.25, p < .02). Participants high in dispositional empathy helped more than participants low in dispositional empathy. There was an interaction of arousal and demand for high dispositional empathy participants (F (1, 112) = 4.13, p < .04), but not for low dispositional empathy participants (F < 1, ns). For participants with high dispositional empathy, high arousal was related to more helping for high demand participants (F (1, 112) = 10.26, p < .001). There was no significant effect for low demand participants on helping. For participants with low dispositional empathy, low arousal, or low demand there was relatively little helping. In multiple regression analyses, empathic concern (F (1, 116) = 23.28, p < .001) and the interaction of empathic concern and personal distress (F (1, 116) = 4.31, p < .04) influenced willingness to help. For participants high in empathic concern, personal distress predicted helping.

Conclusion: "Empathy as a dispositional factor and social evaluation as a situational factor interacted with arousal feedback to predict helping." Confirming the authors' hypothesis, for participants high in dispositional empathy, demand and arousal helped more than those participants high in empathy and demand, but low in arousal.

Commentary: Archer et al.'s (1981) study is a typical example of how dispositional empathy acts in combination with a situational factor (public awareness) and perceived autonomic arousal to influence the person's willingness to respond altruistically. None of the factors alone was sufficient and, with respect to empathic concern expressed and willingness to help, all three were necessary for altruism to be displayed. It is interesting that arousal was necessary for the display of altruism in this study as arousal is one of the elements common in emergency situations where prosocial behavior is required. The arousal may provide the physical energy necessary to carry out the altruistic act. Multiple determination of altruism is a theme that recurs throughout this bibliography.

Correspondence: None Available

Ashton, M. C., Paunonen, S. V., Helmes, E., & Jackson, D. N. (1998). Kin altruism, reciprocal altruism, and the Big Five personality factors. Evolution & Human Behavior, 19(4), 243-255.

Objective: To identify personality characteristics associated with kin altruism and reciprocal altruism, and to relate those characteristics to the Big Five personality dimensions

Design: Cross-sectional survey, questionnaire study with convenience sample

Setting: Large Canadian University

Participants: One hundred eighteen introductory psychology students participated in partial fulfillment of course requirements. The median age was 19 years old (range 17-30). Sixty-nine participants were women and 49 were men.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Kin altruism is defined as when one acts in a manner that jeopardizes one's own well-being while protecting or promoting that of one's own kin. In reciprocal altruism, actions are based on the notion that today's giver of supportive acts will be tomorrow's receiver (Reber, 1995 p. 26). Kin altruism and Reciprocal altruism personality measures were two sets of eight items-- an empathy/attachment scale and a forgiveness/non-retaliation scale. empathy/attachment was presumed to measure kin altruism (i.e., feeling sorry for one's relatives and close friends), while forgiveness/non-retaliation was presumed to measure reciprocal altruism (i.e., the tendency to hesitate to forgive other people).

Assessment of Outcome Variables: A self-report of overall altruistic behavior was administered – the Responsibility subscale of the Jackson Personality Inventory-Revised (Jackson, 1994). Kin and reciprocal altruism were measured with a money allocation task (Kramer, et al., 1986). Participants were to choose an amount of money to divide hypothetically between themselves and another person. For example, a participant could choose between a) $125 for self and $75 for other versus b) $150 for self and $50 for other. The relationship of the participant to the hypothetical other (close friend or non-cooperative person) was varied in each allocation task. The big five personality factors were measured in this study with the 40 adjectives of Saucier's (1994) Big Five Mini-Markers scale and 16 adjectives which represent the four quadrants of the agreeableness and emotional stability factor plane (i.e., patient, critical, sensitive, and unemotional).

Main Results: Both the empathy/attachment scale and the forgiveness/non-retaliation scale correlated positively with participants' scores on the Jackson Personality Inventory- Revised. This suggests that each is related to altruistic behavior. The two scales are not, however, related to each other (r = .04, ns). In the money allocation task, 68% of participants were altruistic in the close friend condition while only 10% of participants were altruistic in the non-cooperator condition. When the altruistic money allocation involved a friend, the empathy/attachment scale was

positively correlated with money allocation (r = .35, p <.01), while the forgiveness/non-retaliation scale was not (r = .11, ns). However, when the altruistic money allocation involved a non-cooperator, the forgiveness/non-retaliation scale was positively correlated with money allocation(r = .26, p <.01), while the empathy/attachment scale was not (r = -.06, ns).

Both the empathy/attachment scale and the forgiveness/non-retaliation scale were positively correlated with the personality factor agreeableness (rs = .41 and .29, respectively; ps <.01). However, they correlated in opposite directions with respect to the emotional stability personality factor. The higher the participant's empathy/attachment score, the lower was his or her emotional stability score (r = -.19, p <.05). The higher the participant's forgiveness/non-retaliation score, the higher his or her emotional stability score (r = .21, p <.05). The 16 adjectives that represent the four quadrants of the agreeableness and emotional stability factor plane help present a consistent picture of the relationship between altruism and personality. The high agreeableness/low emotional stability quadrant is highly positively correlated with the empathy/attachment scale (r = .50, p <.001) and is not at all correlated with the forgiveness/non-retaliation scale (r = -.02, ns). In contrast, the high agreeableness/high emotional stability quadrant is highly positively correlated with the forgiveness/non-retaliation scale (r = .50, p <.001) and not at all correlated with the empathy/attachment scale (r = .17, ns).

Conclusion: "The personality traits thought to facilitate altruism directed mainly toward kin are strongly related to high agreeableness and low emotional stability, whereas the personality traits thought to facilitate altruism directed mainly toward non-kin are strongly related to high agreeableness and high emotional stability." Also, altruism directed at kin is facilitated by personality traits of empathy and attachment while altruism directed at non-kin is facilitated by personality traits of forgiveness and non-retaliation.

Commentary: Ashton et al.'s (1998) study points out that prosocial behavior consists of at least two different sets. On one hand, we have prosocial behavior toward kin and close relationship partners. On the other hand, we have prosocial behavior toward non-kin or people in general. These two forms of prosocial behavior have some similar personality substrates (e.g., agreeableness), but also have some different ones (e.g., emotional stability). These findings remind us that prosocial behavior (and its personality substrates) might very well differ across classes of prosocial behavior.

Correspondence: None Available

Axelrod, S. R., Widiger, T. A., Trull, T. J., & Corbitt, E. M. (1997). Relations of Five-Factor Model antagonism facets with personality disorder symptomatology. Journal of Personality Assessment, 69(2), 297-313.

Objective: To assess the relationship between lower order facets of agreeableness/antagonism with personality disorder symptoms

Design: Cross-sectional survey, questionnaire study including structured interview in a convenience sample

Setting: a university

Participants: Participants were 81 undergraduate students enrolled in introductory psychology. Sixty-two percent of the participants were female. The mean age was 20 years old (range 18-39).

Assessment of Predictor Variables: The NEO-Personality Inventory-Revised (Costa & McCrae, 1992), a self-report questionnaire, was used to measure the six facets of the agreeableness versus antagonism personality factor (trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty, and tendermindedness). The Structured Interview of the Five Factor Model (antagonism subscale) was also used to assess the degree to which the participant displayed each of the 6 facets of agreeableness versus antagonism. The scoring system is a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (prominent antagonism) to 5 (prominent agreeableness) on each of 48 items.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Personality disorders were assessed with two self-report questionnaires - the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory –PD (Morey, Waugh, & Blashfield, 1985) and the Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire – Revised (Hyler & Rieder, 1987). The results of these two scales were combined to create composite measures of antisocial, borderline, narcissistic, paranoid, and passive-aggressive personality traits.

Main Results:
<u>Correlations of interview agreeableness facet scores with personality disorder traits</u>. Correlations of the interview scores with the personality traits were generally supportive of hypotheses. Trust was negatively correlated with paranoid, passive-aggressive, antisocial, borderline, and narcissistic traits ($\underline{r}$s = -.62, -.41, -.29, -.26, and -.27, respectively; $\underline{p}$s <.05). Straightforwardness was negatively correlated with antisocial, borderline, paranoid, passive-aggressive, and narcissistic traits ($\underline{r}$s = -.47, -.23, -.24, -.28, and -.28, respectively; $\underline{p}$s <.05). Altruism was negatively correlated with antisocial and narcissistic traits ($\underline{r}$s = -.36, -.24, respectively; $\underline{p}$s <.05). Modesty was negatively correlated with narcissistic traits ($\underline{r}$ = -.31, $\underline{p}$ <.05). Tendermindedness was negatively correlated with antisocial and narcissistic traits ($\underline{r}$s = -.28, -.30, respectively; $\underline{p}$s <.05). Finally, compliance was negatively correlated with antisocial, borderline, and narcissistic traits ($\underline{r}$s = -.43, -.30, -.24, respectively; $\underline{p}$s <.05).

<u>Correlations of questionnaire agreeableness facet scores with personality disorder traits</u>. Trust was not significantly correlated with any of the personality disorder traits. Straightforwardness was negatively correlated with antisocial traits ($\underline{r}$ = -.42, $\underline{p}$ <.05). Altruism was negatively correlated with antisocial traits ($\underline{r}$ = -.24, $\underline{p}$ <.05). Modesty was negatively correlated with narcissistic traits ($\underline{r}$ = -.31, $\underline{p}$ <.05). Finally, tendermindedness and compliance were not significantly correlated with any traits.

Conclusion: The interview format for the assessment of facets of agreeableness is successful in distinguishing characteristics of personality disorder traits.

Commentary: As we saw in Ashton et al.'s (1998) research, the Big Five personality dimension of agreeableness is quite relevant for conceptualizing the influence of personality traits on altruism and prosocial behavior. Indeed, one of the key facets of agreeableness is itself called "altruism." People who score low on the altruistic personality facet are more likely than others to manifest antisocial and narcissistic personality traits – two clusters of personality traits that most people find highly undesirable in relationship partners. Thus, Axelrod et al.'s (1997) study points to the fact that people with altruistic traits appear better suited to faring well in social relationships. Here a caveat must be made that once psychopathology is involved, generalization to the broader population becomes somewhat questionable.

Correspondence: Seth R. Axelrod, River Valley Services, P.O. Box 351, Middletown, CT 06457

Batson, C. D., Bolen, M. H., Cross, J. A., & Neuringer-Benefiel, H. E. (1986). Where is the altruism in the altruistic personality? Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 50(1), 212-220.

Objective: To determine whether personality characteristics typically associated with altruism are more closely associated with an altruistic motivation to benefit another or an egoistic motivation to avoid shame and guilt for not helping

Design: Experiment with a pre-test survey

Setting: The University of Kansas

Participants: Sixty female students in introductory psychology classes fulfilling a course requirement.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Prior to participation in the experimental portion of the study, participants filled out questionnaires addressing self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965), Social Responsibility (Berkowitz & Lutterman, 1968), Ascription of Responsibility (Schwartz, 1968), Empathy (Davis, 1983), and birth order. Participants were then randomly assigned to two experimental conditions, one involving easy escape from helping and the other involving difficult escape from helping.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants were led to believe that they would watch as another person, in fact a confederate, received a number of electrical shocks. After the second shock trial all participants were asked to rate their emotional response to the confederate's distress. Then participants were given an opportunity to help the person being shocked by taking her place for the remaining trials. In the easy escape condition participants were told that they would not need to watch any more of the shock trials, if they did not choose to take her place. In the difficult escape condition participants were told that they would need to watch the remaining eight shock trials, if they did not choose to take her place. Taking the confederate's place in

the easy escape condition would constitute genuine altruism, while taking the confederate's place in the difficult escape condition could be construed as a way of avoiding the emotional distress of seeing another person hurt.

Main Results: Participants who helped saw the shock victim as more similar to themselves than did participants who did not help ($\underline{t}$(58) = 2.24, $\underline{p}$ < .03). The personality measure of perspective taking (a subscale of empathy) was significantly correlated with the perception of the victim's need ($\underline{r}$ = .32, $\underline{p}$ < .02). Self-reported distress during the experiment was related to both perspective taking and empathic concern empathy subscales ($\underline{r}$s = .31 and .29, respectively; $\underline{p}$s < .05). Self-reported empathy for the victim was related to ascription of responsibility, perspective taking, and empathic concern empathy subscales ($\underline{r}$s = .29, .27, and .37, respectively; $\underline{p}$s < .05).

When escape from helping was easy, 9 of 30 participants agreed to take the shocks; when escape from helping was difficult, 19 of 30 participants agreed to take the shocks ($\underline{z}$ = 2.64, $\underline{p}$ < .005, one tailed). In the easy escape from helping condition, there were no significant correlations between personality variables and helping. In the difficult escape from helping condition, self-esteem, ascription of responsibility, and empathic concern were all significantly positively correlated with helping ($\underline{r}$s = .43, .32, and .41, respectively; $\underline{p}$s < .05). The interaction between birth order and escape condition was significant (Π^2 (1, n=60) = 5.77, p < .02), such that firstborns were more likely to help in the difficult escape from helping condition and laterborns were equally likely to help in both conditions. When the effects of the personality variables self-esteem, ascription of responsibility, empathic concern and birth order are controlled for, self-reported empathy for the victim was related to helping in the easy escape from helping condition, but not in the difficult escape from helping condition ($\underline{r}$ = .34, $\underline{p}$ < .05 and $\underline{r}$ = -.02, ns; respectively). In the difficult escape from helping condition, the association between self-reported empathy and helping is entirely due to the effects of the personality variables, but in the easy escape from helping condition none of the association between empathy and helping is due to personality variables.

Conclusion: "Scales with which we measure three of the personality variables – self-esteem, ascription of responsibility, and empathic concern – did seem to be associated with prosocial motivation. But the pattern of correlations with helping across the escape manipulation suggested that for each of these three, the prosocial motivation was directed toward increasing the helper's own welfare rather than the welfare of the person in need."

Commentary: Batson's program of research, of which this study is characteristic, has focused on isolating the social-psychological factors that promote altruism. Based on studies such as these, Batson has concluded that altruism is not so much the result of helpers' personalities as it is a result of their reactions, in real time, to the plight of another person. In particular, it is only when people have empathy for a distressed individual that they act in ways that are expressly designed to promote the distressed person's well-being. Personality might still be important, but it is empathy, in real time, that appears to promote true selflessness.

Correspondence: C. Daniel Batson, Department of Psychology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Batson, C. D., Duncan, B. D., Ackerman, P., Buckley, T., & Birch, K. (1981). Is empathic emotion a source of altruistic motivation? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 290-302.

Objective: To determine whether empathy leads to altruistic or egoistic motivation to help

Design: 2 experiments

Setting: University of Kansas

Participants: Study 1: Participants were 44 female students in introductory psychology, who participated in partial fulfillment of course requirements.
Study 2: Participants were 48 female students in introductory psychology, who participated in partial fulfillment of course requirements.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: Prior to participation in the experimental portion of the study, participants filled out questionnaires addressing personal values and interests. This bogus questionnaire contained items such as type of magazines liked. Participants were then randomly assigned to view the questionnaire of another participant, in fact a confederate, whose questionnaire was manipulated so as to show interests similar to or different than the participants' interests. Finally, participants were randomly assigned to two experimental conditions, one involving easy escape from helping and the other involving difficult escape from helping.
Study 2: Participants were told that they were to be part of two experiments during the session. The first experiment allowed for a manipulation of empathic concern versus personal distress. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two placebo conditions. The participants were given a cornstarch placebo that they were told either effected a feeling of warmth and sensitivity "similar to what you might experience reading a particularly touching novel" (the empathic concern condition) or they were told the placebo effected a feeling of uneasiness and discomfort "similar to that you might experience reading a particularly distressing novel" (personal distress condition). The participants were randomly assigned to easy or difficult escape conditions as in Study 1.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: Participants were led to believe that they would watch as another person, in fact a confederate, received a number of electrical shocks. After the second shock trial all participants were asked to rate the confederate's emotional response to distress. Then participants were given an opportunity to help the person being shocked by taking her place for the remaining trials. In the easy escape condition participants were told that they would not need to watch any more of the shock trials if they did not choose to take her place. In the difficult escape condition participants were told that they would need to watch the remaining eight shock trials if they did not choose to take her place. Taking the confederate's place in the easy escape condition would constitute genuine altruism,

while taking the confederate's place in the difficult escape condition could be construed as a way of avoiding the emotional distress of seeing another person hurt. Whether the participant was willing to take the confederate's place and, if so, the number of trials the participant would be willing to take were the outcome variables.

Study 2: The outcome variables were the same as in Study 1.

Main Results: Study 1: The interaction between similarity and escape condition was significant (Π^2 (1) = 4.19, p < .04), such that the proportion of participants willing to help was much lower in the dissimilar victim/difficult escape condition (18%) than in the other three conditions (average proportion helping = 79%). Furthermore, there was a main effect for similarity of the shock victim (Π^2 (1) = 11.69, p < .001), such that participants were more willing to help the shock victims with similar interests than shock victims with dissimilar interests. A comparable pattern of results held for number of shock trials the participants volunteered to take for the victim. Specifically, participants in the easy escape/similar victim condition were willing to take more shock trials than participants in either of the difficult escape conditions.

Study 2: The interaction between emotion manipulation and escape condition was significant (Π^2 (1) = 6.10, p < .02), such that the proportion of participants willing to help was much lower in the personal distress/easy escape condition (33%) than in the personal distress/difficult escape condition (75%) or in the empathic concern/easy escape condition (83%).

Conclusion: "In the distress conditions, where motivation was assumed to be egoistic, the rate of helping was significantly lower under easy than under difficult escape. In the empathy conditions, where motivation was assumed to be at least in part altruistic, the rate of helping remained high, even when escape was easy. Results… support the hypothesis that empathy leads to altruistic rather than egoistic motivation to help."

Commentary: Though this study does not come first in the alphabetically listed annotated bibliography, it does come first chronologically in Batson's line of research on the relationship between empathy and altruism. This classic study manipulated participant emotion instead of relying solely on self-report. Further it set the scene for a whole series of studies in which researchers allowed the participant to display altruism in the face of an easy out or forces the participant to act egoistically in a situation that may cause personal distress. The variants of manipulation and observation of empathy and the relation of empathy to altruism are annotated, in part, in this bibliography. Opposing points of view are also reviewed (Cialdini et al.,1997; Neuberg et al., 1997).

Correspondence: C. Daniel Batson, Department of Psychology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Batson, C. D., Klein, T. R., Highberger, L., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). Immorality from empathy-induced altruism: When compassion and justice conflict. <u>Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 68</u>(6), 1042-1054.

Objective: To examine whether empathy-induced altruism can lead one to act in a way that violates the moral principle of justice

Design: Two laboratory experiments

Setting: The University of Kansas

Participants: Study 1: Participants were sixty females
Study 2: Participants were thirty males and thirty females. Participants in both studies were in introductory psychology classes participating to fulfill a course requirement.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions – no communication, communication/low empathy, and communication/high empathy. In the communication conditions, participants received a fictitious account from one of two fictitious fellow participants. The communication addressed a recent relationship break-up. In the high empathy condition participants were instructed to "imagine how the student feels about what is described". In the low empathy condition, participants were instructed to "try to take an objective opinion to what is described".
Study 2: Participants were randomly assigned to two conditions – low empathy and high empathy. All participants were asked to listen to an audiotape of a fictitious radio commercial for a local charity. The radio commercial described how the charitable foundation provides funds to help increased the quality of life for children with a serious illness. It then describes a particular child who could benefit from an expensive drug treatment, but has been placed on a waiting list due to unavailable funds. While listening to the tape, low empathy participants were asked to "take an objective perspective to what is described." High empathy participants were asked to "imagine how the child interviewed feels about what has happened and how it has affected this child's life".

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: The participant was asked to assign each of the fictitious fellow participants to tasks with either potential positive or potential negative consequences. One fellow participant was to be assigned to each outcome. Participants were then asked to rate whether they thought the task assignment was morally right, the degree to which they were concerned with fairness in making the decision, and the degree to which they were concerned with the welfare of the participant from whom they had received the sad communication.
Study 2: The participant was asked to indicate whether the needy child should be moved up to the immediate help group from her place on the waiting list at the expense of other children higher on that waiting list. Participants were then asked to what extent fairness and sympathy for the child each played a role in making their

decision. Participants were further divided into two groups based upon whether they rated fairness higher than sympathy (justice dominant) or sympathy higher than fairness (altruism dominant).

Main Results: Study 1: Task assignment for the fellow participants to positive and negative consequences was even handed in both the no communication condition and in the communication/low empathy condition. In the high empathy condition participants more often assigned the fellow participant from whom they had received the sad communication to receive positive consequences (z = 2.24, p <.02 one tailed). Participants in the no communication and communication/low empathy conditions rated fairness as more important (Ms = 7.7 and 8.2) than participants in the communication/high empathy condition (M = 6.4, ts = 1.89 and 2.59, respectively; ps <.04, one tailed). Mean concern for fellow participants' welfare was not significantly higher in the high empathy condition than in the low empathy condition (Ms = 7.0 and 5.9, t = 1.34, ns). No reliable differences were found between conditions on perceived morality of the decision.

Study 2: Participants in the high empathy condition were more likely to help the needy child than participants in the low empathy condition (73% versus 33%, Π^2 (1, n=60) = 10.31, p <.01). Participant gender did not affect this decision. Neither importance of fairness nor sympathy for the needy child differed by condition. The proportion of altruism dominant participants was higher in the high empathy condition than in the low empathy condition (67% versus 37%, z = 2.36, p <.02). Altruism dominant participants were also more likely to help the needy child (95%) than justice dominant participants (30%; z = 3.46, p <.01).

A path model tested a three-step model from empathy manipulation to helping behavior. "The high empathy perspective should lead to increased empathic feelings (Step 1)", which should lead to increased dominance of altruistic over justice motivation (Step 2), which should lead to increased willingness to help the needy child (Step 3). The model fit well (CFI = .94) and the betas for the proposed paths were all significant (.405, .398, and .700, respectively; ps <.001, one tailed).

Conclusion: "Empathy-induced altruism and justice are two independent prosocial motives, each with its own unique ultimate goal. In resource allocation situations in which these two motives conflict, empathy induced altruism can become a source of immoral justice."

Commentary: This study, conducted using similar methodology to those typically used by Batson in other studies of altruism, demonstrates that the desire to help a person in need (which is motivated by empathy) often conflicts with, and indeed overrides, other important moral principles, such as the principles of justice and fairness. These fascinating findings point out the limits to which we can consider altruism to be "truly moral".

Correspondence: C. Daniel Batson, Department of Psychology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Batson, C. D., Batson, J. G., Todd, R. M., Brummett, B. H., Shaw, L. L., & Aldeguer, C. M. R. (1995). Empathy and the collective good: Caring for one of the others in a social dilemma. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 68(4), 619-631.

Objective: To determine whether feeling empathy for another member of a group would create a desire to benefit that person individually, reducing the benefit to other group members

Design: Two studies, one experiment and one questionnaire study

Setting: The University of Kansas

Participants: Study 1: Participants were 120 introductory psychology students participating in partial fulfillment of a course requirement. Sixty were males and 60 were females.
Study 2: Participants were 45 introductory psychology students participating in partial fulfillment of a course requirement. Fifteen were males and 30 were females.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions – no communication, communication/low empathy, and communication/high empathy. In the communication conditions, participants received a fictitious account of a recent relationship break up from one of three fictitious fellow participants. In the high empathy condition participants were instructed to "imagine how the student feels about what is described". In the low empathy condition, participants were instructed to "try to take an objective opinion to what is described".

Study 2: Procedures were similar to those of the communication condition in Study 1. All participants read a sad story from a fictitious fellow participant, but participants were not induced to take a particular perspective while reading it. Self-reports of empathy for the other participant were completed. Participants were divided into low and high empathy groups based on a median split.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: The participants were asked to allocate two sets of eight raffle tickets either to themselves, to the whole group, or to other (fictitious) participants in the group. Bonus tickets could be earned for generosity to the group on the part of the participant, but that could mean a cost to the self (a social dilemma). After the allocation task participants were asked to what degree they wanted to maximize their own ticket outcomes, the other participants' individual outcomes, or outcomes for the whole group.

Study 2: Outcome variables were the same as in Study 1.

Main Results: Study 1: More participants in the communication/high empathy condition (34%) allocated tickets to the sad fellow participant than did participants in the no-communication and communication/low empathy conditions (3%, combined;

Π^2 (2, $\underline{N}$ =119) = 26.92, $\underline{p}$ < .001). Because bonus tickets could be earned by generosity to the group as a whole, conditions were compared on the total number of tickets allocated. Planned comparisons indicated fewer allocated tickets in the communication/high empathy condition ($\underline{M}$ = 18.90) than in the other 2 conditions ($\underline{M}$ = 20.60, $\underline{t}$s > 2.20, $\underline{p}$s < .03). Therefore, when empathy was induced, the good for the group was decreased. In addition, there was a significant condition by target interaction on motives for allocation ($\underline{F}$ (4, 234) = 8.16, $\underline{p}$ <.001). Participants in the communication/high empathy condition reported more desire to maximize tickets to the other participant than to the group as a whole. Among those participants who reported higher other than group interest, 37% of allocations actually were to the other participant (17% to the group and 47% to the self). So, inducing empathy added a desire to maximize the benefits for the other.

Study 2: More high empathy participants than the low empathy participants allocated tickets to the other 36% vs. 4%; Π^2 (1, $\underline{N}$ = 45) = 7.20, $\underline{p}$ < .01). Because bonus tickets could be earned by generosity to the group as a whole, conditions were compared on the total number of tickets allocated. Planned comparisons indicated marginally fewer allocated tickets by high empathy participants ($\underline{M}$ = 18.73) than in low empathy participants ($\underline{M}$ = 20.35, $\underline{t}$(43) = 1.61, $\underline{p}$ < .06). There was a significant empathy by target interaction on motives for allocation ($\underline{F}$ (2, 86) = 4.83, $\underline{p}$ <.01). Participants with high empathy reported more desire to maximize tickets to the other participant ($\underline{M}$ = 5.95) than to the group as a whole ($\underline{M}$ = 5.27). Again, inducing empathy added a desire to maximize the benefits for the other.

Conclusion: Participants who experience high empathy allocate more resources to the targets of the empathy, even when it reduces the overall good to the group.

Commentary: Like the Batson, Klein, et al., (1995) study previously discussed, this study demonstrates the limits within which empathy-induced altruism can be considered moral. When people experience empathy-induced motivation to help a single person, they sometimes forego consideration of group welfare, as well as principles of justice and fairness. The opposing forces of altruism and justice should be clearly articulated and better examined in future social science on altruism.

Correspondence: C. Daniel Batson, Department of Psychology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Batson, C. D., & Weeks, J. L. (1996). Mood effects of unsuccessful helping: Another test of the empathy-altruism hypothesis. Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 22(2), 148-157.

Objective: To examine whether individuals induced to feel empathy will report lower mood after an unsuccessful attempt to help, even if the failure is justified

Design: Two laboratory experiments

Setting: The University of Kansas

Participants: Study 1: Participants were sixty female introductory psychology students participating in partial fulfillment of a course requirement.
Study 2: Participants were thirty female introductory psychology students participating in partial fulfillment of a course requirement.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions in a 2 X 2 design. The conditions were based on low and high empathy induction and experiencing justified or unjustified failure. Participants listened to a fictitious account of a fellow participant who had just experienced a mild electric shock. In the high empathy condition participants were instructed to "imagine how the events described are affecting the speaker and how she feels as a result". In the low empathy condition, participants were instructed to "just remain objective and detached". Participants were told that if they succeeded in their task, the other participant would have extra time to work on her task and perhaps avoid further shocks. All participants were informed that they had "failed" on the task. For some participants the task was described as "Moderately Easy" providing low justification for failure. For other participants the task was described as "Absolutely Impossible" providing high justification for the failure.
Study 2: Participants were randomly assigned to two conditions - high empathy or low empathy. Participants read a note from a fictitious fellow participant who described the experience of receiving an electric shock either objectively (low empathy condition) or with information about how the other participant felt (high empathy condition).

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: Mood was measured by self-report of how positively or negatively the participant felt on seven, 9-point bipolar scales (i.e., sad-happy). Mood was measured at the beginning of the study and after learning that they had failed to help the other participant by succeeding on their own tasks. Mood change over time was the key outcome variable.
Study 2: All participants were told that they had succeeded in their tasks, but that their success did not help the other participant to avoid shock. Mood was measured in the same manner as in Study 1.

Main Results: Study 1: While all participants reported lower mood after failing to help the other participant avoid the shock, between cell comparisons revealed that participants in the low empathy conditions showed less negative mood than participants in each of the high empathy conditions (ts >2.40, p <.01).
Study 2: Lower mood was reported in the higher empathy condition than in the low empathy condition (t (28) = 3.94, p < .01). This effect remained even after removing the covariate effect of perception of the other's desire for help (F (1, 27) = 11.81, p < .002).

Conclusion: "Even when they could not be held responsible for the failure of their efforts to relieve the other participants' need, subjects induced to feel empathy for this person reported relatively strong negative mood change."

Commentary: Batson's empathy-altruism theory predicts that, because the motive elicited by empathy is altruistic rather than egoistic, would-be altruists will

experience affective distress when they cannot effectively help the target of their empathy. Batson and Week's study provides more evidence for the very interpersonal nature of empathy-induced altruistic motivation.

Correspondence: C. Daniel Batson, Department of Psychology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Ben-Artzi, E., & Mikulincer, M. (1996). Lay theories of emotion: IV. Reactions to negative and positive emotional episodes. Imagination, Cognition & Personality, 16(1), 89-113.

Objective: To assess in what ways a person's appraisals of the emotional world contribute to that person's helping behavior when positive emotions are induced

Design: Study 5 was a laboratory experiment.

Setting: Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel

Participants: Study 5: Participants were 90 undergraduate social science students who participated in fulfillment of requirements for the first year of study. There were 59 females and 31 males ranging in age from 21 to 37 years old.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 5: In order to assess the individual's perception of an emotional situation participants completed the Lay Theories of Emotion Scale. This scale addresses the perceived benefit of experiencing emotion (high or low) and the perceived threat of experiencing emotion (high or low). Participants were randomly assigned to watch a videotape of a humorous skit by a popular comedy group or to watch a neutral videotape documenting the life of fish.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 5: The outcome variable assessed was whether the participant attempted to help the experimenter who "accidentally" dropped a stack of papers.

Main Results: Study 5: A three-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for categorical data of benefit appraisal, threat appraisal, and video condition on helping behavior revealed a main effect for benefit appraisal (Π^2 (1) = 7.04, p < .01). There were more helpers among the high benefit appraisal participants than among the low benefit appraisal participants (66% vs. 36%). There was also a significant interaction between benefit appraisal and video condition (Π^2 (1) = 3.86, p < .05). Following the comedy film, more participants in the high benefit appraisal group engaged in helping than in the low benefit appraisal group (80% vs. 35%). There was not an effect of benefit appraisal on helping for the participants who watched the documentary (48% vs. 36%).

Conclusion: "The effect of positive affect on altruism was significant only for [participants] who hold a benefit appraisal of emotion."

Commentary: Ben-Artzi & Mikulincer (1996) uncovered an important individual difference that appears to influence people's prosocial behavior. People who believe that experiencing emotions is beneficial tend to respond with greater prosocial behavior when put in a good mood than do people who do not hold such a beneficial view of emotions. Whether the helping behavior targeted in the present study was, strictly altruistic, was not assessed. However, it <u>was</u> prosocial, and suggests how positive emotions might influence some people to help other people.

Correspondence: Elisheva Ben-Artzi, Department of Psychology, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel

---

Berkowitz, L. & Lutterman, K. G. (1968). The traditional socially responsible personality. <u>Public Opinion Quarterly, 32</u>, 169-185.

Objective: To determine the relationship between dispositional social responsibility and measures of attitudes and behavior

Design: Cross sectional survey

Setting: Wisconsin

Participants: Participants were 766 Wisconsin adults. They were selected from a statewide probability sample for interviews by the University of Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Social responsibility was assessed with 8 items to which the participant could agree or disagree on a 5 point Likert-type scale (i.e., "Every person should give some of his time for the good of his town or country."). Participants were classified as high, medium, or low on social responsibility based on their scores on this scale. Social class, age, and gender were also assessed.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Several survey items assessed financial contributions and activities associated with nonpolitical and political participation in the community. Several scores on the outcome variables were presented separately for middle and working class participants.

Main Results: People who designated themselves as middle class had higher social responsibility scores than people who designated themselves as working class. People with higher education level and women were also more likely to have high social responsibility scores. Participants high in social responsibility more frequently contributed to educational institutions in the past year than participants low in social responsibility (38% versus 16% for the middle class group, $\Pi^2 = 16.94$, $\underline{p} < .01$; 18% versus 7% for the working class group, $\Pi^2 = 7.02$, $\underline{p} < .05$). Similar results were found for volunteer activities and church membership. Participants high in social responsibility were more involved in volunteer activities than participants low in social

responsibility (36% versus 9% for the middle class group, Π^2 = 17.70, $\underline{p}$ < .01; 24% versus 5% for the working class group, Π^2 = 21.24, $\underline{p}$ < .01). Participants high in social responsibility were more likely to be church members than participants low in social responsibility (93% versus 79% for the middle class group, χ^2 = 9.26, $\underline{p}$ < .01; 92% versus 73% for the working class group, χ^2 = 16.07, $\underline{p}$ < .01). The authors indicated that for participants high in social responsibility church membership was more than simply a social activity. The participants also held conventional religious beliefs and tended to maintain that the church's most important function was to "save souls for God."

In the political arena degree of interest in local and national politics, voting behavior, working for a party or candidate, and contributing money to politics were all engaged in more by high socially responsible participants than by low socially responsible participants. Participants high in social responsibility were more interested in national politics than participants low in social responsibility (23% versus 3% for the middle class group, χ^2 = 40.38, $\underline{p}$ < .01; 15% versus 6% for the working class group, χ^2 = 32.60, $\underline{p}$ < .01). Participants high in social responsibility were more interested in local politics than participants low in social responsibility (23% versus 5% for the middle class group, χ^2 = 26.58, $\underline{p}$ < .01; 16% versus 10% for the working class group, χ^2 = 32.21, $\underline{p}$ < .01). Participants high in social responsibility were more involved in voting than participants low in social responsibility (80% versus 60% for the middle class group, χ^2 = 15.66, $\underline{p}$ < .05; 60% versus 47% for the working class group, χ^2 = 13.07, $\underline{p}$ < .05). Participants high in social responsibility were more likely to work for a party or candidate than participants low in social responsibility (27% versus 8% for the middle class group, χ^2 = 9.32, $\underline{p}$ < .06; 12% versus 3% for the working class group, χ^2 = 18.98, $\underline{p}$ < .01). Participants high in social responsibility were more likely to contribute money to politics than participants low in social responsibility (23% versus 5% for the middle class group, χ^2 = 12.08, $\underline{p}$ < .01; 15% versus 6% for the working class group, χ^2 = 5.71, $\underline{ns}$).

Conclusion: In this study, participants high in social responsibility were very involved in their communities through political and non-political volunteer work, as well as through financial contributions. The authors further indicated that "High responsibles' tend to be conservative people who embrace the traditional ideas of their society".

Commentary: Berkowitz and Lutterman highlight the broad array of community and political involvement of people high in social responsibility. It is also likely tied to the ascription of responsibility to the self as evidenced in other studies in this bibliography (Carlo et al., 1991; Eisenberg et al., 1989). Berkowitz and Lutterman's scale for social responsibility and this early work became the basis of investigating social responsibility in the contexts of prosocial behavior (Romer et al., 1986; Batson et al., 1986; Bierhoff, 1991). Social responsibility and the types of behavior it motivates could be considered a societal level analogue of the ascription of responsibility that motivates altruism toward individuals.

Correspondence: Leonard Berkowitz, Professor Emeritus of Psychology, the University of Wisconsin, Peterson Office Building, A W 49, 750 University Ave. Madison, Wisconsin, 53706

Berndt, T. J., & Das, R. (1987). Effects of popularity and friendship on perceptions of the personality and social behavior of peers. Journal of Early Adolescence, 7(4), 429-439.

Objective: To examine the relationships of popularity and friendship with perceptions of a classmates' personality and social behavior

Design: Longitudinal study involving both questionnaires and individual interviews

Setting: One elementary school and one junior high school in a predominantly white, middle-class, suburban community

Participants: Participants were 46 fourth grade students (average age of 9 years and 9 months) and 44 eighth graders (average age of 13 years 8 months). At each grade approximately half of the students were girls and half of the students were boys.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: In the Fall of the school year, all students completed questionnaires in which they indicated the names of their best friends and rated liking for every same-sex child in the same grade. From this researchers paired close and best friendship pairs based on mutual nomination and high liking ratings. Each child's sociometric status, indicating popularity among classmates, was computed from the average liking ratings of all fellow classmates. This assessment was repeated in the Spring of the school year.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants were interviewed in both the fall and the spring of the school year. Each participant was asked about the personality of the close friend, what was particularly good and bad about the friend and how they could tell their partner was their friend. The total numbers of positive and negative comments were calculated. Each participant also answered a series of closed-ended questions about the friend's prosocial behavior ("How helpful is he/she?"), aggressive behavior ("How often does he/she get into fights or arguments with other kids?"), and academic ability ("How smart is he/she?").

Main Results: A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) on positive and negative interview comments revealed an interaction of Sex X Time (F (2, 81) = 4.87, p < .01). Boys made more positive comments about their friends in the Fall than in the Spring (Ms = .76 and .60). Girls made more negative comments in the Spring than in the Fall (Ms = .59 and .35). All participants viewed their friends more negatively in the Spring than in the Fall.
A MANOVA on the four aspects of personality and popularity revealed a three way interaction of Sex X Friendship Status X Time on both prosocial behavior and aggression (F (4, 79) = 2.65, p < .05). On prosocial behavior pair-wise comparisons revealed that girls with unstable friendships evinced a significant decrease in ratings of their friend's prosocial behavior. On ratings of aggressive behavior, boys with stable friendships and girls with unstable friendships reported an increase in the friend's

aggressive behavior. While the friend's sociometric status was related to perception of the friend's academic ability in Fall and Spring (rs = .30 and .22, ps < .05), sociometric status was not related to either perceptions of prosocial behavior or aggression (rs = -.13 to .08, ns).

Conclusion: While perceptions of friends' personalities are affected by perceptions of both the friendship status and popularity, popularity does not seem to affect perceptions of prosocial or aggressive behavior.

Commentary: In this study, Berndt and Das portray a dynamic situation in which one member of a childhood or adolescent friendship rates the other member on several dimensions. Among those are perceptions of the friend's prosocial and aggressive behavior. For girls, a change in friendship status leads them to perceive their friends as less helpful and more aggressive. For boys, more aggression is perceived in steady friendships than unsteady friendships. At least among children and adolescents, perceptions of another's prosocial behavior, the concrete manifestation of altruism, is tempered by the relationship between the individuals and characteristics of the perceiver. Other perception, like self-report, is often questionable when it comes to altruism. Altruism is imbedded in a social context as well as in situations (Leung & Foster, 1985) and the particular personalities of the actors (Farver & Branstetter, 1994).

Correspondence: Thomas J. Berndt, Department of Psychological Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907-1364

Bierhoff, H. W., Klein, R., & Kramp, P. (1991). Evidence for the altruistic personality from data on accident research. Journal of Personality, 59(2), 263-280.

Objective: To examine whether aspects of altruistic personality could be observed in persons giving help to victims of a traffic accident

Design: Quasi –experimental design with questionnaires

Setting: The Medical University of Hanover, Germany

Participants: Participants were 34 people (26 males, 8 females) who had given aid at the scene of an accident as reported by an ambulance team and a control group of 36 respondents to a questionnaire who had witnessed an accident but had not helped (26 males, 10 females). The group of non-helpers were matched to the group of helpers on age, sex, and social status. The mean age of helpers was 35.40 years old (range 13 to 65 years) and the mean age of non-helpers was 30.53 years old.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: The personality questionnaire consisted of a series of scales used in earlier research on personality and helpfulness. The questionnaire included measures of locus of control (Krampen, 1981), uncertainty (Ullrich de Muynk & Ullrich, 1978), empathy (Schmitt, 1982), belief in a just world

(Dalbert, Montada, & Schmitt, 1987), a German version of the Social Responsibility Scale (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1964), sex-role orientation (Runge, Frey, Gollwitzer, Helmreich, & Spence, 1981), and self-concept (John & Keil, 1972). The self-concept scale had a subscale of empathy as it relates to self-concept.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: The outcome was whether participants had previously helped in a traffic accident.

Main Results: Helpers saw themselves as more empathic than non-helpers. Helpers scores on the self-concept/empathy subscale are considerably higher than scores for non-helpers (Ms = 5.52 vs. 4.76; F (1, 66) = 20.34, p < .001). Helpers also scored higher on the Social Responsibility Scale than non-helpers (Ms = 4.72 vs. 4.28; F (1, 66) = 11.47, p < .001). Believing that they could influence events in their environments, helpers scored higher on internal locus of control than non-helpers (Ms = 4.82 vs. 4.43; F (1, 66) = 10.37, p < .002). Helpers had a stronger belief in a just world than non-helpers (Ms = 3.13 vs. 2.57; F (1, 66) = 6.75, p < .012) and showed lower negatively-valued masculine instrumentality (Ms = 1.86 vs. 2.41; F (1, 66) = 12.39, p < .001). However, helpers and non-helpers did not differ on feelings of competence, uncertainty, empathy (Schmitt, 1982), or the self-concept involving instrumentality.

Conclusion: "The results provide evidence consistent with an altruistic personality, which is characterized by a strong sense of internal control, a high belief in a just world, a pronounced sense of duty, and an empathy-oriented self-concept."

Commentary: In this study Bierhoff, Klein, and Kramp utilized several standard measures of personality characteristics to investigate differences in helpers and non-helpers at the scene of an accident. Prosocial behavior, such as helping in an emergency, cannot truly identify the motives of the individual helper, thereby determining whether the individual behaved altruistically. However, it is concrete evidence for the possible existence of altruism when a choice to not help was available. In this study, seeing oneself as an empathic, caring person promotes helping, but not the general propensity to feel empathy. In Lerner's (1980, 1982) just-world hypothesis, individuals who believe people "get what they deserve and deserve what they get" find a victim of innocent suffering inconsistent with this view and are compelled to help by the discomfort this inconsistency produces. This study is consistent with Lerner's predictions. The moral obligation to help others in time of need, which is not necessarily a personality characteristic, but rather a learned motivation was also associated with helping. Finally, having the characteristic of internal locus of control, or believing oneself to be the master of one's own circumstances and outcomes, seemed to empower the participants to act on behalf of others.

Correspondence: Hans W. Bierhoff, Department of Psychology, University of Marburg, Gutenbergst. 18, D-3550 Marburg, Germany

Burnstein, E., Crandall, C., & Kitayama, S. (1994). Some neo-Darwinian decision rules for altruism: weighing cues for inclusive fitness as a function of the biological importance of the decision. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67,</u> 773-789.

Objective: To investigate how individuals will use their resources to help others who vary in level of kinship, age, gender, and other characteristics

Design: Study 1: Cross-sectional survey
Studies 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6: Experiments utilizing scenarios

Setting: The University of Michigan and Shimane University in Japan

Participants: Study 1: Participants were 26 undergraduates at the University of Michigan.
Study 2: Participants were 82 male and 4 female students at a university in Japan and 28 male and 44 female students at the University of Michigan.
Study 3: Participants were 61 undergraduates.
Study 4: Participants were 292 undergraduates at the University of Michigan.
Study 5: Participants were 47 female and 32 undergraduates at the University of Michigan.
Study 6: Participants were 53 undergraduates.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: Participants were presented lists of 19 kin relationships with varying degrees of genetic relatedness (e.g., identical twin, relatedness (r) = 1.0; mother, r = .5; niece, r = .25; great grandfather, r = .125; step brother, r = 0).
Study 2: Participants were randomly assigned to answer one of two forms of a questionnaire. One was an emergency helping form where they were to imagine helping people out of a burning house. The other one was an everyday helping form where they were to imagine helping people by picking up items from a store. The people in the scenarios varied by sex (male or female), age (3 days old, 10 years old, 18 years old, 45 years old, or 75 years old), and kin status (brother, nephew or uncle, cousin, acquaintance). Participant gender and country of origin were also taken into consideration.
Study 3: Participants were presented with 20 paired descriptions of individuals that varied in age, as in study 2. Half of the target pairs were male and half were female. All of the target pairs were moderately related kin (e.g., grandfather or nephew; relatedness = .25). Participants were asked to imagine living in a sub-Saharan country with high infant mortality and low life expectancy.
Study 4: Participants were randomly assigned to fill out questionnaires in one of four conditions that differed on type of helping (emergency vs. everyday helping) and gender of target (male vs. female). Descriptions of pairs of target individuals differed on health (good health vs. poor health) and kinship status (relatedness = .5 vs. .25 vs. .125).
Study 5: Procedures are the same as in study 4, except that wealth of the

target (rich vs. poor) vas varied in stead of health of the target.

Study 6: Participants were given choices of groups to consider helping in either emergency or everyday situations. The groups varied on the 3 types of kin involved (brother, nephew, or cousin) and the summed relatedness value of the three kin in the group (relatedness = .5, 1.0, or 1.5).

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: Participants indicated the degree of relatedness they perceived with each type of kin relationship from 0 (completely unrelated) to 100 (extremely closely related).

Study 2: In a series of descriptions of three individuals (triads) varying on age, sex, and gender, participants ranked which of the three people they would help either out of the burning building or by picking up items from the store. The person they were most likely to help got a score of 3 and the person they were least likely to help got a score of 1.

Study 3: Participants were asked which member of the pairing they would rescue from a burning house and how likely they were to attempt a rescue from 3 = definitely to 1 = probably.

Study 4: Participants were asked which member of the pairing they would help and how likely they were to help from 3 = definitely to 1 probably.

Study 5: Same as in Study 4.

Study 6: Participants chose between two target groups, instead of two individuals and rated them as in Study 4.

Main Results: Study 1: As actual relatedness decreased, perceived relatedness declined as well (F (5, 100) = 216.9, p < .001). Dunn's multiple comparisons revealed that the greatest drops in perceived relatedness occurred between very close kin and moderately close kin and secondarily between distant kin and acquaintances.

Study 2: Participants' responses did not differ as a function of gender and nationality. Participants reported decreasing likelihood of helping with decreasing relatedness to target (F (3, 430) = 108.60, p < .001). Younger targets were more likely to receive help than older targets (F (3, 450) = 17022, p < .001). Both male and female participants were more likely to help female rather than male targets (F (1, 150) = 27.71, p < .001). The difference between the emergency helping and everyday helping scenarios was significant (F (3, 450) = 5.86, p < .001), such that close kinship led to greater helping in the emergency situation than in the everyday situation. The interaction of age and condition (F (3, 450) = 2.88, p < .05) fell in line with the recipient's fitness value. That is, in the emergency helping situation when help was biologically significant, preference was shown to helping the young over helping the old. In the everyday helping situation, where individuals could be more concerned with morality and civility, more help was given to the very old and the very young, with intermediate values for helping those aged 10-45 years.

Study 3: The relationship between tendency to help and age of recipient had a curvilinear shape (F (4, 240) = 28.73, p < .001), such that participants were most likely to help 10 and 18 year olds, somewhat less likely to help less than 1 year olds and 45 year olds, and very unlikely to help 75 year olds.

Study 4: A significant Kin by helping situation by health status interaction (F (2, 576) = 10.65, p < .001) revealed that in emergency situations participants were more willing to help those in good health, while in everyday situations participants were more willing to help those in poor health. As in Study 2, participants were more willing to help close kin than less close kin (F 2, 576) = 717.98, p < .001) and the

importance of kinship was greater in emergency situations than in everyday situations.

Study 5: Participants reported being more willing to help close kin than less close kin (F (2, 385) = 40.37, p < .001). This was modified by the helping situation such that the importance of helping closely related kin was lower in everyday situations than in emergency situations (F (2, 385) = 21.64, p < .001).

Study 6: Participants helped closer kin types more than less close kin types (F (2, 102) = 50.4, p < .001). They also helped more when the value of the relatedness of a group of targets was high than when the relatedness of the group of targets was low (F (2, 102) = 65.6, p < .001). Finally, the group's relatedness value was more important in helping decisions in emergency helping situations than in everyday helping situations (F (2, 102) = 9.78, p < .001).

Conclusion: "Following W. Hamilton's (1964) analysis of inclusive fitness…is that (a) natural selection favors those who are prone to help others as a function of the latter's' relatedness, potential fecundity, or other features indicating a recipient's capacity to enhance the donor's inclusive fitness, and (b) this effect is especially strong when help is biologically significant (e.g., the recipient will not survive otherwise)."

Commentary: Burnstein et al.'s (1994) article displays some of the traditional methods of exploring altruism from the perspective of sociobiology. Kin relationships are pitted against each other in hypothetical situations to show preferences for altruistic acts toward those with whom one shares greater genetic relatedness and toward those who display greater potential for reproduction of those genes (i.e., the young, healthy, female, etc.). One contribution of this series of studies is the clearly different effects displayed in emergency helping situations versus everyday helping situations. Clearly different processes are activated in the different situations. It would be beneficial to see the sociobiological variables tested in models along with more proximal variables such as empathic concern.

Correspondence: Eugene Burnstein, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106-1248

Bybee, J., Luthar, S., Zigler, E., & Merisca, R. (1997). The fantasy, ideal, and ought selves: Content, relationships to mental health, and functions. Social Cognition, 15(1), 37-53.

Objective: To differentiate (a) fantasy, (b) ideal, and (c) ought selves and then relate these self-conceptions to aspects of personality and behavior

Design: Study 1 was a content analysis of self-descriptions. Study 2 was a questionnaire study involving self and peer reports describing the participant.

Setting: A University

Participants: Study 1: Participants were 81 undergraduate students who

participated in partial fulfillment of course requirements. There were 38 males and 43 females.

Study 2: Participants were 74 undergraduates (43 females and 31 males) who participated in partial fulfillment of course requirements. Seventy-two peers also provided information on the participants, but were not compensated for participation.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: Participants were asked to provide five descriptions of how they want to be in the future (ideal self), to describe what they would like to be like if anything were possible (fantasy self), and to describe how they thought they should be (ought self).

Study 2: Participants indicated the extent to which each of several future self descriptor words were important to them and the extent to which they thought about the self-descriptors. They also completed a comprehensive personality measure, the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: Self-descriptions were content analyzed based on 32 categories from previous research (Harter, 1982; McGuire & Padawer-Singer, 1976; Markus & Nurius, 1986; Singer & Switzer, 1980).

Study 2: Participants rated the extent to which the self-descriptors caused them dejection or agitation. They also completed the Taylor Manifest Anxiety scale (Taylor, 1953). Peers rated the participants on assertive social skills, frustration tolerance, aggressiveness, and study skills (Hightower, et al., 1986).

Main Results: Study 1: The ideal self-descriptions contained the addition of new roles (e.g., occupational roles), physical attractiveness, cognitive abilities, and social competence – often described in egocentric ways. Ought self-descriptions contained conscience, role demands, and duties to others. Two-thirds of participants included desires to be caring and considerate in ought self descriptions while half of participants wanted to work harder in school. Fantasy self-descriptions contained wishes to wealth, power, perfection in all things, and achieving altruistic ends (i.e., discovering the cure for cancer).

Study 2: Preoccupation with the ideal self-image was related to state anxiety (r = .25), self-consciousness (r = .34), and angry-hostility (r = .25, ps < .05). Surprisingly, ideal self-image was not related to academic achievement, positive social interactions, self-discipline, or peer reported assertive social skills. Preoccupation with the ought self-image was related to altruism (r = .36), trusting (r = .34), straightforwardness (r = .45), and openness of feelings (r = .28, ps < .05). These individuals were also more warm (r = .52), gregarious (r = .35), and expressive of positive emotions (r = .61, ps < .05). They expressed higher achievement motivations (r = .27, p < .05).

Preoccupation with the fantasy self-image was related to several negative aspects of personality. Participants preoccupied with the fantasy self had higher state anxiety, more angry hostility and lower scores on altruism, straightforwardness, compliance, and dutifulness (in order, rs = .29, .45, -.33, -.43, -.47, -.38; ps < .05). Their peers rated them with worse scores on study skills, assertive social skills, and frustration tolerance (rs = -.35, -.25, -.39; ps < .05).

Conclusion: "The fantasy self-image shows numerous and maladaptive relationships with measures of personality and adjustment. Of the three future selves, it is the ought self-image that shows the most adaptive correlations with indicators of prosocial behavior, interpersonal competence, and goal-directed actions."

Commentary: When participants concentrated on the ought self, the self associated with conscience and duty, they evinced more prosocial self-descriptions. They also scored higher on altruism (one part of the agreeableness personality dimension). This is consistent with studies by Ashton et al. (1998) and Axelrod (1997), in which the big five personality dimension of agreeableness was important for conceptualizing the influence of personality traits on altruism. In Bybee et al.'s (1997) research we see the influence of both learned and personality characteristics which influence propensity for altruism. That is, the ought self was characterized by many participants as including prosocial behavior, a learned reaction to the needs of others. In addition, individuals who, as part of their personality, concentrated their efforts on the ought self above the ideal and fantasy selves also scored higher on propensity for altruism.

Correspondence: None Available

Carlo, G., Eisenberg, N., Troyer, D., Switzer, G., & Speer, A. L. (1991). The altruistic personality: In what contexts is it apparent? Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 61(3), 450-458.

Objective: To investigate the specific contexts in which the altruistic personality would be most apparent

Design: A laboratory experiment

Setting: Arizona State University

Participants: Participants were 109 undergraduate psychology students who received course credit for participation. There were 47 males and 62 females ranging in age from 17 to 35 years old (Mean age = 20.16).

Assessment of Predictor Variables: In the first session of the experiment participants filled out questionnaires addressing ascription of responsibility (Schwartz, 1968), social responsibility (Berkowitz & Lutterman, 1968) social desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964), affective intensity (Larsen & Diener, 1987) and three subscales from the Davis (1983) empathy measure (empathic concern, perspective taking, and personal distress). A varimax factor analysis of trait personality measures revealed a 2-factor solution – prosocial tendencies and emotionality. The first factor includes ascription of responsibility, perspective taking, social responsibility, and empathic concern and accounts for 42% of the factor variance. The second factor includes emotional intensity and personal distress and accounts for 22% of the factor variance. Because both gender and social desirability were related to scores on the personality indices, these variables were controlled for in further analyses (e.g., women scored higher on dispositional prosocial tendencies and emotionality).

In a second session participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions. The conditions varied on the level of emotion evoked in the participants

(high or low) and in the ease of escape from the unpleasant situation (easy or difficult). In the condition that evoked high emotion, participants viewed a videotape of a fictitious other participant reading unpleasant scenarios concerning assault and answering questions about the scenarios. The fictitious participant was visibly emotional and choked back tears. In the low emotional evocation condition, the fictitious participant did not show signs of distress. In the easy escape, condition participants were told that they would not have to watch the fictitious participant read any more scenarios and answer questions. In the difficult escape condition, participants were told they would have to watch the fictitious participant read 13 more assault scenarios and answer questions.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants were given the opportunity to take the place of the fictitious fellow participant who was experiencing distress and read some or all of the remaining scenarios. For all participants helping required completing another session with no additional course credit, adding further cost for helping.

Main Results: A planned comparison on helping of the high-evocative/difficult escape condition versus the other three conditions combined revealed a main effect for condition (F (1, 101) = 5.95, p < .05). There was more helping in the high-evocative/difficult escape condition than in the other three conditions combined (Ms = .78 versus .37, .34, and .49). Trait emotionality was positively related to helping in the low-evocative/easy escape condition (partial r = .44, p < .05). Traits of prosocial tendencies were positively related to helping in the high-evocative/easy escape condition (partial r = .48, p < .01). Gender differences revealed no effects of prosocial tendencies and condition on helping for men. However, for women the effects of prosocial tendencies on helping are situationally dependent. It was positively related to helping in the high-evocative/easy escape condition (partial r = .69, p < .03), but unrelated in the high-evocative/difficult escape and low-evocative/easy escape conditions (partial r = -.01, ns).

In order to test the hypothesis that the relationship between prosocial tendencies and helping would be strongest when effects due to the situation (vs. personality) were weak, a regression analysis compared the relation of helping scores with prosocial tendencies in the low-evocative/easy escape condition compared to the high-evocative/difficult escape condition. The tendency to be prosocial predicted helping (r^2 change = .12; F (1,99) = 6.82, p < .002). However, there was no difference in the effect of prosocial tendencies by condition. Consistent with the hypothesis, trait emotionality was positively related to helping in the low-evocative/easy escape condition (partial r = .44, p < .05), but it was not significantly related to helping the high-evocative/difficult escape condition (partial r = .15, ns).

Conclusion: "This pattern of findings supports the notion that there are altruistic individuals who assist primarily for other-oriented or moral reasons without regard to external rewards or punishments."

Commentary: "The results of the present study provided some support for both predictions stemming from Batson's (1987) work on situational sympathy [empathy in Batson's nomenclature] and for Snyder and Ickes's (1985) distinction between weak and strong psychological situations. With regard to Batson's distinction between easy and difficult escape contexts, the finding that the prosocial composite scores were

positively correlated with helping in the high-evocative, easy escape condition (when both sex and social desirability were controlled for) is consistent with Batson's findings in regard to the relation of state sympathy to altruism (although the relation in this study held primarily for women)."p. 456

Correspondence: Gustav Carlo or Nancy Eisenberg, Department of Psychology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287

Carlson, M., Charlin, V., & Miller, N. (1988). Positive mood and helping behavior: A test of six hypotheses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 211-229.

Objective: To summarize statistically 34 studies concerning the role of positive mood states in increasing helpfulness

Design: Meta-analytic Review

Studies: The review included 34 studies (with 61 comparisons of positive mood versus neutral mood) published in professional journals. All studies compared the level of helpfulness of positive mood participants to the levels of helpfulness of neutral mood participants, allowed for the calculation of the effect-size estimate of the level of helpfulness of the positive mood group, and the measure of helping occurred within 30 minutes of the positive mood induction.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: The following 16 variables were coded from each study: a) participant and design characteristics (age, sex of participant, sex of helpee, year of study), b) features associated with the positive affect induction (amount of positive affect induced, amount of objective self-awareness induced, extent to which participant is the beneficiary of the positive event, amount of arousal of guilt or inequity in receiving positive mood induction, extent to which induction would lead participant toward positive view of human nature, and amount of sociality of the positive event), and c) variables related to the helping opportunity (pleasantness of the helping task, salience of the helping request, salience of prosocial values in the helping request, the extent to which participants feel responsibility to help, time delay between positive induction and helping, and whether helping entailed sustained and ongoing helping). Objective self-awareness is defined as being aware or conscious of oneself, in a non-subjective, honest appraisal of one's true personal nature (Reber, 1995; p. 701). A composite measure called social outlook was created by summing the positive view of human nature and sociality of the positive event measures and indicates whether social outlook was investigated in the course of the study.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: The effect size index used in the present study was d, the difference between the means of the positive mood induction group and the neutral group, divided by the pooled estimate of standard deviation. All effect-size estimates were corrected for sample size. Predictor variables and effect sizes were also corrected for skewness where appropriate. Some effect-size estimates were

calculated based on $\underline{F}$, $\underline{t}$, or $\underline{r}$ statistics using Glass et al., (1981) formulas.

Main Results: While the mean of the effect sizes was large and suggests that there is a relationship between positive mood and helping ($\underline{M}$ = .54, $\underline{t}$(60) = 5.27, $\underline{p}$ < .001), the relatively large standard deviation of .8 suggests that these effects may be moderated by other variables. Studies with older participants, studies where participants were asked to do pleasant helping tasks, studies where participants tasks led to pleasant views of human nature, and studies where the participant was the direct recipient of the positive mood induction all had increased levels of helping (partial $\underline{r}$s = .33, .34, .31, and .49, respectively; $\underline{p}$s < .05). Studies involving participants with extremely high or low levels of happiness, studies with tasks that produced guilt, or studies with tasks that required the participant to engage in helping over a long period of time were associated with lower levels of helping (partial $\underline{r}$s = -.38, -.44, and -.37, respectively; $\underline{p}$s < .05).
Even after controlling for the effects of objective self-awareness of participants in the studies, studies in which positive events were directly experienced by the participant yielded higher levels of helping (partial $\underline{r}$ = .49, $\underline{p}$ < .001). This outcome was unaffected by the relationship between feelings of deserving the positive event and helpfulness (partial $\underline{r}$ = -.09, $\underline{ns}$). In the studies analyzed, objective self-awareness and request salience are correlated with helping when other variables are partialed out (partial $\underline{r}$ = .37, $\underline{p}$ < .01). However, in studies where social outlook and self as target of the positive event are removed the relationship disappears (partial $\underline{r}$ = .00), suggesting that, in these studies, self-awareness may affect helping by enhancing the inclination to act on other factors that are activated by positive mood.

Conclusion: "The cognitive consequences of a positive mood may be either general (e.g., global priming effects) or help-specific (e.g., enhanced social outlook), and influence helpfulness by altering the perceived capacity of a given prosocial opportunity to provide self-reinforcement. In addition, perceptions of the inherent reward value of the helping task, as well as one's current degree of elation, influence whether or not one views engaging in the prosocial act as likely to maximize one's outcome."

Commentary: Carlson, Charlin, & Miller's (1988) work on positive mood and helping behavior contributes to the understanding of the mechanism through which they are related. Positive mood changes the way that people view their whole world. Furthermore, people act in ways to maintain positive mood because it is rewarding. It is interesting that extremes of positive mood, whether slight positive mood or extreme elation, interfere with helpfulness. A potential caveat to this research is provided by Ben-Artzi & Mikulincer (1996), who found that the relationship of positive mood to helping is strongest for individuals who believe that experiencing emotion has positive benefits. Wegner et al.'s (1986) work on how people understand the task they are engaged in also invokes social cognitive processes which make one more or less susceptible to continued helping behavior. In the present study, level of self-awareness also influences the degree to which people are responsive to other cues promoting positive mood and helpfulness. Work similar to the current research may be necessary to augment the understanding of effects of negative mood on helping (Batson & Weeks, 1996).

Correspondence: Norman Miller, Department of Psychology, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-1061

Chau, L. L., Johnson, R. C., Bowers, J. K., Darvill, T. J., & Danko, G. P. (1990). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity as related to conscience, adjustment, and altruism. Personality & Individual Differences, 11(4), 397-400.

Objective: To investigate the relationships between intrinsic religiosity, extrinsic religiosity, personality, and altruism

Design: Cross-sectional survey

Setting: The University of Hawaii, Honolulu and Northwest Missouri State University

Participants: Thirty-six male, 53 female, and 4 participants with no reported gender came from the University of Hawaii. Forty male and 64 females came from Northwest Missouri State University

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity were measured with the Allport and Ross (1967) I-E scale. Participants also completed the Dimensions of Conscience Questionnaire, a thirty-item scale designed to measure guilt and shame. Finally, participants completed the revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ-R, Eysenck, Eysenck, & Barrett, 1985) to measure psychoticism, extraversion, neuroticism, and tendencies for dishonest responding.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants completed 56 items measuring self-reported altruistic behavior (Johnson et al., 1989). For each item they described how often they had done the behavior, how often someone had done it for them, and how important the altruistic behavior was.

Main Results: Correlations among measures were computed by sample and gender. Intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity were significantly positively correlated for Hawaii females and Missouri males (rs = .50 and .40, ps < .05). Intrinsic religiosity was significantly positively correlated with guilt for Hawaii females and Missouri males (rs = .31 and .37, ps < .05). However, it was not significantly correlated with shame for any of the groups (rs = .10, .05, .08 and .11, ns). Positive correlations between intrinsic religiosity and the three measures of altruism- giving help, receiving help, and importance of helping- were found for Hawaii males (rs = .30, .42, and .30; ps < .05), as well as for Missouri males (rs = .38, .41, and .31; ps < .05). For females intrinsic religiosity was related only to receiving help for Hawaii females (r = .32; p < .05) and to giving help for Missouri females (r = .23; p < .05). Correlations among personality measures and religiosity were inconsistent - varying greatly by sample and gender.

Conclusion: Intrinsic religiosity is related to altruism for males and may also be related to guilt. Intrinsic religiosity appears unrelated to shame.

Commentary: This interesting study is remarkable for its examination of the association of religious factors with measures of self-reported altruism. For males, intrinsic religious motivation was consistently associated with greater levels of help giving, help receiving, and beliefs about altruism. For females, the associations of intrinsic religious motivation with measures of altruism were considerably less robust. This finding suggests that religious involvement might promote the giving and receiving of altruistic help, but its effects may be particularly noteworthy for males. It is important to realize that what was measured in this study was not altruism *per se*, but rather, people's self-reports of their behavior and values. Studies that measure altruism through behavioral observations would be invaluable for confirming that the religion-altruism relationship observed in the present study was substantive rather than artifactual.

Correspondence: None Available

Cialdini, R. B., Brown, S. L., Lewis, B. P., Luce, C., & Neurberg, S. L. (1997). Reinterpreting the empathy-altruism relationship: When one into one equals oneness. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 73(3), 481-494.

Objective: To examine the relationship between empathy and altruism when the participants feel a degree of self-other overlap

Design: Three experimental scenario studies

Setting: Arizona State University

Participants: Study 1: Participants were 44 males and 46 females in introductory psychology courses who received course credit for participation.
Study 2: Participants were 36 males and 38 females in introductory psychology courses who received course credit for participation.
Study 3: Participants were 82 males and 181 females in introductory psychology courses who received course credit for participation.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: Participants were randomly assigned to focus on one of four same-sex persons: a stranger, an acquaintance, a good friend, or a family member as they read a scenario describing the eviction of that person from their apartment. Participants completed measures of empathy (Batson et al., 1995), personal distress, and sadness (Fultz, Schaller, & Cialdini, 1988). Finally, participants rated the degree of "oneness" felt with the described person using the Inclusion of Other in the Self (IOS) Scale (Aron et al., 1992).
Study 2: The measures and procedure were the same as in Study 1. The scenario was changed to someone who died in an accident leaving his/her two children without a home.

Study 3: The measures and procedure were the same as in Studies 1 and 2, except that participants were also randomly assigned to read one of three different scenarios – the eviction from Study 1, the orphaned children from Study 2, and a new situation where the target person needed help making a phone call.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: Participants indicated the level of help they would offer the evicted person on a seven point scale from nothing to offer to let him or her come to live with you rent free.
Study 2: Participants indicated the level of help they would offer the children on a seven point scale from nothing to have the kids come live with you and raise them as you would your own.
Study 3: Again participants indicated the level of help they would offer on appropriate scales. The scale for the phone call ranged from nothing to cut class on the day of the exam to drive him or her to a phone.

Main Results: Study 1: Closer relationship type led to greater willingness to help (F (3,82) = 33.28, p < .001). Closer relationship type also led to greater empathic concern (F (3,82) = 5.37, p < .01) and feelings of oneness with the person in the scenario (F (3,82) = 30.58, p < .001). Both empathic concern and oneness were positively correlated with helping (rs = .45 and .76, p < .01). When entered as a last step in a hierarchical regression analysis, oneness predicted helping (b = 1.10, F (1,74) = 4.09, p < .001), and made the effect of empathic concern non-significant (b = .11, F (1,74) < 1, ns).
Study 2: Closer relationship type led to greater willingness to help (F (3,70) = 17.43, p < .001). Closer relationship type also led to greater empathic concern (F (3,70) = 6.73, p < .001) and feelings of oneness with the person in the scenario (F (3,64) = 27.75, p < .001). Both empathic concern and oneness were positively correlated with helping (rs = .33 and .53, p < .01). When entered as a last step in a hierarchical regression analysis, oneness predicted helping (b = .57, F (1,57) = 10.39, p < .01), and made the effect of empathic concern non-significant (b = .37, F (1,57) = 1.37, ns).
Study 3: A two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed for relationship type and severity of need on degree of helping. Closer relationship type led to greater willingness to help (F (3,243) = 62.35, p < .001). There was a significant main effect for severity of need (F (3,243) = 217.62, p < .001) such that as need increased, helping increased. The interaction of relationship type and severity of need was also significant (F (6, 243) = 10.33, p < .001). The impact of relationship closeness was more pronounced in the higher need situations. As in the previous two studies, for all three need situations feelings of oneness significantly predicted helping and rendered the effect of empathic concern on helping nonsignificant.

Conclusion: As relationship closeness and severity of need increased, so did helping, although the effects of relationship closeness were stronger in high need situations. Even though empathic concern was consistently related to helping it was reduced to nonsignificance when feelings of oneness with the person in need were taken into account.

Commentary: This study is one of many in the ongoing debate regarding the existence of pure altruism. In this installment on the debate, Cialdini and colleagues address the possibility that the crux of the altruism debate is not an ethical one, but an ontological one. Altruism occurs because we are actually helping someone that we

cannot distinguish from our own identity. This paper produced interesting controversy in an exchange between Cialdini and Batson, and the replies and rejoinder (Batson, et al., 1997) are located in volume 73 of the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.

Correspondence: Robert B. Cialdini, Department of Psychology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, 85287-1104

Clary, E. G. & Orenstein, L. (1991). The amount and effectiveness of help: The relationship of motives and abilities to helping behavior. <u>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17</u>(1), 58-64.

Objective: To investigate the influence of helper's motives and abilities on the amount and effectiveness of a long-term altruistic activity

Design: Longitudinal Study

Setting: Crisis Counseling Center in Minneapolis-St. Paul area

Participants: Participants were 125 female and 36 male volunteers at a telephone crisis counseling center. Participants were, on average, 28 years old (range = 18 to 63 years) and came from a variety of education levels (high school diploma to advanced college degrees).

Assessment of Predictor Variables: At the end of the first volunteer training session participants were given a survey that they returned at the second session. Altruistic motivation was measured by participant rankings of their top 5 reasons for volunteering from a list of 25 possible reasons. Altruistic motivation scores ranged from 0 (only egoistic reasons) to 15 (only altruistic reasons). Participants also completed the Davis (1983) Interpersonal Reactivity Index which has four subscales – perspective taking, fantasy, empathic concern, and personal distress.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Two outcome variables were examined – whether the volunteer was screened from the program by staff on the basis of skills and whether the volunteer completed nine months or more of service working at least four hours a week. Three categories of volunteers was developed based on their behavior – screened volunteers, early-termination volunteers, and completed service volunteers.

Main Results: Early terminating volunteers reported lower altruistic motivation ($\underline{M}$ = 2.67) than screened volunteers ($\underline{M}$ = 4.44) and completed service volunteers ($\underline{M}$ = 4.06; $\underline{t}$ (156) = 2.99, $\underline{p}$ < .005). A planned comparison between screened volunteers and the other two groups indicated that screened volunteers had lower perspective taking skills than either early termination or completed service volunteers ($\underline{M}$ = 19.26 versus 20.20 and 20.81; $\underline{t}$ (159) = 1.73, $\underline{p}$ < .05). The other measures of empathy – fantasy, personal distress, and empathic concern – did not distinguish among the three volunteer groups ($\underline{F}$s < 1.40). Altruistic motivation was related to empathic

concern ($\underline{r}$ = .22, $\underline{p}$ < .005), but not to perspective taking ability ($\underline{r}$ = .00, $\underline{ns}$).

Conclusion: "These results argue for considering not only whether a potential helper will *try* to help, but also whether he or she *can* help." [Italics in original manuscript]. Both willingness to help, that is, altruistic motivation, and skills necessary to the task, in this case perspective taking ability, were important in determining which participants were both qualified and completed the term of service.

Commentary: This study by Clary and Orenstein reveals three important points: 1) Without altruistic motivation people drop out and do not carry out their altruistic behavior, 2) Without perspective taking skills people are judged as inadequately skilled for this type of service, and 3) People with altruistic motivation also had higher empathic concern. The specific skills to carry out the helping behavior are as important as the underlying motivation to help. Also, empathic concern may be a precursor to altruistic motivation.

Correspondence: E. Gil Clary, Department of Psychology, College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, MN 55105.

Darley, J. M., & Batson, C. D. (1973). "From Jerusalem to Jericho": A study of situational and dispositional variables in helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27, 100-108.

Objective: To examine the influence of situational and personality variables on helping in a setting inspired by the parable of the Good Samaritan

Design: Experiment with questionnaires and field study

Setting: Princeton Theological Seminary

Participants: Participants were 40 students at Princeton Theological Seminary who were paid $1 for the questionnaire session and $1.50 for the experimental session.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: In a questionnaire session participants were administered several religiosity scales. The Glock & Stark (1966) Doctrinal Orthodoxy Scale measured the extent to which participants agreed with classic doctrines of Protestant theology. Allport & Ross's (1967) intrinsic-extrinsic scales measured the extent to which participants believe that religion is an end in itself or an ends to a means, usually for some reward. Batson's (1971) Religious Life Inventory had three subscales - extrinsic external, extrinsic internal, and intrinsic. The extrinsic external subscale measured the degree to which religion was influenced by significant others and situations. The extrinsic internal subscale measured the "drivenness" in one's religiosity. Finally, the intrinsic subscale measured the degree to which one's religiosity involves questioning of the meaning of life. A principal components analysis of these scales revealed a three component structure consisting of religion as a means

to an end, religion as an end in itself, and religion as a search for meaning (also known as quest religiosity).

Participants returned for a second session in which they were randomly assigned to one of four conditions differing on two variables: a) helping relevance of the message that the participant reads; and b) amount of hurry imposed on the participant. In the task-relevant message condition participants were asked to prepare a 3 to 5 minute speech on possible occupations for seminary graduates. In the helping-relevant message condition participants were asked to prepare a 3 to 5 minute speech on the parable of the Good Samaritan (a story about helping from the New Testament). Participants were instructed that they would not be allowed to make notes, but would have to speak extemporaneously in an adjacent building where there was recording equipment. Each was given a map to the office where they were to give their talk. The second manipulated variable, hurry, was whether the participants were told they were running late and should hurry to the office, were just on time, or had plenty of time and might have to wait briefly at the office.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: On the path indicated by the map, was a person, actually a confederate, slumped in the doorway, head down. As the participant passed, the victim coughed twice. The outcome variable was the amount of help offered the victim from 0 = failed to notice victim in need to 5= refusing to leave the victim and insisting on offering help.

Main Results: The extent to which participants were hurried was significantly related to helping (F (2, 34) = 3.56, p < .05), such that of the participants in the hurry condition 63% offered help, of the participants in the intermediate hurry condition 45% offered help, and of the participants in the high hurry condition only 10% offered help. The type of speech the participant was primed to deliver had no effect on helping (F (2, 34) = 2.63, ns). When participants who were high on quest religiosity stopped to offer help, they were more likely to offer small types of help which were also tentative in nature, unlike participants not high on quest religiosity ($r_{point\ biserial}$ = -.53, p < .05). At the other extreme, participants high in religious orthodoxy were more likely to offer help that was rigid and did not allow information for the victim to change the plan, than did participants low in religious orthodoxy (r = .63, p < .01).

Conclusion: "A person not in a hurry may stop and offer help to a person in distress. A person in a hurry is likely to keep going. Ironically, he is likely to keep going even if he is hurrying to speak on the parable of the Good Samaritan, thus inadvertently confirming the point of the parable."

Commentary: Darley & Batson's (1973) study of situational and personality influences on helping is a true classic, cited in many textbook treatments of altruism. Perhaps the reason this study is so well known is that it clearly highlights the foibles of the human condition. This is a case were the power of the situation (i.e., being hurried) had a stronger impact on the behavior of the participants than personality or even cognitive priming for helping behavior. While personality affected what type of help was offered, the overriding influence of hurry was strong. The authors suggest two competing explanations for this effect. First, that "ethics becomes a luxury as the speed of our daily lives increases;" second, that the participants experienced some conflict over two helping situations – one helping the victim and another of helping the experimenter who depended on them to get to a place quickly.

Correspondence: John Darley, Department of Psychology, Princeton, New Jersey, 08540

<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 2em;"></div>

Davis, M. H., Luce, C., & Kraus, S. J. (1994). The heritability of characteristics associated with dispositional empathy. Journal of Personality, 62, 369-391.

Objective: To explore whether empathic concern, personal distress, and perspective taking are inherited traits

Design: Survey of Monozygotic and Dizygotic twins

Setting: National Survey

Participants: Participants were 839 twin pairs consisting of 509 Monozygotic pairs (MZ = identical twins; 216 male, 293 female) and 330 Dizygotic pairs (DZ = fraternal twins; 135 male, 195 female). Participants were part of a large sample of twins recruited from the 1962 National Merit Scholarship Test (see Loehlin & Nichols, 1976).

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants indicated on a checklist which of 28 adjectives applied to them. Items measured perspective taking (i.e., cooperative, critical of others), empathic concern (i.e., obliging, sensitive), and personal distress (i.e., emotional, excitable).

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Heritability was determined by the difference in the intraclass correlations of twin pairs for each trait and Falconer's(1960) $\underline{h}^2$ heritability estimate.

Main Results: Of the adjectives for empathic concern and personal distress, 75% showed a significant MZ/DZ difference with MZ scores higher. That is MZ twins were more similar in empathic concern and personal distress than were DZ twins. For perspective taking only 42% of the comparisons show this pattern, the others were not significantly different. The heritability estimates were 28% for empathic concern, 32% for personal distress, and 20% for perspective taking.

Conclusion: "Variation in characteristics associated with affective empathy seems to have a considerable genetic component. Variation in perspective taking, in contrast, displays evidence of noticeably weaker genetic contribution. We believe that this difference results from differential association with temperamental emotionality."

Commentary: Many studies in this annotated bibliography investigate the relationship of dispositional empathy to some measure of altruism or helping (Archer, et al., 1981; Carlo, et al., 1991; Penner & Finkelstein, 1998; and others). It is because of this close relationship between dispositional empathy and altruism that this background article is included. The current work (Davis et al., 1994) suggests that this

very basic personality construct, dispositional empathy, have a considerable degree of heritability. Of course this does not preclude the possible influence of nurture or learning on development of dispositional empathy, in particular, perspective taking skills. It simply means that some people may be more predisposed to feel and act out of dispositional empathy than others.

Correspondence: Mark H. Davis, Department of Behavioral Science, Eckerd College, St. Petersburg, FL 33733

Den Ouden, M. D., & Russell, G. W. (1997). Sympathy and altruism in response to disasters: A Dutch and Canadian comparison. Social Behavior and Personality, 25(3) 241-248.

Objective: To investigate cross-culturally the role of age, sympathy, and gender in altruism

Design: Cross-sectional survey with scenarios

Setting: Utrecht University, The Netherlands and University of Lethbridge, Canada

Participants: Participants were first and second year students at Utrecht University, The Netherlands and University of Lethbridge, Canada. From Utrecht there were 110 females and 53 males with an average age of 20.71 years. From Lethbridge there were 113 females and 67 males with an average age of 21.04 years.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: All participants read ten scenarios describing world wide disasters, with special care to avoid describing countries of special interest to Holland or Canada. Participants were asked to rate how much sympathy they felt for those involved in each disaster on a seven-point scale.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants were asked to imagine that they had just won 100 dollars (or guilders) in a lottery. They were then asked how much of the money they would donate to assist families and survivors of each of the ten disasters.

Main Results: To examine the effects of nationality, gender, and the disaster stories on sympathy and altruism, two 2 X 2 X 10 repeated measures ANOVAs were performed. Canadian participants expressed greater sympathy ($\underline{M}$ = 5.10) than Dutch participants ($\underline{M}$ = 4.76; $\underline{F}$ (1, 339) = 56.02, $\underline{p}$ < .001). Females expressed greater sympathy ($\underline{M}$ = 5.21) than Males ($\underline{M}$ = 4.44; $\underline{F}$ (1, 339) = 14.79, $\underline{p}$ < .001). There was also a main effect for disaster scenario ($\underline{F}$ (9, 3051) = 248.12, $\underline{p}$ < .001) and an interaction between nationality and disaster scenario ($\underline{F}$ (9, 3051) = 4.48, $\underline{p}$ < .001) on expressed sympathy. Canadian participants donated more money ($\underline{M}$ = 116.47) than Dutch participants ($\underline{M}$ = 84.69; $\underline{F}$ (1, 339) = 5.13, $\underline{p}$ < .03). There was no main effect of gender on money donated $\underline{F}$ (1, 339) = 1.25, $\underline{ns}$). There was also a main effect for

disaster scenario ($\underline{F}$ (9, 3051) = 67.70, $\underline{p}$ < .001) and an interaction between nationality and disaster scenario ($\underline{F}$ (9, 3051) = 16.47, $\underline{p}$ < .001) on money donated. The relationships of age with sympathy and altruism were significant only for males. Older Dutch men were less sympathetic than younger men ($\underline{r}$ = -.29, $\underline{p}$ < .025). Older Canadian men were less willing to donate money than younger men ($\underline{r}$ = -.23, $\underline{p}$ < .05). For the two nationality by disaster scenario interactions, the authors suggest that some particular types of disaster were more personally relevant to each national group (i.e., floods to the Dutch and landslides to the Canadians), evoking greater sympathy and altruism as personal relevance increased.

Conclusion: "Overall, it would appear that the relationship between sympathy for international disaster victims and the level of assistance people will extend is weak. The strength of the affect-action postulated by Weiner (1980) appears to change as a function of sex and culture."

Commentary: Consistent with other research (Eisenberg, et al., 1989), Den Ouden and Russell found that females expressed greater sympathy than males. It is interesting that the greater sympathy expressed by females did not translate to greater donation of money to assist victims. This study also displays the role of culture in emotional and behavioral response to need in others. More cross-cultural research is needed to aid in determining what personality and individual difference correlates of altruism are human qualities and what are qualities that are tied to culture.

Correspondence: None Available

Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. Psychological Bulletin, 100, 282-308.

Objective: To summarize statistically the results of 172 studies concerning gender and helping behavior

Design: Meta-Analytic Review

Studies: Studies included were 172 studies (with 182 effect sizes) derived from literature in psychology, education, and the social sciences on altruism, prosocial behavior, helping behavior, assistance, and aid. All studies included a measure of helping behavior or commitment to help, the results allowed calculation of sex-of-subject effect size. The subjects in the studies were male and female adults and adolescents over 14 years old from the United States or Canada.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: The following variables were coded from each study: a) date of publication, b) source of publication, c) percentage of male authors, d) sex of first author, e) sample size, f) setting (laboratory, campus, off-campus), g) existence of surveillance of helping, h) availability of other potential helpers, i) type of appeal for help (direct appeal or presentation of need), j) whether the victim and requester were the same person, k) identity of victim/requester.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: The effect size index used in the present study was *d*, the difference between the means of two groups, divided by the pooled (within-sex) standard deviation. An effect size was calculated for 99 helping behaviors. Where possible, effect size calculations were performed for sex-of-victim/requester differences; statistical significance and/or direction of differences was recorded. Similarly, effect size calculations were performed separately for male and female subjects on sex-of-victim/requester.

Main Results: The studies had moderate numbers of participants (Mdn = 119.94) and predominately male authors (Mean = 75.88%). More of the studies were conducted in field settings than in laboratory settings (N = 162 vs. 41) and use of surveillance was more likely to be non-existent or unclear than clear surveillance (N = 156 vs. 25). Studies were evenly distributed with respect to availability of other helpers and type of appeal.

Giving Help: Effect size analyses reveal that men helped more than women (Mean effect size = .07, 95% CI = .02 to .13, total N of subjects = 48,945). Although men helped more than women across situations, the effect size was larger in studies conducted in off-campus settings than in campus settings (χ^2 (2) = 421.68, p < .001; b = .34). The effect size was larger, with women helping more, in studies conducted in laboratory settings than in non-laboratory settings (χ^2 (2) = 7.90, p < .025; b = -.16). The effect size was larger, with the gender difference indicating men helping more than women in studies where there was surveillance than in studies where there was not surveillance (χ^2 (2) = 66.59, p < .001; b = -.16). Furthermore, male-female differences were larger in studies in which the appeal was in terms of an expressed need instead of a direct appeal (b = .24, p < .001). Examining the continuous variables affecting gender differences in helping, males (a) rated themselves more competent to help; b = .58, p < .001, (b) rated themselves as more comfortable in helping; b = .27, p < .001, (c) estimated they faced less danger from helping; b = .72, p < .001, and (d) judged themselves more likely to help than the average woman; b = .49, p < .001. Interactions of competence and perceived danger with availability of other helpers revealed that in studies in which other helpers were present, men were more likely than women to help to the extent that they perceived themselves to be more competent to help (b = .54, p < .001)or in less danger from helping (b = .55, p < .001). In total these effect size moderators accounted for 69% of the variability in observed effect size.

Receiving Help: Effect size analyses reveal that women were helped more than men (Mean effect size = -.23, 95% CI = -.38 to -.08, total N of subjects = 22,357). Although women were helped more than men across situations, the effect size was larger in the off-campus settings than the campus settings - including the laboratory - (Q_B = 200.03, p < .001; b = -.25). Effect sizes were larger, with women being helped more, in studies in which there was surveillance than when there was unclear surveillance (χ^2 (2) = 221.18, p < .001; b = -.62). Conversely, the effect sizes were larger, with men being helped more, in studies in which there was unclear surveillance than in studies in which there was no surveillance (χ^2 (2) = 39.28, p < .001; b = .32). Women were helped more than men in studies in which others were available to help than in studies in which availability of help was unclear or help was unavailable (b = .20, p < .001). Furthermore, women were helped more than men in studies in which the appeal was in terms of an expressed need instead of a direct appeal (b = .19, p < .001). Examining the continuous variables affecting gender differences in receiving

help, females were helped more than males to the extent that males (a) rated themselves more competent to help; $\underline{b}$ = -.34, p < .001, (b) rated themselves as more comfortable in helping; $\underline{b}$ = -.22, p < .001, (c) estimated they faced less danger from helping; $\underline{b}$ = -.22, p < .001, and (d) judged themselves more likely to help than the average woman; $\underline{b}$ = -.42, p < .001. In total, these effect size moderators and their interactions accounted for 61% of the variability in effect size

Conclusion: "Results from our meta-analytic review of sex differences in helping behavior indicate that in general men helped more than women and women received more help than men."

Commentary: Meta-analytic studies, such as this work by Eagly and Crowley, are invaluable in summarizing a large literature by averaging over the smaller inconsistencies between individual studies. While other studies in this bibliography suggest that women may be more sympathetic than men (den Ouden and Russell, 1997; Eisenberg et al., 1989), this study suggests that the actual helping behavior is more often enacted by men than women. However, even though the effect size is of statistical significance, it is not large enough to be of much value in real-world terms. Eagly and Crowley also found that women are more likely to be the recipients of help than men. This effect size is quite large and represents a large effect in both statistical and real-world terms. The person-situation interaction appears to extend to gender. That is, the individual's gender (person effect) and the gender of the requester of help (situation effect) combine to create the complete picture of the helping situation. This includes variables related to the setting (i.e., whether there are other helpers available) and variables related to the individual's personality (i.e., perceived danger to self of helping) affecting likelihood of both helping and being helped. It should be noted that most social psychological studies focus on chivalrous acts toward strangers – the domain of male gender role behavior – and not on the kinds of social support women enact in the helping of friends and family. As further evidence of this bias in the literature, women rated the perceived helping in these studies as more dangerous than did men, felt less competent to help than did men and were inhibited by an audience to witness the helping act.

Correspondence: Alice H. Eagly, Northwestern University, 2029 Sheridan Rd #102, Evanston, IL 60208-2710

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Schaller, M., Miller, P, Carlo, G., Poulin, R., Shea, C., & Shell, R. (1991) Personality and socialization correlates of vicarious emotional responding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61, 459-470.

Objective: To examine the relationship between personality and family characteristics of a precursor to altruism - vicarious emotional responding

Design: Laboratory experiment and survey

Setting: Arizona State University

Participants: Participants were 44 male and 50 female undergraduates participating for partial course credit in introductory psychology. Average age of participants was 19 years old.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: In the first session of the experiment, participants completed a questionnaire containing the following scales: a) Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964), b) Davis's (1983) Interpersonal Reactivity Index which has four subscales (empathic concern, perspective taking, fantasy empathy, and personal distress), c) Larsen's (Larsen et al., 1987) Affect Intensity Measure, d) the Family Cohesiveness subscale of Moos and Moos's (1981) Family Environment Scale, and e) Halberstadt's (1986) Family Expressiveness Scale.

In the second session of the experiment participants viewed two films. One designed to elicit sympathy by showing an interview with a child who had spina bifida and displayed difficulty walking. The other film was designed to illicit personal distress and showed a young man picking up a hitchhiker who eventually threatened to do bodily harm to the young man. Participants were randomly assigned to either objective or perspective taking conditions. Participants were told to view the videotape either imagining themselves in the place of the protagonist or objectively observing the protagonist's behavior.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: All participants were connected to equipment which measured skin conductance and heart rate via electrodes placed on the participant's body. Participants completed mood measures following each film - rating 15 emotion-related adjectives on a seven-point scale.

Main Results: Women exhibited more skin conductance while viewing the sympathy and distress films than did men ($ps < .05$). They also reported higher levels of sympathy in response to both films and distress in response to the distress film than did men ($ps < .05$). Fantasy empathy, which measures the tendency to react emotionally to movies, books, and imagination, was related to vicarious emotional responding, assessed by skin conductance in both films (partial r (75) = .27 and .34, respectively; $ps < .02$). For participants in the perspective taking instruction set, the measure of dispositional perspective taking was positively related to sadness, sympathy, and distress in reaction to the sympathy film (partial r (75) = .47, .25, and .47, respectively; $ps < .10$) and dispositional personal distress was negatively related to sympathy in the sympathy film films (partial r (75) = -.33, $ps < .05$).

Family cohesiveness was significantly related to sympathy and sadness for the sympathy film films (partial r (88) = .23 and .21, respectively; $ps < .03$). The significance of the measures of family expressivity on sadness, sympathy, distress and physical response were driven, primarily, by the reactions of the women. For women, self reports of sadness and sympathy were related to expression of positive emotion in the home for both films (partial r (75) = .46 and .35, respectively for the sympathy film; partial r (75) = .54 and .34, respectively for the distress film $ps < .05$) and expression of emotion was related to distress in reaction to the sympathy film (partial r (75) = .39, $p < .01$). Heart rate was only related to positive emotional expression in the home for women during the distress film (partial r (75) = .39, $p < .01$).

Conclusion: "The results of the present study support the claim that personal variables, including dispositional characteristics of the individual and one's socialization history, are related to the degree to which adults react vicariously to sympathy-evoking and distressing stimuli. However, the relations vary as a function of the type of stimulus and the type of assessment of vicarious responding."

Commentary: This work is a continuation of a line of research in which Eisenberg and colleagues investigate the roles of personality and empathy in producing prosocial behavior (Eisenberg et al., 1989). It has been argued that vicarious emotional responding is a precursor to altruistic or prosocial behavior. In the present study Eisenberg et al., examine the more distal relationships of vicarious emotional responding to personality and socialization variables. While some of the variables examined are dispositional in nature, others are simply individual differences in history of socialization concerning emotion. The dispositional measures are related to spontaneous emotional responding for both men and women, but the individual differences in socialization of emotions was related to vicarious emotional responding only for women. The amount of sympathy and personal distress was appropriately tied to the situational setting of the film. Disposition, socialization, and situation interact to produce appropriate vicarious emotional responding which might, in turn, lead to situationally appropriate helping behaviors.

Correspondence: Nancy Eisenberg, Department of Psychology, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287

Eisenberg, N., Miller, P. A., Schaller, M., Fabes, R. A., Fultz, J., Shell, R., & Shea, C. L. (1989). The role of sympathy and altruistic personality traits in helping: A reexamination. Journal of Personality, 57(1), 41-67.

Objective: To examine the role of social evaluation in sympathy and helping and to examine whether altruistic personality traits and emotional responses affect intention to help

Design: Experiment involving both questionnaire and laboratory sessions

Setting: Arizona State University

Participants: Participants were 78 students, 37 females and 41 males, participating for partial class credit.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: In a questionnaire session, participants completed the Ascription of Responsibility Scale (Schwartz, 1968), the Social Responsibility Scale (Berkowitz & Lutterman, 1968), the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964), the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale (Leary, 1983), the Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1986), and a measure of emotional empathy (Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972). Approximately one week later, the participants returned for the experimental session. They were randomly assigned to an

experimental or a control group. While both groups were fitted with electrodes to measure heart rate, the experimental group was led to believe that the technician could detect truthful answers on questionnaires with the physiological measure. At the experimental session participants also filled out a questionnaire including the Davis Interpersonal Reactivity Index (1983), and measures of current emotional state, personal distress, sympathetic concern, and sad reactions (Fultz, Schaller, & Cialdini, 1988). The Davis Interpersonal Reactivity Index and its subscales of empathic concern, perspective taking, personal distress, and fantasy empathy are measures of dispositional empathy. Measures of current emotional state, sympathetic concern, and sad reactions are measures of situationally induced empathy.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: All participants saw a fictitious "human interest" news report about a single mother struggling to help her two children who were in the hospital as a result of an auto accident. Participants were given the opportunity to help the mother by volunteering their time to run errands, do yard work, etc. Possible responses ranged from 0 hours to 18 hours, in three hour increments.

Main Results: Participants who scored high on measures of emotional empathy, fantasy empathy, and perspective taking saw the mother's need as greater than participants who scored lower on these measures (partial rs = .27, .29, and .27, respectively; ps < .03). In a 2 X 2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) on the four subscales of the Davis Interpersonal Reactivity Index, there was a main effect for gender (F (4,69) = 5.57, p < .01) and an interaction between gender and experimental condition (F (4,69) = 2.74, p < .05). Females scored higher on all dispositional empathy measures - empathic concern, perspective taking, fantasy empathy, and personal distress, than did males. Furthermore, females in the control condition scored significantly higher than males on fantasy empathy as they did not think the experimenter could detect their real responses (Ms = 25.84 for females and 21.42 for males). Both empathic concern and perspective taking were positively correlated with helping the mother (rs = .33, and .28, respectively; ps < .02). Self-reports of situationally induced sympathy were also positively related to helping (r = .27, p < .02). Three measures of altruistic personality, Davis' Empathic Concern, Ascription of Responsibility, and the Mehrabian & Epstein Empathy Scale, were also related to helping (rs = .33, .31, and .29, respectively; ps < .05).
Situational sympathy and fear of negative evaluation were examined as a potential moderators of the relationship between personality characteristics and helping behavior. Dispositional empathic concern was moderated by fear of negative evaluation (r^2 change = .05, F (1,71) = 4.05, p < .05). A path model containing both the direct effects of dispositional empathic concern and situational sympathy on helping and the indirect effect of dispositional empathic concern through situational sympathy revealed significant paths for both direct and indirect effects (W (1) = 4.06 and 21.36, ps < .05). Similar patterns were revealed for dispositional perspective taking and situational sympathy (W (1) = 3.83 and 4.86, ps < .055), as well as for ascription of responsibility and situational sympathy (W (1) = 4.61 and 5.23, ps < .05). The three models each accounted for 13%, 13%, and 14% of the total variance in helping.

Conclusion: "There is indeed an altruistic personality, and the effects of an altruistic disposition on the intention to assist a needy other are partially mediated through individuals' sympathetic reactions to needy others in the given context."

Commentary: This study, like other studies by Batson and colleagues (e.g., Batson et al., 1981, 1983) examined the extent to which personality traits such as empathy and social responsibility predict behavioral expressions of willingness to help. Eisenberg and colleagues found evidence that situational empathy did mediate, in part, the associations between personality variables and offered help. However, unlike Batson, Eisenberg and colleagues did not find that situational empathy completely mediated the association of personality and helping. Thus, additional variables might be at work. Unlike Batson's studies, this experiment did not vary the "ease of escape". Instead, the whole study simulates the "easy escape" condition where non-altruistic motivation should not be activated. Nevertheless, this study shows quite clearly that personality does play a role in some forms of helping (even if the motivations of such forms of helping are not made completely clear).

Correspondence: Nancy Eisenberg, Department of Psychology, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287

Fabes, R. A., Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P. A. (1990). Maternal correlates of children's vicarious emotional responsiveness. Developmental Psychology, 26, 639-648.

Objective: To explore the relationship between mother's sympathetic dispositions and their children's vicarious emotional responses and prosocial behavior

Design: Direct observation and questionnaires

Setting: Arizona State University

Participants: Participants were 59 second graders (25 females, 33 males), 58 fifth graders (25 females, 33 males), and their mothers. Nineteen children were dropped from analyses because of incomplete data or because they did not like recess at school (recess was related to the helping variable).

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Mothers completed demographic information and three subscales of the Davis Interpersonal Reactivity Index (1983) – perspective taking, empathic concern, and personal distress.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Children were invited into a laboratory room to rate bogus TV broadcasts. The child was fitted with two electrocardiograph electrodes which provided heart rate measures during a baseline period (when the newscaster was introducing the study) and during a critical segment (an emotion provoking interview). The emotion provoking interview was of a mother who described a bad auto accident her children had been in, the injuries and adjustment difficulties of the children, and the children's fears of getting behind in school. The mother in the interview was visibly upset. Facial expressions displayed by the children while watching the emotion provoking video were recorded on videotape and rated by two

judges. The ratings ranged from 0 for no sign of emotion to 5 for exceptionally strong facial display. Each of the following emotions were rated in facial expressions: happiness, sadness, distress, and sympathy. The child's general level of expressiveness as displayed when watching a neutral videotape was taken into account in analyses.

Following each videotape the children verbally rated the extent to which they felt each of 11 emotions on a 7 point scale from not at all to very much. The emotion words reflected personal distress (i.e., worried), sympathy (i.e., feeling sorry for someone), and general affect states (i.e., happy, sad). Finally, the experimenter gave the child an opportunity to help the injured children from the videotape by giving up their recess time to gather homework materials from the injured children's teachers. The children were to mark on a calendar which, if any, of 10 school days they were willing to give up their recess to help.

Main Results: There were sex and age differences in children's vicarious emotional responses. After watching the film, boys reported less distress than girls (F (1, 113) = 3.72, p < .05). Girls were more willing to help than boys (F (1, 114) = 3.90, p < .05). Second graders showed less happiness and more sympathy, facially, than did fifth graders (Ms = .06 vs. .15 and .69 vs. .44, respectively; Fs (1, 115) = 4.95 and 3.62, ps < .05). Looking at overall linear trends in heart rate for helping between those who helped very little (1 or fewer days) and those who helped more, heart rate decelerated for children in the high help group, but not in the low help group (F (1, 111) = 3.61, p < .06). Interrelations among measures of children's vicarious emotional responsiveness, helping, and measures of maternal empathy are presented separately for girls and boys.

For girls, verbal reports of negative affect were positively related to verbal reports of sympathy, distress, and facial sadness (rs = .68, .50, and .25, respectively). Verbal reports of sympathy were also related to verbal reports of distress (r = .38) and facial sadness was inversely related to facial distress (r = -.39). Oddly, mothers' scores on empathic concern, and perspective taking were positively related to girls reports of negative affect (rs = .38 and .29, respectively) and mothers' reports of personal distress were related to daughters' reports of positive affect, sympathy, distress, and negative affect (rs = .25, -.29, -.24, and -.30, respectively). Girls who reported more negative, and less positive, affect were most willing to help (rs = .33 and -.28, respectively).

For boys, verbal reports of negative affect were positively correlated with verbal reports of sympathy and distress and with heart rate deceleration (rs = .62, .57, and -.23, respectively). Verbal reports of sympathy were positively related to verbal distress and heart rate deceleration (rs = .63 and -.28, respectively). Boys facial sadness was positively related to facial sympathy (r = .61). Mothers' scores on perspective taking were negatively related to boys' reports of negative affect (r = -.24). Mothers' scores on personal distress were positively correlated with boys' reports of positive affect (r = .21). Mothers' scores on perspective taking and empathic concern were positively related to boys' helpfulness (rs = .23 and .25, respectively). Boys' reports of sympathy and distress were related to willingness to help (rs = .22 and .23, respectively). Also, boys' willingness to help was related to facial expressions of sadness and sympathy (rs = .22 and .24, respectively).

Conclusion: "Mothers who were more sympathetic and better perspective takers had girls who reported feeling more sympathy and negative affect and less happiness after exposure to needy others. Fewer relations between mother's sympathy

and vicarious emotional response were found for boys; however, there were more relations between boys' emotional responses and their helpfulness."

Commentary: Fabes, Eisenberg, and Miller (1990) show three important links in this study: a) the link between emotional responses, facial expressions, and physiological responses in children; b) the link between those responses and willingness to help; and c) the link between mother's dispositional empathy and children's emotional responses. The link between mother's empathy and children's emotional responses may show a passing of traits over generations, though it is impossible to tell what portion of these results may be do to heredity and what part to children observing and mimicking the mother's response or direct teaching of empathic reactions (cf. Davis et al, 1994). The link between verbal reports of emotion, independently judged facial expressions, and heart rate provides convergent validity for measures of dispositional empathy. Furthermore, this study of children joins the longer list of research linking dispositional empathy to helping behavior in adults (Archer et al., 1981; Eisenberg et al., 1989, 1991; Switzer et al., 1991; and others).

Correspondence: Richard A. Fabes, Department of Family Resources and Human Development, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-2502

Farver, J. A. M., & Branstetter, W. H. (1994). Preschoolers' prosocial responses to their peers' distress. Developmental Psychology, 30(3), 334-341.

Objective: To observe individual differences in children's responses to crying by other children

Design: Naturalistic Observation Study

Setting: University Child Development Laboratory

Participants: Fifty-two preschoolers in three child-care programs with an mean age of 49.4 months (range 36-56 months) participated. Twenty-six participants were female and twenty-six were male.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Each child's social interaction with peers was coded throughout a free-play period for positive social interactions, negative social interactions, shared positive emotion, social play, and orienting toward an adult. Assessments of friendship status were made by sociometric analysis, behavioral observation, and teacher nomination. Teachers rated each child's social competence on three scales, difficult child, hesitant child, and sociable child (Howes, 1988). Parents completed the Behavioral Style Questionnaire (McDevitt & Carey, 1978) which researchers used to classify children into three temperament categories, easy, slow to warm-up, and difficult. Easy children are happy and adapt easily to their environment. Slow to warm-up children are shy and slow to adapt to their environment. Difficult children are characteristically unhappy and do not easily adapt to their environment.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Each child's behavior to the naturally occurring crying of a fellow preschooler was coded for the following categories: ignoring the incident, teasing the crying child, watching, commenting on why child is crying, mediating the conflict either physically or verbally, or comforting the crying child. Prosocial peer response was the summed proportions of approach, comment, comfort, and mediate. Ignoring the incident was considered a non-prosocial response and no child teased the crying child.

Main Results: Children rated as having an easy temperament behaved more prosocially to the crying child ($\underline{M}$ = .91) than children rated as having slow to warm-up ($\underline{M}$ = .86) and difficult temperaments ($\underline{M}$ = .67, $\underline{F}$ (2, 51) = 6.93; $\underline{p}$ < .01). The proportion of time a child spent crying was related to proportion of prosocial responses when other children cried ($\underline{r}$ (50) = .48, $\underline{p}$ < .01). Positive social interaction was also positively correlated with prosocial responses ($\underline{r}$ (50) = .40, $\underline{p}$ < .01). There were no significant correlations for shared positive affect, social play, adult orientation, age, or gender. Children with at least one reciprocal friendship had more prosocial responses to peer crying ($\underline{M}$ = .92) than children without reciprocal friendships ($\underline{M}$ = .51, $\underline{F}$ (2, 49) = 5.90; $\underline{p}$ < .01).

Conclusion: "The results suggest that socioemotional functioning with peers and individual characteristics affect children's responses to a peer's distress."

Commentary: While many psychosocial processes function somewhat differently with young children than they do with adults, by examining young children we may see the underlying simpler processes and even the developmental issues related to altruism. One difference between this study and studies of adults is that there seems to be no gender differences in altruistic behavior or altruistic personality characteristics among the children. In studies of adults, females are consistently more empathic in temperament than males (Carlo et al., 1991; Chau et al., 1990, Eisenberg et al., 1989) and males do more overt helping behavior than females (Eagly and Crowley, 1986). Perhaps the most interesting finding in this study is that children who cry a lot themselves are more likely to act prosocially toward another child who is crying. Two explanations for this finding come to mind, either of which strengthens the argument for personality differences in altruistic behavior. The first is that the crying child is more sensitive, empathetic, or simply "soft-hearted" in general and therefore is more likely to respond to the needs of another. A second explanation is that we are witnessing rudimentary perspective taking. The child who cries at some level understands the distress of the other and is more likely to help the other to relieve that distress. As we have seen in other studies, personality variations function in the context of the social environment. Easy temperament, positive social interaction, and reciprocal friendships speak to the interactive nature of altruism in this study.

Correspondence: Jo Ann M. Farver Department of Psychology, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California 90089-1061

49

Gergen, K. J., Gergen, M. M., & Meter, K. (1972). Individual orientations to prosocial behavior. Journal of Social Issues, 8, 105-130.

Objective: To examine the relationship between ten personality measures and prosocial behavior

Design: Cross-sectional survey

Setting: Swarthmore College

Participants: Participants were 72 upper-level students enrolled in a personality theory course. There were 37 males and 35 females.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: During the first class session students completed several personality questionnaires including seven subscales of the Edwards Personal Preference Inventory (Edwards, 1954) – abasement, autonomy, change, deference, nurturance, order, and succorance. Abasement is the need to surrender one's self or will to another. Autonomy is the tendency to act independently of others. Change is the tendency to seek out new experiences and enjoy different activities. Deference is the need to admire and defer to a leader or superior. Nurturance is the tendency to protect, support, and encourage others. Order is the desire to have one's environment methodically and harmoniously arranged. Finally, succorance is the need to receive aid, assistance, and guidance from others. Participants also completed the Zuckerman's test of sensation seeking (i.e., the degree to which individuals search out and enjoy activities with a high level of physical or social sensation; Zuckerman, Kolin, Price, & Zoob, 1964) and a self-esteem measure (i.e., the degree to which the participant values him/herself; deCharms & Rosenbaum, 1960).

Assessment of Outcome Variables: At the end of the following class session students were asked whether they would be willing to help the psychology department by volunteering to help with one or more of the following services: a) help in counseling male high school students with personal problems, b) help in counseling female high school students with personal problems, c) aid a faculty research project on deductive thinking, d) aid in research on unusual states of consciousness, and e) help collate and assemble materials for the class.

Main Results: Because ten separate personality variables were investigated independently for males and females, the findings of this study were quite complex. Therefore, results for males and females are presented separately. For males, participants high in nurturance were more likely to volunteer to help counsel high school males (r = .41, p < .05). However, nurturance was not significantly correlated with any other measure of helping for males. For males, abasement was negatively correlated with willingness to counsel males, counsel females, and help with the deductive thinking experiment (rs = -.30, -.31, -.33, ps < .05), but not with willingness to help with the unusual states experiment or collate class materials (ps > .05). Some

of the correlations between helping and personality characteristics differed by situation. For example, for males, autonomy was negatively correlated with willingness to counsel females (r = -.30, p < .05), but positively correlated with willingness to collate class materials (r = .29, p < .05). Conversely, order was positively correlated with willingness to counsel females (r = .35, p < .05) and negatively correlated with willingness to collate class materials (r = -.28, p < .05). Males also showed significant correlations for willingness to help with unusual states experiments and change, self-consistency, and sensation seeking (rs = .40, -.40, .45, ps < .05). Change and sensation seeking were related to each other (r =.34, p < .05). However, when sensation seeking was held constant, change fails to correlate significantly with willingness to help.

Females showed a similar, but not entirely consistent pattern of correlations between dispositional variables and helping situations. For females, participants higher in deference, nurturance, and order were more willing to help counsel high school females (rs = .32, .34, .40, ps < .05). However, there were no significant correlations between these three variables and female participants' willingness to counsel high school males. Furthermore, deference was negatively correlated with willingness to collate class materials (r = -.33, p < .05). Willingness to counsel high school males was related to abasement, self-consistency, and sensation seeking for these female participants (rs = -.39, -.33, .29, ps < .05). In contrast to the males for whom self-esteem had no significant correlations with helping, females showed positive correlations between self-esteem and willingness to help with the unusual states experiment and collating class materials (rs = .50, .42, ps < .05). The unusual states experiment was correlated with several dispositional variables for the females – autonomy, change, self-esteem, sensation seeking, and succorance (rs = .36, .32, .50, .56, -.31, ps < .05). Self-esteem and autonomy were positively correlated with each other (r = .34, p < .05) and with willingness to help collate materials. However, when self-esteem was held constant, autonomy fails to predict helping.

Conclusion: "Rather than finding trait-dimensions that generally predict to prosocial activities, we find that all ten traits utilized in the study can be related to prosocial behavior. However, whether a relationship exists and the nature of this relationship *depends on the type of situation in question.* [emphasis in the original] There is widespread evidence of interaction among predictor variables. In particular, identical personality traits do not generally operate in similar ways for males and females." Furthermore, intercorrelations between dispositional variables may be evidence of some spurious associations.

Commentary: Gergen, Gergen, and Meter's (1972) article is more than just a study of dispositional traits and helping behavior. They go to great lengths to discuss the pitfalls of simple correlations between dispositional traits and helping. Four areas are discussed: a) The inconsistency of prediction of personality variables across situations, b) Interactions among dispositional variables and other individual differences (i.e., gender differences), c) The need to isolate independent effects of predictors separate from their correlations with other predictors, and d) The inconsistency of personality variables over time may lower the magnitude of correlations. We need to use caution when interpreting correlations between personality traits and helping behavior. The context of the helping behavior and the intercorrelations with other traits should be considered at the very least. This article is considered a classic in this area of study. Much progress has been made in addressing

these issues since its publication.

Correspondence: Kenneth J. Gergen, Swarthmore College, Department of Psychology, 500 College Ave, Swarthmore, PA, 19081

<div style="border:1px solid black; height:40px;"></div>

Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1987). Love and sex attitudes and religious beliefs. Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology, 5(3), 391-398.

Objective: To explore the relations between love and religious belief

Design: Cross-sectional questionnaire study

Setting: Study 1: The University of Miami
Study 2: Texas Tech University

Participants: Study 1: Participants were 807 college students.
Study 2: Participants were 567 college students.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants completed a self-rating of religiousness, from very religious to very anti-religious. Participants also completed a 51-item sexual attitudes inventory.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants completed a 42-item love styles scale. The scale addressed each of the six theoretical types of love: eros (romantic, passionate love), ludus (game-playing love), storge (compassionate love), mania (possessive, dependent love), pragma (logical, practical love), and agape (selfless, religious love). Greater endorsement of items was indicated by marking lower numbers on the scale.

Main Results: In both studies participants who rated themselves as very religious also rated themselves as having more storge, pragma, and agape love styles than non-religious participants (Ms = 2.3 vs. 2.8 on Storge, 2.6 vs. 3.0 for pragma, and 2.2 vs. 2.6 for agape; Fs > 3.3, ps < .05). Very religious participants rated themselves as having less ludus than non-religious participants (Ms = 2.3 vs. 2.8 on ludus; F = 4.6, p < .05).

Conclusion: "Subjects who were more religious endorsed the more 'dependable' love styles of storge (compassionate), pragma (practical), and agape (selfless), while they relatively rejected ludus (game-playing)."

Commentary: Lee (1977) defines the agape love style as altruistic and loving without concern for receiving anything in return. The dictionary of the Information Please Almanac defines agape as "unselfish love of one person for another without sexual implications; brotherly love". It is clear that the concept of agape love is related to altruism and in the case of Lee (1977) is defined in terms of altruism. According to the findings of Hendrick and Hendrick's work (1987) religiousness is related to selfless,

altruistic intentions in the form of the expression of agape love style. It would be easy to believe that these religious participants, who also evinced higher levels of practical and compassionate love styles, would be better prepared to behave altruistically. What this study cannot answer is whether the religiousness affects expression of agape altruism through individual personality differences or whether religious teaching leads to greater acceptance of altruistic love. Furthermore, there is no investigation of the direct link between the agape love style, religiousness, and prosocial behavior.

Correspondence: Susan S. Hendrick, Department of Psychology, Box 42051, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409-2051

Jackson, L. M. & Esses, V. M. (1997). Of scripture and ascription: The relation between religious fundamentalism and intergroup helping. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23(8) 893-906.

Objective: To investigate the relationships between religious fundamentalism, threat to group values, and degree of helping for an outgroup

Design: Experiment with questionnaires

Setting: A University in Eastern Canada

Participants: Study 1: Participants were 116 students (48 males and 68 females) from the University of Western Ontario who participated in exchange for course credit. Participants indicated their primary religious affiliation as Protestant (29), Catholic (33), Jewish (16), "personal religion" (10), agnostic (13), atheist (4) or other, including Muslim and Hindu (10).
Study 2: Participants were 92 individuals (46 males and 46 females) who participated either in exchange for course credit or $5. Participants indicated their primary religious affiliation as Protestant (24), Catholic (25), Jewish (7), "personal religion" (7), agnostic (11), atheist (4), or other, including Muslim and Hindu (12).

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: Participants were randomly assigned to review materials concerning one of two target groups – homosexuals or Native Canadians. All participants then completed an open-ended measure of symbolic beliefs (Esses, Haddock, & Zanna, 1993). This measure asked participants to list values, customs, and traditions that were important to them and that they believed were either threatened or promoted by the target group. Participants gave ratings of threat or promotion to each of the values on a scale of –3 to +3. Next, participants read a short statement explaining that their assigned target group had disproportionally high unemployment. Then participants were asked to rate the extent that the target group members were responsible for the problem and to what extent the target group members were responsible for the solution to the problem on a seven-point Likert-type scale. Religious fundamentalism was assessed with the short form of the Religious Fundamentalism scale (Altemeyer and Hunsberger, 1992).
Study 2: Study materials were identical to Study 1, except that the target

groups were changed to never married mothers and students.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: Participants were asked to what extent they would endorse each of three helping styles – Personal change, Direct Assistance, and Empowerment. The personal change style is characterized by the belief that the solution to the problem is to change the person or the group with the problem. The direct assistance style is characterized by the belief that the solution to the problem is to deal directly with the problem at hand (i.e., "The government should provide funding for the creation of jobs"). The empowerment style is characterized by the belief that the solution to the problem is for individuals to accept that they caused the problem and to seek a solution through a recognized authority.

Study 2: Study materials were identical to Study 1.

Main Results: Study 1: For participants with the homosexual target group, Religious fundamentalism was significantly, negatively correlated with the belief that the target group promoted their values ($\underline{r}$ = -.47, $\underline{p}$ < .001). That is, participants high in religious fundamentalism espoused beliefs that were more threatening than promoting. This same relationship did not hold for participants with the Native Canadian target group. For participants with the homosexual target group, Religious fundamentalism was significantly, positively correlated with attributions of responsibility ($\underline{r}$ = .33, $\underline{p}$ < .001). That is, participants high in religious fundamentalism attributed more of the responsibility for unemployment to the group members than did participants low in religious fundamentalism. This same relationship did not hold for participants with the Native Canadian target group. Because the effect of religious fundamentalism was reduced to non-significance when placed in the model with symbolic beliefs, there is some support for the idea that the relationship between high levels of religious fundamentalism and attribution of responsibility is due to the perception that homosexuals threaten values. For both the homosexual target group and the Native Canadian target group, high attributions of responsibility were associated with high endorsement of personal change, low endorsement of direct assistance, and low endorsement of empowerment ($\underline{r}$s = .72, -.52, and -.69 for the homosexual target group, $\underline{r}$s = .52, -.37, and -.44 for the Native Canadian target group; $\underline{p}$s < .001).

Study 2: For participants with the single mothers target group, Religious fundamentalism was significantly, negatively correlated with the belief that the target group promoted their values ($\underline{r}$ = -.48, $\underline{p}$ < .001). That is, participants high in religious fundamentalism espoused beliefs that were more threatening than promoting. This same relationship did not hold for participants with the student target group. For participants with the single mothers target group, Religious fundamentalism was significantly, positively correlated with attributions of responsibility ($\underline{r}$ = .32, $\underline{p}$ < .001). That is, participants high in religious fundamentalism attributed more of the responsibility for unemployment to the group members than did participants low in religious fundamentalism. This same relationship did not hold for participants with the student target group. Because the effect of religious fundamentalism was reduced to non-significance when placed in the model with symbolic beliefs, there is some support for the idea that the relationship between high levels of religious fundamentalism and attribution of responsibility is due to the perception that single mothers threaten values. For the single mothers target group, high attributions of responsibility were associated with high endorsement of personal change, low endorsement of direct assistance, and low endorsement of empowerment ($\underline{r}$s = .39, -

.42, and -.45; ps < .001). For the students target group, high attributions of responsibility were associated with high endorsement of personal change and low endorsement of empowerment (rs = .73, and -.40; ps < .001). There was not a significant correlation between attributions of responsibility and endorsement of direct assistance.

Conclusion: "Attributions of responsibility for the problem predicted endorsement of personal change and rejection of empowerment. Religious fundamentalism is related to endorsement of personal change, at least in part, through value threat and attributions of responsibility for problems."

Commentary: These studies by Jackson and Esses suggest a model for intergroup helping that involves characteristics of the individual (religious fundamentalism), cognitive processes (attributions made under threat to values), and three types of helping (personal change, direct assistance, and empowerment). The model helps to explain why individuals choose to help outgroup members in particular ways and in what ways the helper may feel threatened by outgroup members. If the helper chooses to help the threatening outgroup, he or she is more likely to do so through promoting or enabling the outgroup member to make a personal change. The authors correctly suggest that this model is not necessarily generalizable to helping individuals who may or may not be outgroup members. Furthermore, they suggest that future research might ask "how different religious value systems influence the way in which people define problems and their solutions."

Correspondence: Lynne Jackson, Department of Psychology, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3C5

Johnson, R. C., Danko, G. P., Davill, T. J., Bochner, S., Bowers, J. K., Huang, Y-H., Park, J. Y., Pecjak, V., Rahim, A. R. A., & Pennington, D. (1989). Cross-cultural assessment of altruism and its correlates. Personality and Individual Differences, 10, 855-868.

Objective: To investigate the personality correlates of giving help, receiving help, and importance of helping in six countries

Design: Cross-sectional survey

Setting: Universities in Australia, Egypt, Korea, the Republic of China (Taiwan), the United States (Hawaii and Missouri), and Yugoslavia.

Participants: Participants were recruited from universities in Australia (82 participants), Egypt (181 participants), Korea (403 participants), the Republic of China (Taiwan; 224 participants), the United States (Hawaii and Missouri; 216 and 104 participants, respectively), and Yugoslavia (243 participants). The Egyptian participants were from a small city of about 100,000 population and the Missouri participants were from a town of about 10,000. All other participants were from large

urban areas.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants completed the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ-R; Eysenck, Eysenck, and Barrett, 1985) with subscales for psychoticism, extraversion, neuroticism, and dishonest responding. United States participants completed the Intrinsic-Extrinsic Religiosity Scale (IER; Feagin, 1974; Allport and Ross, 1967). Finally participants filled out the Dimensions of Conscience Questionnaire designed to assess guilt (failure to fulfill norms of role reciprocity) and shame (status incongruity/embarrassment). Fifteen items for each of shame and guilt were assessed on a 7-point scale ranging from feeling "not at all badly" to feeling "as bad as I could possibly feel."

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants completed a 56-item scale addressing altruism in the form of helping behaviors (i.e., "holding the elevator for someone"). Participants rated how often they had performed each behavior, how often they had been the recipient of each behavior, and how important each behavior was. The scale included 20 items from the Rushton, Chrisjohn, and Fekken (1981) altruism scale.

Main Results: Main effects for sample country and gender were revealed on giving help (Fs = 24.93 and 45.68, respectively; ps < .001). Similarly, main effects for sample country and gender were revealed on receiving help (Fs = 20.72 and 15.68, respectively; ps < .001). Only a main effect of sample country was revealed for importance of help (F = 26.77, p < .001). Interactions between sample country and gender were found for both giving and receiving help (Fs = 5.62 and 6.25, respectively; ps < .001), but was caused simply by a low level of giving and receiving help for both males and females in the Taiwan sample. Males report giving more help than females in Australia, Egypt, Korea, and Hawaii (ts = 2.00, 5.86, 5.29, and 3.07, respectively; ps < .05), but males and females reported giving the same amount of help in Taiwan, Missouri, and Yugoslavia. Males report receiving more help than females in Egypt and Korea (ts = 5.42, and 3.42, respectively; ps < .05), while females reported receiving more help than males in Taiwan (t = 2.33, p < .05). However, males and females reported receiving the same amount of help in Australia, Hawaii, Missouri, and Yugoslavia.

Correlations of personality variables with the three measures of altruism reveal significant findings for guilt, shame, extraversion, and intrinsic religiosity. Guilt is significantly positively related to giving (rs = .09 and .22, females and males respectively; ps < .05) and receiving help (rs = .19 and .30, females and males respectively; ps < .001). As shame increased propensity to give help (rs = -.19 and -.14, females and males respectively; ps < .001) and receive help (rs = -.21 and -.23, females and males respectively; ps < .001) decreased while importance of help increased for males (r = .17, p < .001). The higher in extraversion a participant was, the more likely he or she was to report giving help (rs = .30 and .42, females and males respectively; ps < .001) and receiving help (rs = .28 and .36, females and males respectively; ps < .001). The higher in intrinsic religiosity a participant was, the more likely he or she was to report giving help (rs = .22 and .40, females and males respectively; ps < .001) and receiving help for males (r = .35, p < .001) and the higher they rated the importance of help (rs = .23 and .30, females and males respectively; ps < .001).

Conclusion: "Sex differences are present for the altruism scale as a whole, with almost all of the differences showing males to be more altruistic. Guilt is positively correlated with importance of help and tends to be positively correlated with both giving and receiving help, while shame tends to be negatively correlated with both giving and receiving help. Psychoticism, neuroticism, and lie scale scores are generally unrelated to altruism, while extraversion is consistently, positively correlated with both giving and receiving help."

Commentary: Johnson et al.'s expansive cross-cultural study is to be commended for its breadth and replication of previous findings in six countries. The authors note that, like the work of Eagly and Crowley (1986), this work deals primarily with altruistic acts toward strangers or acquaintances where males are found to report being more helpful while females are typically more helpful toward close relationship partners. Johnson et al. found that guilt, possibly stirred by some sense of social responsibility (Berkowitz and Lutterman, 1968; Bierhoff et al., 1991), was related to both giving and receiving help. Conversely, shame seems to inhibit giving and receiving of help. Individuals who exhibit high levels of shame most likely fear the social repercussions of mistakenly trying to help someone who does not need help or display weakness in asking help for oneself. The positive social effects of guilt and the negative social effects of shame are now well-replicated and appear to be quite robust.

Correspondence: Ronald C. Johnson, Professor Emeritus, Department of Psychology, College of Social Sciences, University of Hawaii at Manoa, 2430 Campus Road, Honolulu, HI 96822

Kerber, K. W. (1984). The perception of non-emergency helping situations: Cost, rewards, and the altruistic personality. <u>Journal of Personality 52</u>, 177-187.

Objective: To evaluate individual differences in the perception of non-emergency helping situations

Design: Experiments with Questionnaires

Setting: College of the Holy Cross, Worchester, MA

Participants: Participants were 132 undergraduates (58 males, 74 females) who participated in return for two dollars.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants completed three scales from the Omnibus Personality Inventory – complexity, social extroversion, and altruism (Heist & Yonge, 1968). They also completed the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964)

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions in which they read scenarios that were either high or low in costs and high or low in rewards. Costs were varied by manipulating the amount of time or

money lost. Rewards were varied by manipulating the amount of appreciation, information, or money gained. Participants rated the amount of help they were willing to provide, the perceived costs of helping, and the perceived rewards of helping.

Main Results: To examine whether rewards, costs, and altruism affected willingness to help, a 2 X 2 X 3 (Reward X Cost X Altruism) analysis of covariance was performed on willingness to help with social desirability as the covariate. High rewards led to more helping ($\underline{M}$= 5.52) than did low rewards ($\underline{M}$= 3.83, $\underline{F}$ (1,119) = 130.48, $\underline{p}$ < .001). High costs led to less helping ($\underline{M}$= 4.02) than did low costs ($\underline{M}$= 5.34, $\underline{F}$ (1,119) = 78.92, $\underline{p}$ < .001). High altruism led to more helping ($\underline{M}$= 5.01) than did moderate altruism ($\underline{M}$= 4.92) and low altruism ($\underline{M}$= 4.10, $\underline{F}$ (2,119) = 14.02, $\underline{p}$ < .001). The same analysis of covariance was performed on ratings of perceived rewards and perceived costs. Persons high in altruism perceived higher rewards ($\underline{M}$= 4.79) than did people with moderate altruism ($\underline{M}$= 3.97) and low altruism ($\underline{M}$= 3.79, $\underline{F}$ (2,119) = 9.39, $\underline{p}$ < .01). Conversely, persons high in altruism perceived fewer costs ($\underline{M}$= 3.31) than did people with moderate altruism ($\underline{M}$= 3.57) and low altruism ($\underline{M}$= 3.99, $\underline{F}$ (2,119) = 5.25, $\underline{p}$ < .01).

Path analyses revealed significant relationships between rewards and helping (β = .44; $\underline{t}$ (126) = 5.81, $\underline{p}$ < .01), costs and helping (β = -.42; $\underline{t}$ (126) = 5.54, $\underline{p}$ < .01), altruism and rewards (∃ = .41; $\underline{t}$ (128) = 3.55, $\underline{p}$ < .01), altruism and costs (β = -.37; $\underline{t}$ (128) = 3.42, $\underline{p}$ < .01), sex and altruism (β = .21; $\underline{t}$ (129) = 2.69, $\underline{p}$ < .01), and social desirability and altruism (β = .37; $\underline{t}$ (129) = 4.64, $\underline{p}$ < .01).

Conclusion: "Altruism influences willingness to help indirectly through its effects on the perception of rewards and costs, while approval motivation and the sex of the subject have their primary effects on responses to the altruism scale."

Commentary: Kerber's study shows an important link between dispositional altruism and helping through the cognitive interpretation of the situation. Persons high in dispositional altruism view help-giving situations as more rewarding and less costly than persons lower in altruism This is an important clue to the mechanisms by which dispositional altruism may lead to increased helping. Furthermore, this study shows clearly the relatively more distant link of gender and social desirability to dispositional altruism.

Correspondence: None Available

Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., & Lester, S. W. (1996). The effect of other-oriented values on decision making: A test of propositions of a theory of concern for others in organizations. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 68(3), 234-245.

Objective: To examine the relationship between other-oriented values, value placed on personal outcome, and engaging cognition about costs and benefits

Design: Two experiments with repeated-measures mixed design

Setting: The University of South Carolina

Participants: Study 1: Participants were 70 undergraduate business students enrolled in and introductory management class. They received course credit for their participation.
Study 2: Participants were 161 undergraduate business students enrolled in and introductory management class. They received course credit for their participation.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1:Concern for others was measured with the concern for others subscale of the Comparative Emphasis Scale (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987a and 1987b). Concern for others is the extent to which an individual places emphasis on being helpful to others and cooperative. It is related to dispositional empathy (Davis, 1980).
Study 2: As in Study 1 participants completed the concern for others subscale. Participants were then randomly assigned to view a videotape designed to induce positive arousal or relaxation.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Studies 1 and 2: Participants responded to several questions assessing their decision-making processes. Two variables assessed level of payoff and level of risk. Each question was of the format, "What is the most you would be willing to pay for a lottery ticket with a ____ chance of winning $____?". The three probabilities of winning presented were 10%, 50%, and 90%. The three levels of payoff were $10, $100, and $300. The attractiveness of each choice was measured by the amount of money the participant was willing to spend for each of the fictitious lottery tickets.

Main Results: Study 1: Participants low in concern for others were willing to pay more for the lottery tickets ($\underline{M}$ = 24.91) than were participants high in concern for others ($\underline{M}$ = 16.84; $\underline{F}$ = 4.44, $\underline{p}$ <.05). There was an interaction between concern for others and level of payoff ($\underline{F}$ = 22.82, $\underline{p}$ <.01), such that in comparison to participants with high concern for others, participants with low concern for others were willing to risk more money as the level of payoff increased. Furthermore, there was an interaction between concern for others and level of risk ($\underline{F}$ = 3.40, $\underline{p}$ <.05), such that in comparison to participants with high concern for others, participants with low concern for others were willing to risk more money as the probability of winning increased.
Study 2: The impact of concern for others on attractiveness of the gamble was moderated by positive affect arousal ($\underline{F}$ = 4.46, $\underline{p}$ <.05). The impact of concern for others was only significant in the positive arousal condition. In the positive arousal condition, participants low in concern for others were willing to risk more money ($\underline{M}$ = 24.30) than participants high in concern for others ($\underline{M}$ = 14.60). In the non-aroused condition there was little difference between participants with high and low concerned for others on amount of money risked. Parallel results were found in a significant three-way interaction between concern for others, level of payoff, and positive affect arousal ($\underline{F}$ = 3.49, $\underline{p}$ <.05). The interaction of concern for others and payoff was only significant in the positive arousal condition (positive arousal: $\underline{F}$ = 3.39, $\underline{p}$ <.05; non-arousal: $\underline{F}$ = 1.24, $\underline{ns}$). In the positive arousal condition, the payoff had a stronger impact on willingness to spend money for participants with low concern for others than for participants with high concern for others.

Conclusion: "Persons who were high in the value of concern for others placed less importance on personal outcomes and were less disposed to engage in deliberate rational computations."

Commentary: Korsgaard et al. (1996) investigated two variables related to altruism in opposite ways – concern for others and importance of personal outcomes. Presumably an altruistic person would be high on concern for others and low on importance of personal outcomes as indicated by this study and by others (Batson et al., 1986,1995; Carlo et al., 1991; Cialdini et al., 1997). Concern for others is conceptually related to Davis' (1980) Empathic Concern, but while empathic concern is a trait measured in absolute amounts, concern for others is measured as relative to other values and traits in the person's life (fairness, achievement, etc.). The importance of this study lies in the differences in cognitive processing utilized by the high and low concern for others participants. These individuals did not just act differently in their decision making, they got to the behavior by different means. This leads one to wonder whether the individual differences between altruistic and non-altruistic individuals is based on differences in cognitive processes and what role those cognitive processes play in combination with personality and environment to produce altruistic behavior.

Correspondence: M. Audrey Korsgaard, The Darla Moore School of Business, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208

Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., & Lester, S. W. (1997). Beyond helping: Do other-oriented values have broader implications in organizations? Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(1), 160-177.

Objective: To determine whether the value of concern for others is related to sensitivity to social information and helping others

Design: Study 1: Cross-sectional Survey
          Studies 2 and 3: Experiments

Setting: The University of South Carolina

Participants: Study 1: Participants were 64 first-year students in a Masters of Business Administration program. The average age of participants was 25 years old; 70% were male and 30% were female.
          Study 2: Participants were 106 undergraduate business students from management classes. Participants were matched on scores for the Concern for Others scale, then randomly assigned to conditions.
          Study 3: Participants were 55 undergraduate business students from management classes who volunteered to participate.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: All participants received naturally

occurring feedback on a classroom presentation. The professor's evaluation of each participant on each of 25 items (i.e., content, delivery style, etc.) represents the favorableness of feedback variable. Scores ranged from 77 to 98 with a mean of 88.6. Five to ten days following receipt of feedback participants completed a questionnaire addressing Concern for Others - a subscale of the Comparative Emphasis Scale (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987a and 1987b).

Study 2: Participants completed a proofreading task at the beginning of a class session. At the end of the class session participants were randomly assigned to receive High or Low specificity feedback "You should be more sensitive to wrong word errors." Or "You performed very well". They then completed the concern for others subscale and a second proofreading task.

Study 3: Participants first completed the concern for others subscale. Then they were instructed to make a series of ten daily decisions as if they were managers in a company. Next, participants were randomly assigned to receive feedback indicating they had made good management decisions ("above average") or poor management decisions ("below average").

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: The post-feedback questionnaire also contained items addressing satisfaction with feedback (Giles & Mossholder, 1990) and acceptance of feedback (Ilgen et al., 1979). Acceptance of feedback contains items addressing agreement with feedback and incorporation of feedback into self-view.

Study 2: Number of lines proofread and number of errors detected were the outcome variables.

Study 3: As in Study 1, the post-feedback questionnaire also contained items addressing satisfaction with feedback (Giles & Mossholder, 1990) and acceptance of feedback (Ilgen et al., 1979). Acceptance of feedback contains items addressing agreement with feedback and incorporation of feedback into self-view. Finally, participants completed a second set of 10 management decisions.

Main Results: Study 1: For participants high in concern for others satisfaction was not related to favorableness of feedback (r = .03, ns), while for participants low in concern for others, self-ratings of satisfaction were directly related to the favorableness of feedback (r = .48, p < .05). For participants high in concern for others self-ratings were not related to favorableness of feedback (r = -.04, ns), while for participants low in concern for others, self-ratings were directly related to the favorableness of feedback (r = .62, p < .05). Specifically, participants with low concern for others rated themselves higher if they received favorable feedback (M = 3.26) than if they received unfavorable feedback (M = 2.91).

Study 2:   There was an interaction between concern for others and specificity of feedback on both number of lines proofread (β = -2.80; t = -2.04, p < .05) and number of errors identified (β = -3.43; t = -2.30, p < .05). For participants high in concern for others, specific feedback led to fewer lines proofread and fewer errors identified. For participants low in concern for others, specific feedback led to more lines proofread and no difference in number of errors identified.

Study 3: The three way interaction of concern for others, valence of feedback, and time (F (1,50) = 4.07, p < .05). Examining the effects of concern for others and trial within each level of feedback revealed that the two-way interaction of concern for others and trial was stronger in the favorable feedback condition (F (1,25) = 3.30, p < .05) than in the unfavorable feedback condition (F (1,25) = 1.10, ns). That is, concern for others was more likely to be associated with changes in participants' management

decisions when the participants received favorable feedback (Low concern for others mean change = .30, high concern for others mean change = .07). The opposite pattern held when participants received unfavorable feedback (Low concern for others mean change = .14, high concern for others mean change = .29).

Conclusion: "We found that individual's endorsement of this value [concern for others] was related to predictable differences in their affective reaction, acceptance, and behavioral response to social information in the form of feedback on their performance."

Commentary: Building on previous work surrounding concern for others (Korsgaard, et al., 1996), Korsgaard, et al., (1997) continued to investigate the relationship between concern for others as a principle moral value and affective reaction, acceptance, and behavioral response. Participants high in concern for others were not swayed by favorable or unfavorable feedback to change their satisfaction or self-rating. Their reactions to situations were not contingent on whatever costs or benefits they might accrue in the situation. Like true altruism, this individual difference of placing concern for others as a high value directs behavior away from the self to the demands of the situation. As in the previous study, the difference in cognitive processes of high and low concern for others participants is highlighted.

Correspondence: M. Audrey Korsgaard, The Darla Moore School of Business, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208

Leak, G. K. (1993). Relationship between religious orientation and love styles, sexual attitudes, and sexual behaviors. Journal of Psychology & Theology, 21(4), 315-318.

Objective: To investigate the relationships among love styles, religious orientation, sexual attitudes, and sexual behaviors

Design: Cross-sectional survey

Setting: Creighton University

Participants: Participants were 84 students from introductory and upper-division psychology classes. Fifty-six were female and 28 were male. The mean age was 19.6 years. Seventy-five percent of the participants were Catholic, while the remaining participants came from various protestant denominations.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Religious orientation was measured by the Allport and Ross (1967) Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religious Orientation Scales as well as the Quest Scale (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991). Sexual behavior was measured with the 16-item version of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Gerrard & Gibbons, 1982). Sexual attitudes were measured by the Sexual Attitudes Questionnaire (Hendrick, Hendrick, Slapion-Foote, & Foote, 1985).

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants completed a 42-item love styles scale. The scale addressed each of the six theoretical types of love: eros (romantic, passionate love), ludus (game-playing love), storge (compassionate love), mania (possessive, dependent love), pragma (logical, practical love), and agape (selfless, religious love). Greater endorsement of items was indicated by marking lower numbers on the scale.

Main Results: Participants high in extrinsic religiosity were more likely to endorse sexually permissive and instrumental attitudes (rs = .39 and .41, respectively; ps < .01). On the other hand, participants high in intrinsic religiosity were less likely to endorse sexually permissive attitudes and more likely to address sexually conventional attitudes (rs = -.35 and .25, respectively; ps < .05). The love styles of mania and pragma were associated with extrinsic religiosity (rs = .40 and .37, respectively; ps < .01). The storge love style was associated with intrinsic religiosity (r = .33, p < .01). The agape love style was not related to any of the measures in this study.

Conclusion: Intrinsic religiousness, extrinsic religiousness, and sexuality are unrelated to the agape love style.

Commentary: Unlike the Hendrick and Hendrick (1987) study, this study showed no relationship between religiousness and agape love style. This inconsistency in the literature would indicate that more research is needed to clarify the relationship between religiosity and altruism as represented by the agape love style. This is of interest to altruism research, because agape is typically defined in terms of altruism.

Correspondence: Gary K. Leak, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, Creighton University, 2400 California Plaza, Omaha, Nebraska 68178

Lefcourt, H. M., & Shepherd, R. S. (1995). Organ donation, authoritarianism, and perspective taking humor. Journal of Research in Personality, 29(1), 121-138.

Objective: To investigate the effect of the personality variables authoritarianism and perspective taking humor on the altruistic behavior of organ donation

Design: 2 Cross-sectional surveys

Setting: The University of Waterloo

Participants: Study 1: Participants were 60 undergraduate university students. They volunteered but the study also served as a laboratory for their course in personality. Forty-five participants were female and 15 were male.
Study 2: Participants were 277 undergraduate university students from introductory and personality psychology courses. One hundred fifty-five participants were female and 122 were male.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: Thoughts, feelings, and behaviors related to death were measured with the Death Anxiety Scale (Templer, 1970). Participants also answered questions concerning the avoidance of activities that cause anxiety about death (Avoidance of Ontological Confrontation with Death Scale, Thauberger, Cleland, and Thauberger, 1979). Participants described how they felt when thinking about their own deaths on the Death Affect Checklist (McNair, Lorr, & Droppelman, 1971). Finally, participants completed the Situation Humor Response Questionnaire (Martin & Lefcourt, 1984) to assess humor or amusability. This last measure was used because it is thought that persons who use humor to help cope with negative events are less likely to suffer negative emotions when thinking about their own mortality.

Study 2: Participants completed self-report measures of right-wing authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988) and humor (Situational Humor Response Questionnaire) in mass testing situations. In a later laboratory session participants rated several of Gary Larson's Farside cartoons on funniness (Cartoon Measure of Appreciation) and then asked to describe what made the cartoon funny. Responses were coded for understanding of the humor (Cartoon Measure of Comprehension) on a scale of 1 = no or little understanding to 3 = understanding of the human behavior being lampooned. The product of appreciation and comprehension was calculate to form the scale measure called the Cartoon Measure of Perspective taking Humor.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: Participants completed the Death Behavior Questionnaire (Shepherd, 1989) to assess readiness to confront death related situations or tasks, such as organ and body donation.

Study 2: Organ Donor Status was assessed by recording information from participants' drivers licenses as a part of the laboratory portion of the study.

Main Results: Study 1: The single item assessing organ donation was not significantly related to any of the other measures. However, overall scores on the Death Behavior Questionnaire were related to less avoidance of death (r = .57, p < .001), more humor and amusability (r = .26, p < .05), and less negative feelings about death (Death Affect Checklist r = -.35, Death Anxiety Scale r = -.31; ps < .05).

Study 2: Approximately 30% of the participants in this study had signed the portion of the Drivers License indicating willingness to be an organ donor. Right-wing authoritarianism was negatively correlated with each of the humor measures (r = -.17 for Situational Humor Response; r = -.30 for Cartoon Measure of Perspective Taking Humor, ps < .01). All of the humor measures were also associated with having signed for organ donation (r = -.20 for Situational Humor Response; r = -.18 for Cartoon Measure of Perspective Taking Humor, ps < .01). However, the relationship with the Cartoon Measure of Appreciation is particularly small (r = -.12, p< .10). In a hierarchical regression analysis on organ donation, authoritarianism was entered first, followed by the Cartoon Measure of Perspective Taking Humor and the Situational Humor Response Questionnaire and the associated interactions. Authoritarianism accounted for 6.7% of the variance (F = 19.84, p < .001) and situational humor accounted for 2.2% of the variance (F = 6.48, p < .025) in organ donation. Analyses also revealed a significant interaction between authoritarianism and the Cartoon Measure of Perspective Taking Humor (F = 4.34, p < .05) such that for participants high in authoritarianism, more participants with high humor scores had signed for organ donation (33%) than participants with low humor scores (11%).

Conclusion: "Our data support the connotation that for some people, volunteering as an organ donor can arouse negative feelings associated with mortality which, in turn leave them refractory to appeals for organ donation and likely to avoid simple acts like signing the organ donation form attached to their driver's license. [Participants] who were high in authoritarianism and low in perspective taking humor were the least likely to have signed their organ donation forms."

Commentary: Lefcourt and Shepherd's (1995) study reveals that elements of this particular kind of altruist behavior, organ donation, were related to situation specific elements (i.e., willingness to think about death). Also, a combination of personality variables - authoritarianism and perspective taking humor - were contributed to an interaction on altruistic behavior beyond their main effects. For those participants high in authoritarianism, the ability to engage in perspective taking humor may have helped them to see beyond the grim situation and engage in altruistic behavior. One wonders whether such highly specific interactions of personality variables, such as authoritarianism and perspective taking humor, are specific to the organ donation situation or whether they would apply in other contexts, particularly where the altruistic behavior involves engaging in extremely unpleasant cognition.

Correspondence: Prof. Emeritus Herbert M. Lefcourt, Department of Psychology, 200 University Ave. W., University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1

Leung, J. J., & Foster, S. F. (1985). Helping the elderly: A study on altruism in children. Child Study Journal, 15(4), 293-309.

Objective: To examine the effects of preaching, recipient deservingness, personality attractiveness, and participant gender on children's altruism toward the elderly

Design: Experimental scenario study

Setting: Five Roman Catholic schools in a western Canadian city

Participants: One hundred ninety-five 5th and 6th grade students participated in the study. In 5th grade, 52 students were male and 52 were female. In the 6th grade, 39 students were male and 53 were female.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants were randomly assigned to one of eight experimental conditions. In manipulation of the "preaching" variable, the children were either exhorted to help the elderly, who were described as less fortunate or were given a lesson addressing why the elderly may not need help. Children then read a story about a senior citizen which manipulated two variables, deservingness of Mr. Brown and Mr. Brown's personality. Deservingness was manipulated by

describing Mr. Brown as either having a refrigerator that he saved for and then it accidentally burned out or as having a refrigerator that he received as a gift and then it burned out due to Mr. Brown's carelessness. Personality attractiveness was manipulated by describing Mr. Brown as a nice man who treated children kindly or as a mean man who was unsympathetic and threatening to children.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: The children were each given 50¢, in nickels, which they were allowed to either keep for themselves or donate to help the elderly Mr. Brown. The amount each child pledged and then subsequently donated were measures of helping. Participants were also asked how many half-page stories they would write to cheer the older man.

Main Results: On all three outcome variables, girls were more generous than boys for pledged stories ($\underline{F}$ (1,179) = 7.31, $\underline{p}$ < .01), pledged donations ($\underline{F}$ (1,179) = 5.79, $\underline{p}$ < .02), and actual donations ($\underline{F}$ (1,179) = 4.45, $\underline{p}$ < .04). While questions about the stories indicated that the children understood the stories and that the manipulations were effective, preaching, deservingness, and personality attractiveness did not affect pledged or actual helping. Means on each of dependent variables were high regardless of condition. On average, 1.93 stories were pledged, 22.51¢ was pledged, and 20.98¢ was actually donated.

Conclusion: The children were uniformly generous to a needy older adult regardless of experimental condition. Girls were more generous than boys in both pledged and actual behavior.

Commentary: Leung and Foster's (1985) study investigated whether situational variables, the personality of others, and exhortation would affect the way children responded to a needy person. They demonstrated only that children understand the norm of social responsibility. That is, they understand the benefit of helping those who need help, regardless of circumstances. Though the manipulation was effective, it could have been stronger – perhaps presenting a video or audio appeal. Gender differences have been found in other studies in which it was investigated (Penner & Finkelstein, 1998; Carlo et al., 1991) with females showing greater altruism or the effects of gender on altruism being situationally dependent. Attempting to explain the gender differences in altruistic behavior in this study would be an exercise in attempting to unconfound the roles of socialization and biological drives. Whether the actions of the girls and boys in Leung and Foster's (1985) study were driven by nature or nurture is impossible to determine without more formal investigation of gender differences in altruism.

Correspondence: None Available

Litvack-Miller, W., McDougall, D., & Romney, D. M. (1997). The structure of empathy during middle childhood and its relationship to prosocial behavior. <u>Genetic, Social, & General Psychology Monographs, 123</u>(3), 303-324.

Objective: To investigate the structure and development of dispositional empathy in children and its relationship to altruism

Design: Experiment with questionnaires

Setting: Five religious schools in Calgary, Alberta, Canada

Participants: Participants were 478 students from five schools in a Canadian city. Of the participants from the second grade, 119 were male and 98 were female. Of the participants from the fourth grade, 57 participants were male and 79 were female. Of the participants from the sixth grade, 60 participants were male and 65 were female.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Dispositional empathy was measured with a child-adapted version of the Davis (1980) Interpersonal Reactivity Index which has four subscales – perspective taking, fantasy, empathic concern, and personal distress. Researchers cued situational empathy in half of the classes of children by asking them to "Watch this film not only with your eyes and ears, but also with your hearts and imaginations" and to imagine themselves in the sad situation of the foster children. The other half of the children were only told that they would be watching a film about foster families and they would later be asked about the film. All children watched the same film.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Altruism was measured in four ways. First, it was measured by the children's self-reports of how they would respond to each of six vignettes describing another person needing help. Second, teachers rated the children's tendencies to spontaneously comfort, help, share, and cooperate with peers. Following the film, the children were given an opportunity to pledge time and donate money to help the children. The children were each given 50¢, in nickels, which they were allowed to either keep for themselves or donate to help foster children. The amount of money each child subsequently donated was the third measure of helping. The children were also asked how much time they would be willing to volunteer to help with fundraising for the foster children, a fourth measure of helping.

Main Results: A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) of age and gender on the four empathy subscales revealed main effects for grade ($\underline{F}$ (10, 934) = 2.95, $\underline{p}$ < .001) and gender ($\underline{F}$ (5, 466) = 6.16, $\underline{p}$ < .001). Sixth grade students reported more empathic concern than did second and fourth grade students. Grade had no effect on the other empathy measures. Girls consistently scored higher than boys on perspective taking ($\underline{M}$ = 3.34 vs. 3.13), empathic concern ($\underline{M}$ = 4.17 vs. 3.91), and personal distress ($\underline{M}$ = 3.20 vs. 3.00), but there was not a difference on fantasy.
To investigate the relationship between the dispositional empathy measures and the altruism measures, stepwise regression analyses were performed. Fantasy and personal distress did not significantly predict any of the altruism measures. Perspective taking predicted a significant portion of the variance in teacher ratings of comforting others ($\exists$ = .186; $\underline{t}$ = 2.66, $\underline{p}$ < .01), monetary donations ($\exists$ = .193; $\underline{t}$ = 4.24, $\underline{p}$ < .01), and scores on self-reported altruism vignettes ($\exists$ = .253; $\underline{t}$ = 3.04, $\underline{p}$ < .01). Empathic concern predicted a significant portion of the variance in teacher ratings of comforting others ($\exists$ = .238; $\underline{t}$ = 3.39, $\underline{p}$ < .01), helping ($\exists$ = .218; $\underline{t}$ = 3.04, $\underline{p}$ < .01),

sharing ($\exists$ = .254; $\underline{t}$ = 3.58, $\underline{p}$ < .01), cooperation ($\exists$ = .218; $\underline{t}$ = 3.04, $\underline{p}$ < .01), monetary donations ($\exists$ = .204; $\underline{t}$ = 4.50, $\underline{p}$ < .01), and scores on self-reported altruism vignettes ($\exists$ = .134; $\underline{t}$ = 3.04, $\underline{p}$ < .01). There were no significant effects of empathy instructions before the film on measures of altruism.

Conclusion: "Girls were more empathic than boys, and older children showed more empathic concern than younger children. Only empathic concern and perspective taking were significant predictors of prosocial behavior."

Commentary: While a relationship between dispositional empathy and prosocial behavior has been found in adults (Eisenberg et al., 1989; Eisenberg et al., 1991), this study is important for its investigation of the developmental roots of the empathy-altruism link in children. It seems that the empathic concern and perspective taking aspects of dispositional empathy are related to prosocial behavior, but not the personal distress and fantasy aspects of dispositional empathy. The expression of empathic distress is one of the first vicarious emotional experiences a child has - as early as the first year of life (Hoffman, 1975, 1977). Yet, this type of empathy appears unrelated to prosocial behavior in these children. Also, in contrast to Batson's studies annotated above (Batson et al., 1995a; Batson et al., 1995b; Batson & Weeks, 1996), the instruction to take the perspective of the needy other was not sufficient to influence the empathy or altruistic behavior in these children. However, it is important to note that Batson's manipulations of empathy were administered individually to participants and probably had a stronger impact. Litvack-Miller and colleagues did find that the capacity for empathic concern increases with age. The strength of the relationship between empathy and altruism may increase with age to the type of relationship we see in adults.

Correspondence: Daniel McDougall, Department of Educational Psychology, The University of Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4, Canada

---

Magee, M., & Hojat, M. (1998). Personality profiles of male and female positive role models in medicine. Psychological Reports, 82(2), 547-559.

Objective: To examine the personality profiles of physicians nominated as positive role models

Design: Cross-sectional survey

Setting: Nationwide

Participants: Participants were 188 physicians nominated by the CEO's of their affiliated institutions nationwide as positive role models. One hundred sixty-four participants were male and 24 were female. The mean age was 50 years (range 31-86 years). Response rate was 80%.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants completed the 240 item revised NEO Personality Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992). The NEO can be used to distinguish five core personality characteristics, known as the Big 5 – agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, openness to experience, and emotional instability. Thirty personality characteristics, including altruism, can also be distinguished from scores on the NEO.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Subscales of the NEO measure altruism.

Main Results: When compared to national norms for males and females, several differences are found on the big five personality factors and the altruism personality trait. To control for chance findings when conducting multiple comparisons, alpha was set at .01 for the Big 5 personality characteristics and .001 for each of the 30 personality traits. Both the male and female positive role models scored above the general population on conscientiousness. Male role models scored higher than the average male on agreeableness. Female role models scored higher than the average female on openness to experience and extraversion, but lower than the average female on emotional instability. Both male and female role models scored higher than the general population on the personality trait of altruism.

Conclusion: Physicians nominated by their CEOs as positive role models displayed higher levels of altruism than the general population.

Commentary: The nomination as a "positive role model" may indicate some behavioral altruism that coincides with higher male agreeableness in general and higher male and female altruism in particular. That is, positive role models are not only knowledgeable, but of high character and helpful to their co-workers. It is interesting that these positive role models were high on traits that are generally considered favorable – conscientiousness, and for females, openness, extraversion, and emotional stability. The work of Magee & Hojat (1998), provides a parallel to the work of Ashton et al. (1998) who found that altruism directed toward non-kin, reciprocal altruism, is strongly related to high agreeableness and high emotional stability. The findings from this study must be presented with the caveat that the participants in the study differed from established national norms on the NEO. This deviation could be accounted for by the fact that the participants were all physicians and not necessarily related to their role-model status.

Correspondence: Mike Magee, M.D. Senior Medical Advisor, Pfizer Inc., 235 East 42nd Street, New York, NY 10017-5755 or email (mmagee@pfizer.com)

Mallandain, I., & Davies, M. F. (1994). The colours of love: Personality correlates of love styles. Personality & Individual Differences, 17(4), 557-560.

Objective: To determine which personality characteristics are associated with love styles

Design: Cross-sectional survey

Setting: Birkbeck College and Goldsmiths Colleges of the University of London

Participants: Participants were 120 undergraduate and graduate students at Birkbeck College and Goldsmith College. There were an equal number of male and female participants. The mean age was 30.67 years (range 18-56 years). Sixty-two percent of the participants were currently in a relationship and 23% were married.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Self-esteem was measured by the Cheek and Buss (1981) Self-esteem scale. Emotionality was measured by the Buss and Plomin (1984) Emotionality scale. Impulsivity was measured by the Buss and Plomin (1975) Impulsivity scale.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants completed a 42-item love styles scale. The scale addressed each of the six theoretical types of love: eros (romantic, passionate love), ludus (game-playing love), storge (compassionate love), mania (possessive, dependent love), pragma (logical, practical love), and agape (selfless, religious love). Greater endorsement of items was indicated by marking lower numbers on the scale.

Main Results: Females scored higher than males on the storge love style ($\underline{M}$s = 25.32 vs. 22.38; $\underline{F}$ (1, 101) = 6.03, $\underline{p}$ < .02), but lower than males on agape love style ($\underline{M}$s = 20.88 vs. 23.38; $\underline{F}$ (1, 101) = 6.00, $\underline{p}$ < .02). Self-esteem was significantly negatively correlated with mania ($\underline{r}$ = -.38), Storge ($\underline{r}$ = -.26) and agape ($\underline{r}$ = -.18). Self-esteem was positively correlated with eros ($\underline{r}$ = .19). Neither emotionality nor impulsivity was significantly correlated with storge or agape.

Conclusion: "The results of the study provide some support for the hypothesis that love styles have trait-like characteristics. On the other hand, certain discrepancies between predictions and findings suggest that state rather than trait factors need to be taken into account when considering individual differences in styles of loving."

Commentary: While Hendrick and Hendrick's (1987) and Leak's (1993) studies investigate the relationship of love styles, including agape, to religiosity, Mallandain and Davies (1994) investigate personality correlates of the love styles. Caution should be used in interpreting the small, though significant, negative correlation between agape love style and self-esteem. There is no theoretical or logical reason why selfless, loving people should have lower self-esteem. More research is needed on a diverse participant population to clarify and establish these results. In fact, it contradicts the authors' own findings concerning emotional stability and Ashton et al.'s (1998) work on altruism and the Big Five personality traits.

Correspondence: Martin F. Davies, Department of Psychology, Goldsmiths College, University of London, New Cross, London SE14 6NW, England

McAdams, D. P., Hoffman, B. J., Mansfield, E. D., & Day, R. (1996). Themes of agency and communion in significant autobiographical scenes. Journal of Personality, 64(2), 339-377.

Objective: To investigate themes of agency and communion in autobiographical memories as they relate to personality, social motives, and daily goals

Design: Studies 1 and 3: Cross-sectional survey
Study 2: Interviews

Setting: Study 1: Loyola University.
Studies 2 and 3: a Midwestern city

Participants: Study 1: Participants were 130 undergraduate students enrolled in introductory psychology classes in a Midwestern university. They received course credit for their participation. Of the participants, 67 were female and 63 were male.
Study 2: Participants consisted of 86 adults. They were recruited through newspaper advertisements, school contacts, and community organizations and paid $50 for their participation. Of the participants, 50 were female and 36 were male. The mean age was 43.89 years (range 22-72 years).
Study 3: Participants were152 adults living in a small Midwestern city. Of the participants, 80 were female and 72 were male. The sample was divided into distinct age groups. The "young adults" age range was 22-27 years. The "mid-life" adults age range was 37-42 years. The "older" adults age range was 67-72 years

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: The Thematic Apperception Test (TAT, Atkinson, 1958) was administered to participants in the standard group administration format. In the TAT, participants were given 5 minutes to write an imaginative story about each of six pictures of people (i.e., two people sitting on a park bench). Each participant's stories were scored for power, achievement, and intimacy motivation.
Study 2: In the first session of the study, the participants were administered the TAT as in Study 1.
Study 3: Participants generated a list of personal strivings, or goals and objectives they were trying to accomplish. The lists were coded for achievement, power, and intimacy motivation. They also completed the Personality Research Form (PRF; Jackson, 1984), a measure of the personality needs of achievement, dominance, affiliation, and nurturance.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: Participants were asked to write a description of their earliest memory and a life-story high point, or peak experience. These descriptions were coded by researchers for presence or absence (0 or 1) of themes of agency and communion. Each of four elements was coded for each theme with a score range of 0 to 4 for each theme. Agency themes were self-mastery, status, achievement/responsibility, and empowerment. Communion themes were

love/friendship, dialogue, care/help, and community. The themes of agency and communion come from work by Wiggins and Broughton (1985).

Study 2: In a second session participants were interviewed using the McAdams (1985,1993) life-story interview. Each participant described his or her life as if it were a story or book with chapters, setting, scenes, and characters. In the interview participants were asked to describe: a) a peak experience, b) their earliest recollection, c) an event in which they experienced a life transition, d) a memorable event from childhood, e) a memorable event from adolescence, f) a memorable event from adulthood, and f) one other "significant scene" from any point in their life. Two coders scored transcriptions of the interviews for themes of agency and communion.

Study 3: Participants were asked to write a description of their earliest memory, a life-story high point, or peak experience, and an event in which they experienced a life transition. These descriptions were coded by researchers for themes of agency and communion.

Main Results: Study 1: Total agency summed across themes and memories was positively correlated with achievement motivation and power motivation (rs = .40 and .27, respectively; ps < .01). Power and achievement motives were uncorrelated with the communal themes, except that love/friendship showed a positive correlation with power (r= .24, p < .05). Total communion summed across themes and memories was positively correlated with intimacy motivation (r = .47, p < .01).

Study 2: Total agency summed across themes and memories was positively correlated with achievement motivation and power motivation (rs = .39 and .29, respectively; ps < .01). These total correlations were driven by correlations of empowerment with power and achievement motives (rs = .28 and .29, respectively; ps < .01) and the correlation of self-mastery with achievement motivation (r= .32, p < .01). None of the other agency themes were significantly correlated with achievement or power motivations. Total communion summed across themes and memories was positively correlated with intimacy motivation (r = 53, p < .01).

Study 3: Total agency summed across themes and memories was positively correlated with achievement motivation, power motivation, PRF Achievement, and PRF Dominance (rs = .49, .20, .17, and .29, respectively; ps < .05). Total communion summed across themes and memories was positively correlated with intimacy motivation, PRF Affiliation, and PRF nurturance (rs = .39, .21, and .27, respectively; ps < .05).

Conclusion: "The three studies provide empirical support for a thematic coherence in personality across the arenas of autobiographical memories, social motives, and daily goals."

Commentary: McAdams and colleagues (1996) demonstrate individual differences in autobiographical memories based on two themes – a self-oriented agency approach and an other-oriented communal approach. These themes parallel the social motives of achievement motivation and intimacy motivation, respectively. In Study 3, communion is also related to affiliation and nurturance from self-report questionnaires. The communal approach seems to have some general quality that is consistent with Agreeableness from other studies (Ashton et al., 1998; Axelrod, et al., 1997). Furthermore, the data could be reinterpreted to address aspects of participant descriptions of the ideal self (Agency approach) and the ought self (communal approach; Bybee et al., 1997). Further research linking agency and communal

orientations to other well-know psychosocial constructs seems important.

Correspondence: Dan P. McAdams, Program in Human Development and Social Policy, Northwestern University, 2115 North Campus Drive, Evanston, IL 60208-2610

McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 836-844.

Objective: To distinguish between the antecedents of altruism toward an individual versus altruism toward an organization

Design: Cross-sectional survey and ratings by multiple acquaintances of participants

Setting: A Southeastern university

Participants: Participants were 100 female departmental and administrative secretaries at a university. Secretaries' average age was 41 years old and their average tenure with the university was 8.9 years. All participants were included in a raffle for free dinners for two as incentive for participation.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Job satisfaction was measured with a single item rated on a 7-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) – "Considering all aspects of my job, I would say that I am very satisfied with my job." Perceived reward equity was measured with a single item rated on a 7-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) – "I feel that job rewards, salary increases, and such are equitably and fairly distributed among employees in this organization." Perceived recognition for desirable behavior was measured with six items rated on a 5-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Two items represented each of the three types of prosocial behavior – institutional, individual, and role-prescribed (i.e., "If I am seen doing helpful things for other which are not part of the job requirements, it is likely that I will receive a pay increase.") Placing value on concern for others was measured with the Comparative Emphasis Scale (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987b). Empathic concern was assessed with the empathic concern subscale of the Davis (1980) Interpersonal Reactivity Index.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: The prosocial behavior of each participant was rated by her supervisor and at least one other person in her department who was familiar with her behavior. The response rate for the raters was 80%. Twenty percent of the raters were immediate supervisors, 32% were faculty, 30% were coworkers, and 18% were administrators, graduate students, and others. Three types of prosocial behaviors were rated: prosocial institutional behavior (i.e., "Offers ideas to improve the functioning of the department"), role-prescribed prosocial behavior (i.e., "Completes work requested as soon as possible.") and prosocial individual behavior

(i.e., "Collects money for flowers for sick co-workers or funerals."). All items were rated in a 5-point scale from 1 (never does this) to 5 (always does this). Items were summed to form single measures of each type of prosocial behavior for each rater. Then ratings for each of the prosocial behaviors were averaged across raters to form the measures of prosocial behavior for each secretary.

Main Results: Job satisfaction was significantly positively correlated with both prosocial behavior to the organization (r = .25, p < .01) and prosocial behavior to the individual (r = .26, p < .01). The more satisfied the secretaries were with their jobs, the more prosocial they behaved. Empathic concern and valuing concern for others were both significantly positively correlated with prosocial behavior to the individual (rs = .21 and .18, respectively; p < .05). Perceived reward equity and perceived recognition for desirable behavior were both significantly positively correlated with prosocial behavior to the organization (rs = .20 and .30, respectively; p < .05). Role prescribed prosocial behavior was not related to job satisfaction, reward equity, recognition for desirable behavior, or the value of concern for others. However, it was negatively correlated with empathic concern (r = -.19, p < .05). In regression analyses, both job satisfaction and concern for others/empathic concern made independent contributions to explaining the variance in prosocial behavior to individuals (R^2s = .07 and .07, respectively; ps < .05). In regression analyses, only reward equity/recognition for desirable behavior made independent contributions to explaining the variance in prosocial behavior to organizations (R^2 = .10, p < .05). Job satisfaction did not make a unique contribution to prosocial behavior to organizations.

Conclusion: "The relationship between empathy and prosocial individual behavior in this study is comparable to relationships involving empathy and various types of prosocial behavior outside of work." Concerning prosocial behavior toward organizations, "Employees probably viewed reward equity and recognition for desirable behavior as benefits provided by the organization. Thus, it is not surprising that they would direct their reciprocation efforts to the organization rather than to specific individuals."

Commentary: McNeely and Meglino (1994) highlight the disparity in individual differences related to prosocial behavior directed toward individuals and prosocial behavior directed toward organizations. When the focus is individuals, the dispositions of empathic concern and the value of concern for others are key to prosocial behavior. This is consistent with much of the other research in this bibliography on dispositional empathic concern. (e.g., Romer, et al., 1986). Including Neuberg et al.'s (1997) suggestion that empathic concern may serve an orienting function with respect to altruism. McNeely and Meglino (1994) interpret the role of job satisfaction in individual prosocial behavior as an indicator of a mood effect, which should be investigated further. For prosocial behavior toward organizations, the perceptions that one's organization is fair and recognition is made for positive behavior invokes the norm of reciprocity – facilitating organizational prosocial behavior. This equity/exchange approach to the situation is far from the communal orientation of the individual prosocial behavior. Therefore, the factors necessary to encourage prosocial behavior in business contexts might be surprisingly different from those necessary for prosocial behavior in personal contexts.

Correspondence: Bruce M. Meglino, The Darla Moore School of Business, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208

Mohan, J., & Bhatia, S. (1987). Altruistic behaviour of engineers and teachers in relation to their personality. Indian Journal of Applied Psychology, 24(2), 87-90.

Objective: To measure the relationship among altruism and personality of male engineers and teachers

Design: Cross-sectional survey

Setting: Chandigarh, India

Participants: Participants were 50 adults randomly selected from institutions of Chandigarh. Twenty-five were engineers and 25 were teachers. The mean age was 35 years.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Personality was measured with the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1978), consisting of subscales for extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism. Psychoticism in this measure consists primarily of low conscientiousness and low agreeableness items.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants completed the 20 item self-report Altruism scale (Rushton, Chrisjohn, and Fekken, 1981). This is a self-report scale that asks participants about their history of helpful behaviors.

Main Results: Teachers scored higher than engineers on extraversion (M = 14.40 vs. 11.56; t = 2.37, p < .05) and neuroticism (M = 10.88 vs. 7.44; t = 2.62, p < .05), but teachers scored lower than engineers on psychoticism (M = 3.16 vs. 6.80; t = 6.38, p < .01). There were not differences between the two groups on altruism (M = 29.28 vs. 27.64; t = .67, ns). Altruism was significantly, negatively correlated with psychoticism for engineers (r = -.56, p < .01), but not for teachers (r = -.15, ns). No other correlations between personality variables and altruism were significant.

Conclusion: "The differences in personality of the two professional groups do not have any bearing on altruistic behavior."

Commentary: As Mohan and Bhatia (1987) show, sometimes not finding relationships between variables is important. This study brings to question stereotypes concerning personality characteristics of particular professions – in this case, the stereotypes of teachers as more helpful than engineers. More surprising, however, are the null findings for the relationship between personality and altruism. Of course, with only 25 in each group, power was extremely low and it would be difficult to observe significant results even where they exist. In a somewhat more recent study of personality and altruism, using the same measures, Rushton et al., (1989) found that altruism was positively related to extraversion and negatively related to neuroticism.

In this study, Altruism was related to less psychoticism for engineers, but not for teachers. Altruism in this case reflects higher levels of conscientiousness and agreeableness for the engineers. What part of the disparity in results is due to cross-cultural differences and what is due to the true nature of the relationships among the variables is unclear at this time.

Correspondence: Jitendra Mohan and Sangeeta Bhatia, Department of Psychology Panjab University, Sector 14, 160 014Chandigarh, India

---

Neuberg, S. L., Cialdini, R. B., Brown, S. L., Luce, C., Sagarin, B. J. & Lewis, B. P. (1997). Does empathy lead to anything more than superficial helping? Comment on Batson et al. (1997). Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 73(3), 510-516.

Objective: To comment on and present evidence concerning the relationship between empathy, self-other overlap, and helping

Design: Experiment

Setting: Arizona State University

Participants: Participants were 79 students in introductory psychology courses who received course credit for participation.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants were randomly assigned to focus on one of four same-sex persons: a stranger, an acquaintance, a good friend, or a family member as they read a scenario describing the eviction of that person from their apartment. Participants completed measures of empathy (Batson et al., 1997), personal distress, and sadness (Fultz, Schaller, & Cialdini, 1988). Finally, participants rated the degree of "oneness" felt with the described person using the Inclusion of Other in the Self (IOS) Scale (Aron et al., 1992). The order of presentation of the measures was modified from previous studies such that ratings of empathy and oneness preceded helping decisions.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants indicated the level of help they would offer the evicted person on a 7-point scale from nothing to offering to let him or her come to live with you rent free.

Main Results: The closer the relationships, the more willing the participants were to help (F (3,76) = 61.51, p = .0001). The closer the relationships, the more empathic concern the participants reported (F (3,76) = 10.82, p = .0001) and the more oneness they felt with the described person (F (3,76) = 56.14, p < .0001). Helping was positively correlated with both empathic concern and oneness (rs = .62 and .80). Once the effects of non-altruistic variables (i.e., participant gender, sadness, and distress) were accounted for, empathic concern could not predict the amount of help participants were willing to give (b = .068, F (1, 64) = .73, ns). However, oneness remained a unique predictor of helping (b = .94, F (1, 64) = 44.74, p < .0001).

Conclusion: The authors propose that "the function of empathic concern may be essentially preparatory, serving to orient people to opportunities for helping and acting to spur relatively superficial assistance."

Commentary: This study is yet another installation in the debate concerning the existence of pure altruism, or true selflessness. In response to the criticisms of Batson and colleagues (1997), Neuberg, et al. (1997) conducted an experiment to investigate the role of self-other merging and pit them against empathic concern. While helping was strongly related to empathic concern, this effect disappears as other variables, including feelings of closeness, are taken into consideration. The question remains whether there is conceptual overlap in feelings of oneness with another person and the participant's empathic concern for that person.

Correspondence: Steven Neuberg or Robert B. Cialdini, Department of Psychology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-1104

<div style="border:1px solid black; height:2em;"></div>

Noonan, A. E., Tennstedt, S. L., & Rebelsky, F. G. (1996). Making the best of it: Themes of meaning among informal caregivers to the elderly. Journal of Aging Studies, 10(4), 313-327.

Objective: To explore the reasons caregivers give for continuing in stressful caregiving situations

Design: Cross-sectional interview

Setting: Massachusetts Elder Health Project

Participants: Participants were 65 caregivers who were already participating in the Massachusetts Elder Health Project. The mean age was 63.4 years. 87.7% of the participants were female.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants were interviewed by an investigator for approximately one hour and asked about their caregiving situations. Participants' responses were audiotaped and transcribed.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: The transcriptions were coded for amount of burden, relationship of caregiver to elder, disability of elder, and 16 possible caregiver meaning themes.

Main Results: Caregivers focused on the following issues in their descriptions of why they care for the elder: gratification and satisfaction with caregiving (i.e., "I'm glad I'm able to do it."), family responsibility/reciprocity (i.e., "You are supposed to take care of your family whether you love them or not."), friendship and company (i.e., emotional support and companionship), doing what needs to be done (i.e., "I do what I have to do and make the best of it."). Participants also mentioned personal growth for

the caregiver, improved relationships between the elder and caregiver, and simply having a caring personality.

Conclusion: Caregivers report carrying out their duties to an elder because of situational factors such as social roles, emotional factors such as positive emotions, and having a caring nature. Caregivers perceive their behavior as multidetermined.

Commentary: Noonan, Tennstedt, and Rebelsky do something few other researchers have done – they have asked the person carrying out consistent helping behavior why they do it. While self-report and introspection can be suspect as sole methods of inquiry, they often give us insight into the motivations of the participant and are quite useful in the context of the broader body of research. Furthermore, these methods provide a rich picture, not stripped bare by the necessities of controlled laboratory research. In this case, the stated motives of the caregivers match much of what we know from other studies. That is, not all prosocial behavior is motivated by pure altruism, there are many paths to prosocial behavior, some of which are situationally determined, and factors of both the caregiver and the recipient are involved.

Correspondence: Anne E. Noonan, New England Research Institutes, 9 Galen St., Watertown, MA 02472

Omoto, A. M. & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 671-686.

Objective: To explore how helping dispositions, motivations, and experiences affect long-term volunteerism

Design: Cross-sectional surveys

Setting: An AIDS service organization

Participants: Participants were 116 active volunteers at an AIDS service organization (63% males, 36% females). Participants had been involved with the organization for 2 to 42 months and volunteered, on average, 4.8 hours a week.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: The helping personality variable was operationalized by a seven-item measure of empathic concern (Davis, 1980), an eight-item measure of social responsibility (Berkowitz & Lutterman, 1968), and ten nurturance items from the Personality Research Form (Jackson, 1974). Motivations for volunteering were measured with a specially created 25-item scale measuring five factors of volunteer motivation (values, understanding, personal development, community concern, and esteem enhancement). Social support was measured with several items tapping social network size and perceived availability of support. Fourteen items measured satisfaction with volunteering and six items tapped

organizational integration (i.e., acceptance of goals of organization, number of meetings attended, and number of friends in organization). Nine items measured change in attitudes toward several objects - people with AIDS, volunteer work and agencies, people who do AIDS volunteer work, homosexuals, the gay community, themselves, and their outlook on life.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: The outcome variable was the duration of service at the AIDS service organization.

Main Results: Fifty-four percent of the volunteers were still active one year later and only 16% were still active 2 ½ years later. Researchers specified a structural equation model with satisfaction, volunteer motivations, and social support variables each predicting duration of volunteering directly (path coefficients = .24, .31, and -.31, respectively). Helping personality predicts duration indirectly through satisfaction (path coefficient = .42). Organizational integration was affected by helping personality (path coefficient = .39) and was uncorrelated with satisfaction (r = .16), but does not directly influence duration. Helping personality, volunteer motivations, and social support were allowed to intercorrelate. While the model's Π^2 estimate did not indicate a good fit ($\Pi^2(96)$ = 147.01), other statistics better used to asses the goodness of fit of the structural model indicated that, indeed, the hypothesized model fit well (GFI = .86, Π^2/df = 1.53, RMR = .10). In a similar model, perceived attitude change replaced duration of helping in model analyses. Satisfaction, volunteer motivations, and social support variables each predict attitude change directly (path coefficients = .26, .44, and .27, respectively). Helping personality predicted attitude change indirectly through satisfaction (path coefficient = .44). Organizational integration was affected by helping personality (path coefficient = .40) and is uncorrelated with satisfaction (r = .17), but does not directly influence attitude change. Helping personality, volunteer motivations, and social support were allowed to intercorrelate. While the model's Π^2 estimate did not indicate a good fit ($\Pi^2(126)$ = 187.11), other statistics better used to asses the goodness of fit of the structural model indicated that, indeed, the hypothesized model fit well (GFI = .84, Π^2/df = 1.49, RMR = .10).

Conclusion: "Structural equation analyses indicate that dispositional helping influences satisfaction and integration but not duration of service, whereas greater motivation and less social support predict long active volunteer service. The model is generalized to the prediction of perceived attitude change." In an attempt to explain the unexpected relationship between social support and volunteering the authors suggest, "Those who lack social support may be seeking to acquire it through volunteer service, and those with social support may be taking refuge from the stresses of volunteering by seeking the support they possess elsewhere."

Commentary: Unlike Unger & Thumuluri's (1997) study which found important relationships between trait empathy and continuous volunteering, Omoto and Snyder's study (1995) suggests that the influence of dispositional variables is indirect, through satisfaction with volunteering and integration in the organization. Clary & Orenstein (1991) examined the relationship of perspective taking and empathic concern with motivation and ability in volunteer work. Similarly, Penner & Finkelstein (1998) found that length of service and time spent volunteering were correlated with other-oriented empathy and helpfulness. The research in this area may be equivocal,

but Omoto and Snyder did the field a service by putting variables reflecting a wider range of personal and situational processes involved in volunteering in a single model.

Correspondence: Allen M. Omoto, Department of Psychology, 426 Fraser Hall, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Organ, D. W. & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. Personnel Psychology, 48, 775-802.

Objective: To examine the literature and determine whether job attitudes and dispositional variables influence individual contributions in the workplace above the call of duty

Design: Meta-analytic review

Setting: Indiana University

Studies: The meta-analysis included 55 articles, papers, conference presentations, and dissertations. Papers were specifically selected for inclusion if they had a general measure of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and an aggregate measure of an attitude or personality trait. Mean effect sizes were only calculated if data were available from at least four independent studies.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Measures of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) included measures of altruism or aid to coworkers, good work behavior (good attendance, use of company property, etc.), courtesy, willingness to forbear personal inconvenience (sportsmanship), and constructive involvement in the governance of the organization (civic virtue). Satisfaction consisted of global job satisfaction scores. Fairness was computed from reported distributive and procedural fairness using combined correlations of the measures (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990). Other variables derived from study reports were organizational commitment, leader supportiveness, conscientiousness, agreeableness, positive and negative affectivity, tenure, and gender.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Using procedures developed by Hunter and Schmidt (1990), correlations in the meta-analysis were corrected for sample sizes of the studies and unreliability of the measures. A coefficient of variation in OCB measures allowed for comparisons of high variability and low variability participant groups. The Q statistic was computed to examine whether the observed variability in the corrected correlations was greater than that due to sampling error alone as a precursor to examining potential moderators of effect size.

Main Results: There was a modest effect size estimate for the relationship between altruism and satisfaction (Mean correlation = .28). This relationship was moderated by method of measurement of altruism (self vs. other-rating), such that

self-ratings of altruism produced higher correlations between satisfaction and altruism than did other-ratings of altruism and satisfaction (.39 vs. .26, z = 4.08, p < .01; Q = 40.4, p < .01). Perception of leader supportiveness and altruism had a moderately strong association ($\underline{M}$ean correlation = .32), although there was some evidence that this relationship was moderated by the number of studies conducted solely on males (Q = 50.9, p < .01). Fairness in the workplace, conscientiousness, agreeableness, negative affectivity and positive affectivity had lower mean correlations with altruism ($\underline{M}$ean correlation = .24, .22, .13, -.06, and .15; respectively).

      There was a modest effect size estimate for the relationship between compliance and satisfaction ($\underline{M}$ean correlation = .28). This relationship was moderated by method of measurement of compliance (self vs. other-rating), such that self-ratings of compliance produced higher correlations between satisfaction and compliance than did other-ratings of compliance and satisfaction (.50 vs. .24, z = 5.93, p < .01). The relationship of compliance with conscientiousness ($\underline{M}$ean correlation = .30) was also moderated by method of measurement of compliance (self vs. other-rating), such that self-ratings of compliance produced higher correlations between conscientiousness and compliance than did other-ratings of compliance and conscientiousness (.47 vs. .23, z = 3.73, p < .01) Perception of leader supportiveness and fairness in the workplace was moderately correlated with compliance, while agreeableness, negative and positive affectivity were correlated with compliance at lower levels ($\underline{M}\Delta$ = .35, .27, .11, -.12, and .07; respectively). The authors note that the moderating effects of self versus other-ratings of constructs suggests a spurious inflation of the correlations due to common method variance.

      Conclusion: Satisfaction, perceived fairness, organizational commitment, and leader supportiveness correlate with measures of organizational citizenship behavior. Dispositional measures do not correlate as well with measures of OCB. While conscientiousness correlates with compliance measures of OCB, it does not correlated well with measures of altruism.

      Commentary: Organ & Ryan's (1995) work highlights a key distinction that should be made in the organizational citizenship behavior – the altruistic behavior enacted toward individuals is not the same as compliance to company norms. Compliance is not altruism, though it is may be an important part of being a good worker or member of the company. McNeely & Meglino (1994) also note the differences between concern for individuals in the company and concern for the organization, itself. While job satisfaction in both studies is related to the more altruistic construct, fairness and good leadership invoke norms of reciprocity toward the organization. However, McNeely & Meglino suggest that job satisfaction may be a mood effect. In this more inclusive review of the literature, Organ & Ryan suggest that the effects of job satisfaction is not a mood effect and more research is needed on these constructs.

      Correspondence: Dennis W. Organ, School of Business, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405

<div style="border:1px solid black"></div>

Penner, L. A., & Finkelstein, M. A. (1998). Dispositional and structural determinants of volunteerism. <u>Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 74</u>(2), 525-537.

Objective: To examine the personality and situational correlates of volunteer behavior

Design: Cross-sectional survey

Setting: Southeastern United States

Participants: Participants were 146 unpaid volunteers from the mailing list of a large organization that serves people who are "infected and affected by HIV" in the southeastern United States. Of the participants, 56% were female and 44% were male. The participants' mean age was 35.93 years old.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants completed three sets of questionnaires, each separated by four to five months. Participants indicated to what extent each of five motives influenced their decision to volunteer: community concern, esteem enhancement, understanding AIDS, personal development, and values. The personality variables of other-oriented empathy and helpfulness were derived from answers to the Prosocial Personality Battery (Penner et al., 1995).

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants completed questions regarding volunteer status (active vs. not active), length of service as a volunteer, how much time is spent volunteering, and how many volunteer meetings were attended. Other questions assessed feelings about, satisfaction with, and commitment to volunteering.

Main Results: Length of service was significantly, positively correlated with organizational satisfaction, other-oriented empathy, helpfulness, and the values motive for volunteering (rs = .20, .21, .21 and .23; respectively). For the first set of questionnaires, gender differences emerged on other-oriented empathy and helpfulness. While there was a significant positive correlation of other-oriented empathy and amount of time spent volunteering for men (r = .29), the same relationship did not hold for women (r = -.08; t (141) = 2.21, p < .05). In contrast, for women helpfulness correlated with the number of meetings attended (r = .27), but the same relationship did not hold for men (r = -.07; t (141) = 2.07, p < .05). For the second set of questionnaires, other-oriented empathy was positively correlated with time spent volunteering (r = .23) for both men and women. The correlations between contact with persons with AIDS/HIV and other oriented empathy was significant and positive for men (r = .36), but not for women (r = -.08; t (72) = 1.86, p < .10). Similarly, for the third questionnaire, the correlations between contact with persons with AIDS/HIV and other oriented empathy was significant and positive for men (r = .40), but not for women (r = -.10; t (51) = 1.84, p < .10).

Correlations were computed between other-oriented empathy and helpfulness and each of the motives for volunteering. At the first questionnaire both are correlated

with the value of volunteering (i.e., "I enjoy helping other people"); $\underline{r}$s = .44 and .17, respectively; $\underline{p}$s < .05. For the second questionnaire, other-oriented empathy was positively correlated with satisfaction with volunteering, positive feelings toward volunteering and the value of volunteering ($\underline{r}$s = .24, .26, and .43, respectively; $\underline{p}$s < .05). No other correlations at questionnaires 1, 2, or 3 were statistically significant.

Conclusion: "Helping behaviors among people who score high on the helpfulness factor and among people who score high on other-oriented empathy are probably motivated by different needs and goals. Specifically, we believe that the motive of high scorers on other-oriented empathy are those that one would typically associate with prosocial actions: concern for the welfare of others, satisfaction derived from being helpful, and feelings of responsibility for others' welfare. In contrast, people who score high on the helpfulness factor may help primarily because it serves to reinforce their feelings of being efficacious and competent people."

Commentary: Volunteerism is a type of prosocial behavior that goes beyond a simple, single helping acts demonstrated in many of the studies of this bibliography. In volunteering we see patterns of personality and behavior demonstrated over a period of time. For example, Penner & Finkelstein distinguish between patterns of motivation for the person whose primary desire is the welfare of others and the person whose primary desire is self-esteem. The latter pattern seems related to Berkowitz & Lutterman's (1968) depiction of the socially responsible person who is highly involved in the community. An interesting extension of this work would combine the present study with the work of Clary & Orenstein (1991) to investigate the motives of persons selected and not selected for volunteering.

Correspondence: Louis A. Penner, Department of Psychology, University of South Florida, 4202 East Fowler Avenue, BEH 339, Tampa, Florida 33620-8200 or email to penner@chuma.cas.usf.edu

---

Ribal, J. E. (1963). Character and meanings of selfishness and altruism. Sociology and Social Research, 47, 311-321.

Objective: To investigate the differences between personality types with varying needs for nurturance and succorance and the relationship of those personality types to other personality variables

Design: Cross-Sectional Survey

Setting: a university in California

Participants: Participants were 572 students (325 men and 247 women) from a university in California.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants completed the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Edwards, 1954), a questionnaire designed to address

each of fifteen personality needs (i.e., achievement, endurance, exhibition, affiliation, aggression, order). Participants also wrote autobiographical descriptions that included information on involvement in primary and secondary groups and patterns of socialization related to formation of personality needs. Taped interviews asking in-depth questions concerning socialization were also conducted.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants scoring in the upper and lower quartiles on succorance and nurturance were chosen to fit each of the four social character types as follows. The altruistic personality type was high on nurturance, but low on succorance. The receptive-giver was high on both nurturance and succorance. The selfish person was low on nurturance, but high on succorance and the inner-sustaining person was low on both nurturance and succorance. One hundred ninety-four participants (98 males and 96 female) represented each of the four possible social character types on the two dimensions of succorance and nurturance. Nurturance is defined as the need to give to others and succorance is defined as the need to receive from others. Scores on this social character types questionnaire were then compared to measures of personality presumed to be related to altruism.

Main Results: The results of this study are most clearly presented as descriptions of each of the social character types, the personality and individual difference variables related to each. First, the altruistic social character type is defined by high nurturance and low succorance levels. Altruistic males were higher than other males on endurance. Altruistic women were higher than other women on affiliation needs, but lower on achievement and dominance needs. Altruists tended to passively await opportunities to be nurturing, did not seek and even rejected aid themselves, and were often attracted to selfish types. Family characteristics of altruists included coming from large families, being an only child, receiving firm discipline with rewards for internalizing adult roles, being independent and self-reliant, and giving out of religious belief.

Second, the selfish social character type is characterized by low nurturance and high succorance. Selfish men and women tended to be higher in exhibition and lower in affiliation than other men and women. Selfish women tended to also be higher in aggression than other women. Selfish people had high dependency on others for gratification of their needs, were unmotivated to help others, and found relationships with altruists very satisfying. Family characteristics of selfish people included parental indulgence, frustration intensifying their needs, and few demands and little encouragement given to induce giving.

Third, the receptive-giving social character type is characterized by high nurturance and high succorance. Receptive-Giving men and women tended to be lower in endurance than other men and women. Receptive-Giving women tended to also be lower in dominance than other women. Receptive-Giving men tended to be higher in affiliation, but lower in autonomy than other men. Receptive-Giving people preferred close relationships that were both dependent and supportive, found relationships with others like themselves most gratifying, and giving was contingent on receiving in most cases. Family characteristics of receptive-givers included a model of learning that gratification depends on giving to others, the family was a "warm" providing unit, and the parents were nurturing models.

Fourth, the inner-sustaining social character type is characterized by low nurturance and low succorance. Inner-Sustaining men and women tended to be higher in autonomy, endurance, and aggression, but lower in affiliation than other

men and women. Inner-Sustaining women tended to also be higher in achievement and exhibition than other women. Inner-Sustaining people preferred detachment to involvement with others, were very autonomous so as to be very productive, and avoided both dependency and interdependency. Family characteristics of inner-sustainers included blocked learning of nurturing motives, early self-sufficiency, and overt rebellion in adolescence.

Conclusion: "The use of a social character typology formulated on the basis of personality needs for nurturance and succorance has been demonstrated with the possible outcome that some new insights and understandings about the structure of personality, the nature of human relations, and the process of socialization have resulted."

Commentary: Like the more recent studies by Romer, Gruder, & Lizzadro (1986), Ribal utilizes a typology to fully describe personality and socialization characteristics associated with altruism. Note that both altruists and receptive-givers would be likely to perform prosocial behaviors. Further investigation might address the relationship between the altruist and the selfish person, which in this research approximates the relationship between a martyr and someone who manipulates the martyr for selfish gain. Also, the development of these giving/receiving personality types might be compared to more recent research on attachment styles in childhood and adulthood.

Correspondence: None Available

Romer, D., Gruder, C. L., & Lizzadro, T. (1986). A person-situation approach to altruistic behavior. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 51(5), 1001-1012.

Objective: To determine the influence of nurturance, succorance, and situation on helping behavior

Design: Study 1: Cross-sectional survey
Study 2: Laboratory Experiment

Setting: University of Illinois at Chicago

Participants: Study 1: Participants consisted of 94 undergraduate students who participated to complete a requirement for a introductory psychology course.
Study 2: Participants consisted of 125 undergraduate students who participated to complete a requirement for a introductory psychology course.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: Study 1 was primarily a scale development and validation study. A measure of helping orientation was designed to distinguish 4 possible personality types on the two dimensions of succorance and nurturance. The altruistic personality type would be high on nurturance, but low on succorance. The receptive-giver would be high on both nurturance and succorance.

The selfish person would be low on nurturance, but high on succorance and the inner-sustaining person would be low on both nurturance and succorance. Scores on the Helping-Orientation Questionnaire were then compared to measures of personality presumed to be related to altruism.

Study 2: Of the 125 original participants screened 65 participants were chosen to represent three categories on the Helping-Orientation Questionnaire: 27 altruists, 20 receptive-givers, and 18 selfish persons. Half of the participants were assigned to a compensation condition and half to a non-compensation condition. Participants in the compensation condition were offered partial course credit for participation while participants in the no-compensation condition were told that they could not receive partial course credit for participation.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: Participants completed the nurturance and succorance subscales of the Jackson Personality Research Form (1967) to assess construct validity of the novel measures of helping orientation. For concurrent validity, participants completed the Social Responsibility Scale (Berkowitz and Lutterman, 1968) and the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980). The latter contains subscales measuring personal distress, perspective taking, empathic concern, and fantasy.

Study 2: Participants were telephoned and asked to participate in an experiment that needed to be completed by the end of the semester. If participants agreed to participate, they were asked how much time they were willing to spend at the experiment.

Main Results: Study 1: Consistent with expectations, altruists and receptive-givers were more nurturant on the Jackson Personality Research Form than the other two types (Ms = 11.31 and 11.00 vs. 9.78 and 9.00; F (1,90) = 8.23, p < .05). Furthermore, the receptive giving and selfish types were more succorant on the Jackson Personality Research Form than the other two types (Ms = 9.64 and 8.05 vs. 7.72 and 6.94; F (1,90) = 4.49, p < .05). Empathic concern was expressed more by altruists and receptive-givers than by selfish and inner-sustaining participants (Ms = 4.36 and 4.05 vs. 3.67 and 3.63; F (1,89) = 20.62, p < .05). Nurturant type participants (altruists and receptive-givers) were also more likely to engage in perspective taking than non-nurturant type participants (selfish and inner-sustaining; Ms = 3.80 and 3.48 vs. 3.42 and 3.31; F (1,89) = 4.14, p < .05). Nurturant types were more likely than non-nurturant types to engage in empathic concern and fantasy empathy(Ms = 2.73 and 2.89 vs. 2.67 and 2.69; F (1,88) = 4.47, p < .05).

Study 2: An interaction between personality type and compensation condition emerged, such that altruists who had not been offered compensation and receptive-givers who had been offered compensation were more likely to help the experimenter and agree to participate in the study than were the other participants (82% vs. 48%, χ^2 (1, n=47) = 5.80, p < .05). When no compensation was offered, altruists tended to give help more often than receptive-givers (77% vs. 45%, χ^2 (1, n=24) = 2.54, p < .15). When there was compensation, receptive-givers tended to give help more often than altruists (89% vs. 50%, χ^2 (1, n=23) = 3.65, p < .07). Selfish participants were equally likely to help in compensation and no compensation conditions (33%).

Results for number of hours volunteered to help follow a similar pattern as agreement to help. An interaction between personality type and compensation condition emerged such that altruists who had not been offered compensation and receptive-givers who had been offered compensation volunteered more hours than did

the other participants (<u>t</u> (59) = 2.47, <u>p</u> < .02). When no compensation was offered altruists volunteered more hours than receptive-givers (.92 hrs vs. .45 hrs, <u>t</u> (59) = 1.71, <u>p</u> < .08). When there was compensation receptive-givers volunteered more hours than altruists (1.33 hrs vs. .79 hrs, <u>t</u> (59) = 1.78, <u>p</u> < .08). Selfish participants volunteered similarly low numbers of hours in compensation and no compensation conditions (<u>M</u> = .22 hrs).

Conclusion: Both personality and situational variables are important in determining when helping will occur. "Receptive-givers appear to be strongly motivated by both nurturance and succorance and, hence, prefer to help in situations in which reciprocation or social rewards are forthcoming. Altruists, however, are just as motivated by nurturance, but they also prefer social independence (nonsuccorance) and, hence, prefer to help in situations in which social rewards are not forthcoming."

Commentary: Like the early work of Ribal (1963) above, Romer, Gruder, and Lizzadro explore the relationship of personality variables and helping behavior to social character types. Again, note that both altruists and receptive-givers would be likely to perform prosocial behaviors, but this time the motives for performing the behaviors and the conditions under which the behaviors are likely to occur are made more clear. Perhaps selfish people were less likely to help in all conditions because the incentives were too low, or perhaps their needs for nurturance so outstripped their needs for succorance that they felt unable to help.

Correspondence: None Available

Rushton, J. P., Fulker, D. W., Neale, M. C., Nias, D. K. B., & Eysenck, H. J. (1986). Altruism and aggression: The heritability of individual differences. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50</u>, 1192-1198.

Objective: To estimate the heritability of altruism and aggression

Design: Twin Study with questionnaires

Setting: England

Participants: Participants were 573 monozygotic (MZ = identical twins) and dizygotic (DZ = fraternal twins) twin pairs from the University of London Institute of Psychiatry Volunteer Twin Register. There were 206 MZ female, 90 MZ male, 133 DZ female, 46 DZ male, and 98 DZ mixed sex twin pairs. Twins ranged in age from 19 to 60 years old.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants completed five questionnaires mailed to them on altruism (Self-Report Altruism Scale; Rushton, Chrisjohn, & Fekken, 1981), emotional empathy (Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972), nurturance (Subscale of the Personality Research Form; Jackson, 1974), aggressive behavior, and assertive behavior (23 and 24 items, respectively from the Interpersonal Behavior

Survey; Mauger & Adkinson, 1980).

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Correlations between twins scores were computed separately by type of twin pairing (MZ vs. DZ) and Falconer's (1981) heritabilities were calculated in percentages. Analyses were also conducted separately by gender and age of participant. In twin correlations and heritability analyses, gender and age were covaried out.

Main Results: In correlational analyses, altruism, empathy, nurturance, and assertiveness increased with age (rs = .48, .43, .41, and .23, respectively; ps < .001), while aggressiveness decreased with age (r = -.40, p < .001). As expected, women had higher mean scores than men on empathy and nurturance, while men had higher scores than women on aggression and assertiveness (ts = 14.54, 13.98, 9.88, and 6.27, respectively; ps < .001). Overall, the MZ twins showed greater correlations on each of the measures than did DZ twins: a) self-report altruism .53 vs. .25, heritability = 56%, b) empathy .54 vs. .20, heritability = 68%, c) nurturance .49 vs. .14, heritability = 70%, d) aggressiveness .40 vs. .04, heritability = 72%, and e) assertiveness .52 vs. .20, heritability = 64%. The heritability scores can be partitioned into variance due to genetic effects V(G), variance due to common environment shared by twins V(CE), and variance that is due to the uniqueness of each twin V(SE). Using a maximum-likelihood estimation procedure, for self-report altruism V(G) = 51%, V(CE) = 2%, and V(SE) = 47%. Very similar results were revealed for empathy, nurturance, aggressiveness, and assertiveness, such that approximately half of the variance was due to genetics, half to individual differences, and none of the variance was due to common environment.

Conclusion: "Altruism increased over the age span from 19 to 60. Women had higher scores than men on altruism and lower scores on aggression." Heritability estimates of 56%, 68%, and 70% were obtained for measures of altruism, empathy, and nurturance.

Commentary: Rushton et al.'s (1986) work suggest a strong heritable component to altruism and its dispositional correlates – empathy and nurturance. Davis et al. (1994) also explored heritability of another approach to empathy and found lower, but still important genetic components. One of the important sections of this work is the partitioning of the variance into genetic, common environment, and unique personality components of heritability. It is clear that while genetics play a substantial role, heredity is not destiny (nor is common environment). Individual differences, personality, and unique experiences that the individual brings to the situation also influence level of altruism, empathy, and nurturance. These differences are the focus of much of the other work in this bibliography.

Correspondence: J. Philippe Rushton, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada N6A 5C2

Rushton, J. P., Fulker, D. W., Neale, M. C., Nias, D. K., & Eysenck, H. J. (1989). Aging and the relation of aggression, altruism, and assertiveness scales to the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire. Personality & Individual Differences, 10(2), 261-263.

Objective: To examine the relationships between age, aggression, altruism, assertiveness, and scores on the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire

Design: Cross-sectional survey

Setting: Most geographic areas of the U.K.

Participants: Participants consisted of 573 twin pairs from the University of London Institute of Psychiatry Twin Register. The mean age was 30 years (range 19 to over 60 years). Seventy percent of the sample was female.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants completed the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975). Emotional empathy was measured with a 33-item self-report measure (Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972). nurturance (Nurturance Scale, Jackson, 1974), aggressiveness (Mauger & Adkinson, 1980), and assertiveness (Interpersonal Behavior Survey) were also measured.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Altruism was measured with the 20-item Self-Report Altruism Scale (Rushton, Chrisjohn, and Fekken, 1981).

Main Results: Altruism was positively related to assertiveness (r = .30, p < .001), nurturance (r = .43, p < .001), empathy (r = .15, p < .001), and extraversion (r = .21, p < .001). Altruism was negatively related to aggressiveness (r = -.23, p < .001) and neuroticism (r = -.15, p < .001).

Conclusion: Altruism has positive relationships with several personality variables and negative relationships with others. Perhaps the most surprising relationships are those of altruism and assertiveness and extraversion. The more outgoing a person was, the more altruistic he or she was.

Commentary: In investigating a personality variable in relation to other traits it is important to include all phases of the life span. Children (as in Berndt & Das, 1987; Farver & Branstetter, 1994; Leung & Foster, 1985; Litvack-Miller et al., 1997) and college students are much more common study participants than the adults investigated in this study. What we find in the results of Rushton et al.'s (1989) study is that the positive relationship between altruism and nurturance and empathy that we find in other studies carries through adulthood (nurturance: Ribal, 1963; Gergen et al., 1972; Romer et al., 1986, Empathy: Archer et al., 1981; Batson et al., 1986). Of particular interest is the relationship between altruism and assertiveness and extraversion that conceptually replicates the findings of Schenk & Heinisch (1986). This strengthens the link between altruism and the ability to carry out altruistic acts which is facilitated by instrumental traits such as gregariousness, comfort in social

situations, and being able to put one's own (albeit prosocial) needs and desires forward.

Correspondence: J. Philippe Rushton, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario N6A 5C2, Canada

---

Rushton, J. P., Chrisjohn, R. D. & Fekken, G. C. (1981) The altruistic personality and the self-report altruism scale. <u>Personality and Individual Differences,</u> <u>2</u>, 293-302.

Objective: To examine the stability of individual differences in altruism across situations and to examine the properties of a self-report altruism scale

Design: Cross-sectional survey and peer reports

Setting: The University of Western Ontario

Participants: Study 1: Participants were 118 undergraduate students (39 males and 79 females) at the University of Western Ontario and 416 friends/peers who answered questions concerning the students. The students completed the questionnaires during class time.
Study 2: Participants were 146 undergraduate students (64 males and 82 females).
Study 3: Participants were 200 university students.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: Participants completed the Self-Report Altruism Scale (SRA-scale), a 20-item scale that asks participants how often they engaged in altruistic behaviors on a 5-point scale from 1 = never to 5 = very often (i.e., "I have given directions to a stranger.")
Study 2: Participants completed the SRA-scale to measure altruism.
Study 3: Participants completed the SRA-scale to measure altruism.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: Each participant was asked to give a questionnaire to eight people who knew them well. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a stamped, addressed envelope. The questionnaire contained the SRA-scale to be filled out in relation to the participant and four global ratings of the target person's altruism. Peers rated how caring, how helpful, how considerate of other's feelings, and how willing to make a sacrifice the participant was on a 7-point scale. Response rate for the peer ratings was 45%; 75% of the participants (n=88) had one or more raters. Eighty participants had two or more raters. Peer ratings on the SRA-scale were summed across the 20 items and then averaged across all peers that rated a particular participant. A similar peer score was created for the global altruism items by summing the four items and averaging across the peer raters.
Study 2: Over three testing sessions eight 'altruistic' responses were measured: 1) volunteering to read to blind persons in response to a telephone solicitation, 2) volunteering to participate in experiments for a needy experimenter, 3) whether they

had ever taken a first aid course, 4) whether they had completed the organ donor card on their drivers licenses, 5) a questionnaire measuring 'sensitive attitudes' (Educational Testing Service: Derman et al., 1978), 6) the nurturance subscale of the Personality Research Form (Jackson, 1974), 7) paper and pencil measures of helping in emergency scenarios, and 8) having helping interests on the Jackson Vocational Interest Survey (Jackson, 1977).

Study 3: Participants completed the Social Responsibility Scale (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1964), the Emotional Empathy Scale (Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972), the Social Interest Scale (Crandall, 1975), the Fantasy-Empathy Scale (Stotland et al., 1978), The Machieavellianism Scale (Christie & Geis, 1968), the Rokeach Value Survey (Form C, Rokeach, 1973), the nurturance scale of the Personality Research Form (Jackson, 1974), and the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1976).

Main Results: Study 1: Split-half reliabilities for the peer ratings of the 80 participants who had two or more raters was significant for both the SRA-scale scores and the global altruism scores ($\underline{r}$s(78) = .51 and .39, respectively; $\underline{p}$s < .01). The internal consistency reliability of the peer rating form was high ($\forall$ = .89, n = 416). There was, as expected, a positive correlation between the peer-rated SRA –scale scores and the global altruism ratings ($\underline{r}$(86) = .54, $\underline{p}$ < .001). Using Spearman's correction formula for attenuation due to unreliability, similarly strong relationships were found between participant SRA-scale scores and peer rated SRA-scale scores and global altruism scores ($\underline{r}$s(78) = .56 and .33, respectively; $\underline{p}$s < .01).

Study 2: The SRA-scale scores were significantly, positively correlated with having filled out the organ donation card, the paper and pencil measure of 'sensitive attitude', the nurturance scale, and the responses to the emergency helping scenarios ($\underline{r}$s = .25, .33, .28, and .33, respectively; $\underline{p}$s < .01) after social desirability was partialled out. The SRA-scale scores also predicted a linear combination of the eight measures ($\underline{r}$ = .59, $\underline{p}$ < .01; after correcting for measure unreliability).

Study 3: The SRA-scale scores were significantly, positively correlated with measures of social responsibility, empathy, nurturance, having equality and helpfulness as personal values, and having 'high' levels of moral reasoning ($\underline{r}$s = .15, .17, .20, .28, .14, and .16, respectively; $\underline{p}$s < .05). The SRA-scale scores were significantly, negatively correlated with Machiavellianism ($\underline{r}$ = -.13, $\underline{p}$ < .05). The SRA-scale scores also predicted a linear combination of the eight measures ($\underline{r}$ = .44, $\underline{p}$ < .001; after controlling for measure unreliability).

Conclusion: "Findings from Study 1 support the idea of consistent individual differences in two ways. First, there was some agreement among peers' ratings of an individuals altruistic behavior. Second, better than chance agreement was also found between an individual's own report of his or her altruistic behavior and his or her peer's reports. [Study 2] found that an individual's self-reported altruism was related to a variety of altruistic criteria, and that when these criteria were combined a somewhat stronger relationship obtained. [Study 3] found significant positive relations among a variety of questionnaire measures of prosocial orientation. Self-reported altruism was related to all of these, and particularly so to an aggregated composite."

Commentary: Rushton, Chrisjohn, & Fekken's (1981) work has become the basis of other research on self-reported altruism (Mohan & Bhatia, 1987; Rushton et al., 1989). The current study provides convergent validity for the scale. It also provides some evidence of the stability of individual differences in altruism with the use of the

multiple other reports on the SRA-scale. Furthermore, the findings from Studies 2 and 3 are similar to findings from other studies concerning the relationship of altruism to empathy, nurturance, social responsibility and other qualities.

Correspondence: J. Philippe Rushton, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada N6A 5C2

<div style="border:1px solid black; height:2em;"></div>

Sawyer, J. (1966). The altruism scale: a measure of cooperative, individualistic, and competitive interpersonal orientation. <u>American Journal of Sociology, 71</u>, 407-416.

Objective: To investigate the properties of a scale to measure altruism

Design: Cross-sectional survey with scenarios

Setting: The University of Chicago and George Williams College

Participants: Participants were 122 students from three groups. The first group consisted of social science students recruited from a class at the University of Chicago (n= 28). Most of these students were graduate students. The second group consisted of graduate business students from the University's Graduate School of Business (n= 32). The third group consisted of students from George Williams College, which at the time trained students for the YMCA and other social service positions (n= 62).

Assessment of Predictor Variables: The independent variable in this study was college setting (i.e., the students from the three different schools were hypothesized to have differing levels of altruism). Participants completed the F scale to measure authoritarianism (Adorno, 1950).

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants were asked to use a grid with three rows and three columns representing the participant's grade (A, B, or C) and another person's grade in a fictitious course. On the grid the participants were asked to rank their preference (from 1 to 9) for each of the nine possible outcomes. If participants had no preference between two or more outcomes, they were to give each of the outcomes in question the same rank. "To produce a measure of relative altruism, the discrimination between C's and A's for the other is divided by the discrimination between C's and A's for the self."

Relative altruism =
<u>(Summed ranks for C to other)- (summed ranks for A to other)</u>
(Summed ranks for C to self)- (summed ranks for A to self)

Scores ranged from +1.0 to –1.0 where +1.0 = strictly cooperative, 0 = strictly individualistic, and –1.0 = strictly competitive. Participants ranked grades for self and each of three "others" – a friend, a stranger, and an antagonist.
Then participants rated the amount of interest he had in the other person's

grades on a scale of –1.0 to +1.0 in increments of tenths. The scale was anchored by descriptions such that +1.0 was "I am equally interested in how good his grade is and in how good my grade is", 0 was "I am only interested in how good my grade is" and –1.0 was "I am only interested in how much better my grade is than his; I do not care how good my grade is *per se*." Similar rankings of salaries ($6,000, $8,000, and $10,000) and amount of interest in own and other's salaries were also measured for a friend, a stranger, and an antagonist.

Main Results: Across all groups altruism toward the friend was greater than altruism toward the stranger and the antagonist ($\underline{M}$s = .45, .12 and -.18, respectively). The students training for the YMCA were more altruistic than the social science and business students ($\underline{M}$s = .21, .02 and .07, respectively). The responses of business students were balanced around zero, having scores of .33 for friend and -.29 for antagonist, a spread of about .6. The social science students discriminated more with a spread of about .8 between friend and antagonist.

Examining individual characteristics, authoritarianism as measured by the F scale was unrelated to altruism ($\underline{r}$ = -.03), but was related in predictable ways to group membership. Business students were the most authoritarian, followed by the YMCA students, and finally the social science students. Gender differences occurred on altruism for YMCA students and social science students. For all targets, female YMCA students were more altruistic than male YMCA students. Female social science students were less punitive toward the antagonist than male social science students ($\underline{M}$s = -.22 vs. -.42), in that they did not necessarily choose lower grades for the other than for the self.

Conclusion: "Grossly, the tendencies differentiating the three groups may be put as follows: YMCA students help everyone, business students help themselves, and social science students help those who help them. Altruism toward a friend is substantially greater than that toward a stranger, which in turn is substantially greater than that toward an antagonist."

Commentary: Sawyer's (1966) measure of altruism is a contrast to Rushton et al.'s (1981) self-report measure or other self-report or behavioral measures frequently used in research. Sawyer's measure hits behavioral tendencies at the micro-level of dyads while Rushton et al. measure self-reports of common altruistic behaviors. What we cannot know is whether the group differences that occurred in the present study were because persons of a given set of altruistic characteristics migrated toward those fields or whether the fields themselves shaped the individual's understanding of interpersonal processes (or both). Again, we see a bias in the participants for altruistic behavior toward friends being greater than altruistic behavior toward strangers or antagonists (cf. Ashton et al., 1998).

Correspondence: None Available

Schenk, J., & Heinisch, R. (1986). Self-descriptions by means of sex-role scales and personality scales: A critical evaluation of recent masculinity and femininity scales. Personality & Individual Differences, 7(2), 161-168.

Objective: To examine the relationship between instrumentality, expressiveness, and various personality scales

Design: Cross-sectional survey

Setting: Germany

Participants: Participants consisted of 100 adults who attended various adult education courses. There were equal numbers of male and female participants. The mean age for participants was 29 years for males and 27 years for females.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Instrumentality and expressiveness were measured using 40 items derived from the Bem Sex Role Inventory (1974) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence and Helmreich, 1978). Instrumentality is the propensity to engage in behavior that is goal-directed or a means to some end. Expressiveness refers to the degree to which a person exhibits stereotypically feminine traits such as nurturing behavior, personal warmth, and higher emotionality.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Altruism and helpfulness were measured by 13 items on self-report Likert-type scales. Altruism here is defined as "The willingness to sink one's own needs and welfare in favor of someone else", while helpfulness was defined as "Offering help to others who are in trouble, even if one's own interests are neglected by this."

Main Results: Both altruism and helpfulness were strongly, positively correlated with expressiveness (rs = .59 and .43, respectively), but were not strongly correlated with instrumentality (rs = .13 and .15, respectively). This corresponds, roughly, to greater expressed altruism in women than men (M = 25.3 vs. 23.5, p < .06) and greater expressed helpfulness in women than men (M = 22.2 vs. 20.8, p < .04). It is interesting, in light of these results, that participants' ratings of dealing with others' problems with empathy is significantly positively correlated for both males and females with self-confidence (rs = .53 and .34), assertiveness (rs = .48 and .47), leadership abilities (rs = .64 and .63), competency (rs = .60 and .60), ambition (rs = .14 and .50), and competitive orientation (rs = .25 and .14).

Conclusion: Altruism and helpfulness were more closely related to expressiveness than instrumentality. Women reported being more altruistic and helpful than men did. However, altruistic behavior – dealing with other's problems with empathy – was associated with instrumental qualities.

Commentary: Schenk and Heinisch (1986) demonstrated the duality that we have seen in other studies where self-reports of altruistic intentions or feelings are

pitted against altruistic behavior (Rushton et al., 1989). Altruistic intentions and feelings are associated with the more feminine traits of empathy and expressiveness while enacting altruistic behavior may require some instrumentality in conjunction with that expressiveness.

Correspondence: J. Schenk and R. Heinisch, Psychologisches Institut, Belfortstrasses 18, 7800 Freiburg i.Br., F.R.G.

Schütz, A., & Tice, D. M. (1997). Associative and competitive indirect self-enhancement in close relationships moderated by trait self-esteem. European Journal of Social Psychology, 27(3), 257-273.

Objective: To examine the ways in which people describe themselves and their romantic partners especially in relation to self-esteem and publicness of description

Design: Laboratory experiment with questionnaires

Setting: A university

Participants: Participants consisted of 40 female undergraduates currently involved in a romantic relationship. They received course credit for their participation. The mean age was 19 years (range 17-22).

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants completed a series of personality questionnaires including a masculinity-femininity scale (Personal Attributes Questionnaire, Spence & Helmreich, 1978) and a self-esteem scale (modified Feelings of Inadequacy Scale, Fleming & Courtney, 1984). Participants were randomly assigned to public or private conditions. Then they were asked to write descriptions of their relationships and partners. In the public condition, participants expected to read their descriptions to other members of the group. In the private condition, participants were asked to put their descriptions in a box where it would not be seen by others.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants responses were coded for personality variables such as likeability, altruism, competence, sensitivity, and assertiveness/threat. Descriptions were also coded for self-presentational concerns of ingratiation, exemplification, self-promotion, supplication, and intimidation (Jones & Pittman, 1982). That is, researchers looked for evidence of participants presenting themselves in such a way as to establish themselves in the good graces of others, using themselves as an example of some trait, and putting themselves forward for some reward, asking for help, or to awe others or overstate themselves by a display of wealth, talent, etc.

Main Results: Participants made fewer comments about their own competence ($\underline{F}$ (1,36) = 6.44, $\underline{p}$ < .05), altruism ($\underline{F}$ (1,36) = 3.16, $\underline{p}$ < .08), and sensitivity ($\underline{F}$ (1,36) = 4.62, $\underline{p}$ < .05) in public than in private. Furthermore, low self-esteem participants said

they were proud of their altruistic nature more frequently (M = 1.23) than high self-esteem participants (M = .53; F (1,36) = 4.93, p < .05).

Conclusion: "Low self-esteem [participants] may simply not be convinced that they possess abilities that are good enough to justify assertive self-presentation. To make favorable impressions, they may rely on areas where no specific abilities are necessary but were merely possessing a trait (such as altruism) increases one's likeability."

Commentary: Schütz & Tice (1997) find that reporting that one behaves altruistically in close relationships, whether the participants actually are altruistic or not, can be motivated by self-presentational concerns. If it is important for the person to be liked, they may present their altruistic behavior publicly to increase self-esteem. This behavior also avoids the appearance of bragging associated with talking about abilities. Management of self-esteem through altruism has been found in other studies. Work by Penner & Finkelstein (1998) suggests that those participants high in helpfulness were motivated by feeling efficacious - thereby raising self-esteem. Gergen et al. (1972) found that self-esteem in females was related to some types of helping, but not others. Therefore, the implications of self-esteem level for altruistic behavior is less straightforward than the implications of the motivation to present oneself as being altruistic.

Correspondence: Astrid Schütz, Department of Psychology, University of Bamberg, Postfach 1549, D-96045, Bamberg, Germany, fax: +49 951 1869; tel +49 951 1867; email to astrid.schuetz@ppp.uni-bamberg.de

Schwartz, S. H. (1970). Elicitation of moral obligation and self-sacrificing behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 15, 283-293.

Objective: To investigate the relationship between self-sacrificing behavior, feelings of personal responsibility, and costs related to the behavior

Design: Field experiment

Setting: Red Cross donation center

Participants: Participants were 144 persons who had just donated blood at a Red Cross donation center. There were 109 males and 35 females, 78% of the sample was married, 32% of the sample was 18-29 years old, 28% of the sample was 30-39 years old, and 40% of the sample was 40 years old or older.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Three variables were manipulated in a discussion of bone marrow donation with the participants who had recently donated blood – salience of the consequences of donation for the recipient, the odds that the volunteer would be called on to donate, and the salience of the personal responsibility of the participant to help. After a general description of bone marrow transplantation

for leukemia participants heard a description of the person needing the bone marrow which varied by severity of the consequences – Low "30 year old female with no matching donor in her family", Moderate "Young mother with no matching donor in her family", or High "Young mother with no matching donor in her family, survival is unlikely without transplant, and her death would be a tragedy for her kids." Next participants heard a description of the odds that they personally would be needed to serve as a bone marrow donor – Low "1 in every 1,000" or High "1 in every 25". Finally they heard a description of how donors were being solicited, an appeal with either low personal responsibility "running ads for potential donors in newspapers across the state" or high personal responsibility "turning to people who are giving blood today, because your blood is already available to start the testing."

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants' level of willingness to help with the bone marrow donation process was assessed on a 4-point scale created by summing the answers to several questions about the donation process. The four levels of commitment were: 0 = not willing to have blood tested for compatibility, 1 = willing to have blood tested, but less than 50/50 chance would actually donate, 2 = at least 50/50 chance would actually donate, but not willing to be on call for future transplants, 3 = at least 50/50 chance would actually donate and willing to be on call for future transplants.

Main Results: Participants volunteered to help with bone marrow donation at high levels. Fifty-nine percent of the participants reached the highest level of commitment, another 24% said there would be at least a 50/50 chance that they would donate, and only 17% failed to commit at a low level. Because of the skewed nature of the distribution, a squared transformation was performed to produce a more normal distribution. In an analysis of variance for volunteering with two levels of responsibility, three levels of consequences, and two levels of odds of being called to volunteer, main effects emerged for salience of responsibility ($\underline{F}(1,132) = 6.70$, $\underline{p} < .02$) and salience of consequences ($\underline{F}(1,132) = 3.18$, $\underline{p} < .05$). Participants were more committed to volunteering under conditions of high responsibility than under conditions of low responsibility ($\underline{M}s = 7.08$ vs. 5.72). Participants were most committed to volunteering under moderate consequences for the person needing a donation, slightly less committed under high consequences, and lowest under low consequences ($\underline{M}s = 7.23$, 6.38, and 5.60, respectively). This main effect is qualified by an interaction of the consequences variable with the odds variable ($\underline{F}(2,132) = 4.88$, $\underline{p} < .01$). Upon examination of the means, it became evident that in the condition where there were low odds of being called to actually donate there was a linearly increasing effect of consequences for the donee on commitment to volunteer. However, in the condition where there were high odds of being called to participate, there was a curvilinear relationship between the consequences for the donee and commitment to volunteer. The moderate consequences condition produced the highest commitments to volunteer while the low and high consequences conditions produced equally low levels of commitment. A single post-hoc comparison of these patterns was significant ($\underline{F}(4,132) = 3.82$, $\underline{p} < .01$). Approximately 7% of the variance in volunteering was accounted for by this comparison.

Conclusion: "The strikingly high rate of volunteering is traced to the momentum of compliance. The chances of finding a compatible donor under 1/25 odds were good. The intensity of pressure may therefore have been experienced as less

legitimate, and reactance may have been expressed more freely as refusal. [In the odds of 1/1000 condition] results support the view that the more fully the consequences of action or inaction for the welfare of others are spelled out in the decision situation, the more difficult it is to neutralize norms and hence to violate them. Based on the assumption that norms giving rise to a sense of moral obligation were activated, the significant relationship between volunteering and salience of personal responsibility in the appeal may be interpreted as evidence that this situational variable influenced the ease with which the moral norms could be neutralized."

Commentary: Two important points come from this research by Schwartz (1970). First, willingness to act prosocially can be affected by the kinds of appeals made. Research in attitudes and in advertising has shown that it is possible to change opinions on political issues, get people to buy products and services, and even volunteer or give money to charities. The special message of this study is that increasing the persuasiveness of an appeal on several variables at once can produce reactance and even lead to decreased prosocial behavior. The second important point in this article is that people who engage in prosocial behavior, particularly when enacting that behavior, act in accordance to principles of consistency. Therefore, at the time they are behaving prosocially, they are particularly susceptible to appeals for similar prosocial behavior. The work of Schwartz here and elsewhere on individual differences in altruism is considered classic. This early, representative piece is supplemented by an extended list of references to his work in the reference list at the end of this document.

Correspondence: None Available

Senneker, P., & Hendrick, C. (1983). Androgyny and helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 916-925.

Objective: To investigate the relationship between masculinity, femininity, androgyny and helping behavior

Design: Laboratory experiment

Setting: The University of Miami

Participants: Participants were 78 male and 82 female students in introductory psychology classes who received partial course credit for participation. All of the participants took the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) at an earlier point in the semester. Androgyny is defined as having approximately equal, high levels of both masculine (instrumental) and feminine (expressive) traits. Sex-typed refers to having high levels of traits associated with one's gender and low levels of trait associated with the other gender. Sex-typed females have high levels of femininity and low levels of masculinity, while sex-typed males have high levels of masculinity and low levels of femininity. In this study there were 76 androgynous and 84 sex-typed participants approximately equally distributed among experimental conditions.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions that manipulated the number of bystanders: (a) participant was alone with the victim, (b) participant and victim were grouped with four confederates of the same-sex as the participant, or (c) participant and victim were grouped with two male and two female confederates. All participants were ostensibly in a study of college living in which they would interact with another anonymous student via microphone and headphones. In reality, the anonymous student was a confederate who, in the course of the discussion, choked on some food, struggled for breath, cried out for help and then went silent.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Two outcome variables were measured - the amount of time it took participants to leave their cubicle and go for help (participants who did not leave were assigned a maximum response time of 3 minutes) and whether the participant engaged in direct help by going for the door labeled for the anonymous student or engaged in indirect help by going for the door labeled for the experimenter.

Main Results: For response time analyses, there were three significant main effects and no significant interaction effects. Participants in six person groups responded more slowly than participants alone with the victim ($\underline{M}$s = 94.1 seconds vs. 65.9 seconds; $\underline{F}$(2,148) = 4.1, $\underline{p}$ < .05). Females responded more slowly than males ($\underline{M}$s = 95.0 seconds vs. 74.3 seconds; $\underline{F}$(1,148) = 4.3, $\underline{p}$ < .05). Sex-typed participants responded more slowly than androgynous participants ($\underline{M}$s = 94.2 seconds vs. 74.6 seconds; $\underline{F}$(1,148) = 4.4, $\underline{p}$ < .05). When examining helping behavior the data show that 69% of the participants offered some form of help and of those helping 61% attempted to help the victim directly. There is a marginal difference between the number of male participants that attempted to help either directly or indirectly than the number of female participants that attempted to help (74% vs. 63%; $\underline{z}$ = 1.55, $\underline{p}$ < .07). More male than female participants offered direct help (71% vs. 50%; $\underline{z}$ = 2.28, $\underline{p}$ < .02). There was no difference between androgynous and sex-typed participants on number of participants offering help or type of help offered. More participants who thought they were alone with the victim offered help than participants that thought there were four other bystanders (81% vs. 63%; $\underline{p}$ < .01). For sex-typed participants, more males offered direct help while more females offered indirect help or no help at all (χ^2(2) = 7.2, $\underline{p}$ < .05). The same pattern did not hold for androgynous participants (χ^2(2) = 3.16, $\underline{p}$ > .05).

Conclusion: "Speed of helping and/or proportion of subjects helping showed: (a) more help by males than by females, (b) more help in subject alone conditions than in larger group conditions, and (c) more help by androgynous than sex-typed males and females but not between androgynous males and females. Results further suggested that such competence is due to masculinity rather than sex *per se*."

Commentary: Like Eagly and Crowley (1986) and Johnson et al. (1989), Senneker and Hendrick (1983) found that males were more helpful than females. Furthermore, like Schenk and Heinisch (1986) and Rushton et al. (1989) enacting altruistic behavior may require some instrumentality in conjunction with expressiveness. The best demonstration of that in the current study is the higher levels of helping by males who have a naturally high level of masculine instrumentality and higher levels of helping by androgynous than sex-typed females.

Correspondence: Clyde Hendrick, Department of Psychology, Texas Tech University, Box 42051, Lubbock, TX 79409-2051

<div style="border:1px solid black; height:40px;"></div>

Sharma, V., & Rosha, J. (1992). Altruism as a function of self-actualization and locus of control of benefactor. Psychological Studies, 37(1), 26-30.

Objective: To examine the relationship between altruism, self-actualization, and locus of control

Design: Cross-sectional survey

Setting: Punjabi University, Patiala, India

Participants: Participants consisted of 48 female students of Part I and II of Punjabi University, Patiala. The mean age was 21.9 years.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants completed a series of questionnaires measuring locus of control (Rotter, 1966) and self-actualization (Personality Orientation Inventory, Shostrom, 1964). Participants were statistically divided into four groups based on level of self-actualization (high or low) and typical locus of control (internal or external). Locus of control is defined as "the perceived source of control over one's behavior. It is measured along a dimension running from high internal to high external, with internal persons being those who take responsibility for their own actions and view themselves as having control over their own destinies, and externals being those who tend to see control as residing elsewhere and tend to attribute success or failure to outside forces" (Reber, p. 423). Self-Actualization is the fulfillment of the full personal potential once all lower levels of basic needs are fulfilled. Qualities of the self-actualized person include: "independence, autonomy, a tendency to form a few deep friendships, a 'philosophical' sense of humor, a tendency to resist outside pressures, and a general transcendence of the environment rather than a simple 'coping' with it (Reber, p. 700).

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants completed a self-report altruism inventory (Chrisjohn, Fekken, & Rushton, 1981)

Main Results: High self-actualized participants scored higher on altruism ($\underline{M}$ = 54.76) than low self-actualized participants ($\underline{M}$ = 46.67; $\underline{F}$ = 12.57, $\underline{p}$ < .01). Participants with an internal locus of control scored higher on altruism ($\underline{M}$ = 55.37) than participants with an external locus of control ($\underline{M}$ = 45.96; $\underline{F}$ = 17.41, $\underline{p}$ < .01). An interaction effect of self-actualization and locus of control on altruism was significant. Participants who were both high on self-actualization and had an internal locus of control were more altruistic than participants in any of the other three groups. The other three groups do not differ from each other on altruism scores.

Conclusion: Both high self-actualization and internal locus of control are personality characteristics associated with higher altruism scores in this sample.

Commentary: In Sharma and Rosha's (1992) study of Indian students a positive relationship between internal locus of control and altruism was found. This mimics the relationship between instrumentality and altruism (Schenk & Heinisch, 1986; Rushton, et al., 1989) in that, some internal motivation and action may be necessary for altruism to take place. The positive relationship between self-actualization and altruism suggests that altruists may be more psychologically healthy and mature than persons scoring lower on altruism. This is in agreement with other research in the current bibliography that has found a relationship between positive mental health and altruism (Mohan & Bhatia, 1987; Rushton et al., 1989). Although, Johnson et al., (1989) found no relationship between neuroticism and altruism.

Correspondence: Vandana Sharma, Lecturer, Department of Psychology, Punjabi University, Patiala-147 002, India

---

Sibicky, M. E., Schroeder, D. A., & Dovidio, J. F. (1995). Empathy and helping: Considering the consequences of intervention. Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 16(4), 435-453.

Objective: To investigate whether people high in empathic concern would be sensitive to the long-term consequences of their altruistic behavior

Design: Laboratory experiment

Setting: A university

Participants: Participants consisted of 84 female introductory psychology students. They received course credit for their participation.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions. The conditions varied on whether the participants were instructed to imagine the feelings of a person who needed help on a puzzle or objectively observe the actions of a person who needed help on a puzzle. The conditions also varied on the effect of the participant's potential intervention. Participants were allowed to give hints to the other person to help them solve the puzzle. They were told either that "each hint they provided would make it easier for the person to solve the puzzle and avoid the possibility of shock" or that "giving too many hints during the session could penalize the person in the future". Participants indicated their feelings for the other person on the Emotional Response Questionnaire (Toi & Batson, 1982). This includes subscales for personal distress, empathic concern, and sadness.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants flipped switches that they believed gave the person completing the puzzle hints. The experimenter recorded the number of hints the participant gave.

Main Results: Participants who were asked to imagine the feelings of the other person reported greater empathic concern (M = 4.42) than did participants who were asked to objectively observe the other person (M = 3.60; F (1,80) = 10.17, p < .003). There were no differences between the conditions on personal distress or sadness. Across all conditions, participants who were higher on empathic concern reported thinking more about the consequences of their hints for the person doing the puzzle (r = .32, p < .001). Participants who both imagined the feelings of the other and were warned of potential detriments for giving hints gave significantly fewer hints to the other person (M = 1.86) than participants in the other three conditions averaged (M = 2.90; t(80) = 4.20, p < .001). Furthermore, the relationship between empathic concern and number of hints given was positive when participants believed there was benefit for the other person (r = .21, p < .20), but there was a significant negative relationship between empathic concern and number of hints given when participants believed there was a detriment for the other person (r = -.37, p < .02).

Conclusion: "As expected, an empathic orientation and greater empathic concern related to greater concern for the consequences of intervention. This greater concern was manifested in different levels of intervention, depending on whether [participants] were or were not aware that intervention had potential detrimental effects. As predicted, more empathic [participants] intervened *less* when they believed that such action might ultimately be harmful to the person requesting hints."

Commentary: Sibicky et al. (1995) demonstrate that altruism is not all one sided. That is, the altruistic person does not just act to ease their own empathic concern, but takes into consideration the outcome of their actions for the person needing help. Altruistic people are interested in helping, and not harming, those toward whom their behavior is directed. Consistent with other studies in this bibliography (Archer et al., 1981; Clary & Orenstein, 1991; Eisenberg et al., 1989), when there is no potential harm to the needy person, empathic concern leads to increased prosocial behavior. However, other studies in this bibliography found that empathic concern was associated with altruism under specific conditions (Batson et al., 1986) or that the relationship between empathic concern and altruism was mediated by feelings of oneness with the needy person (Carlo et al., 1991).

Correspondence: Mark Sibicky, Department of Psychology, Marietta College, Marietta, OH 45750

Smith, B. M. M. & Nelson, L. D. (1975). Personality correlates of helping behavior. Psychological Reports, 37, 307-316.

Objective: To differentiate between the personality variables associated with volunteers and non-volunteers

Design: Quasi-experiment with survey

Setting: Community residents in Virginia

Participants: Participants were 571 male rescue squad members and members of Big Brothers organizations in Virginia. Questionnaires were distributed to the volunteer participants by the directors of their organizations. Non-volunteer participants were 566 males drawn from a statewide probability sample that excluded anyone who indicated membership in a helping organization.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: All participants completed Cattell's Personality Factor Questionnaire (also called the 16 PF because it evaluates 16 separate personality traits; Cattell, 1956).

Assessment of Outcome Variables: The dependent variable in this study was whether the participant was a member of a volunteer group or not.

Main Results: Compared to non-volunteers, volunteers were more outgoing (Ms = 48.17 vs. 51.83; t = 6.13, p < .001), happy-go-lucky (Ms = 48.23 vs. 51.77; t = 5.93, p < .001), venturesome (Ms = 48.17 vs. 51.83; t = 6.13, p < .001), tenderminded (Ms = 48.66 vs. 51.36; t = 4.52, p < .001), and had higher superego strength (Ms = 49.12 vs. 50.89; t = 6.13, p < .01). Compared to non-volunteers, volunteers were less shrewd (Ms = 50.83 vs. 49.16; t = 2.79, p < .01), less liberal (Ms = 50.94 vs. 49.05; t = 3.17, p < .01), and less self-sufficient (Ms = 52.05 vs. 47.96; t = 6.87, p < .001).

Conclusion: "Members of volunteer groups and non-volunteers scored significantly differently on Cattell's 16PF scale, volunteers being extroverted (out-going, happy-go-lucky, venturesome, and tenderminded), and scoring lower on shrewd, liberal, and self-sufficient."

Commentary: Smith and Nelson's (1975) study is a nice addition to the group of studies that shows extraversion and masculine/instrumental traits related to prosocial behavior (Rushton, et al., 1989; Schenk & Heinisch, 1986). It seems that for volunteering and other prosocial behavior to take place there has to be a willingness to be among people and to engage in goal-oriented behavior. For extraverts, being among people in order to help is rewarding; for introverts, being among people is a cost. Note, however, that tendermindedness is a construct that is more correctly associated with agreeableness than extraversion and high superego strength is more correctly associated with conscientiousness than extraversion. Furthermore, whether work in this genre shows a relation between instrumentality and helping may depend on the

type of prosocial behaviors that are examined (See annotation of Eagly & Crowley, 1986).

Correspondence: None Available

Smith, K. D., Keating, J. P., & Stotland, E. (1989). Altruism reconsidered: The effect of denying feedback on a victim's status to empathic witness. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57</u>, 641-650.

Objective: To explore the role of empathy in helping for the sake of seeing the other express joy

Design: Laboratory Experiment

Setting: University of Washington

Participants: participants were 64 undergraduates at the University of Washington who were recruited by phone for two, one-hour sessions.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants watched a videotape of a freshman female who was experiencing feelings of stress and isolation. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions differing on two levels of empathy, and two levels of expected feedback. For the low empathy condition, participants were instructed to watch the videotape attending to body movement, trying to be as objective as possible, remembering exactly what the person does. In the high empathy condition participants were instructed to imagine how the person being interviewed feels, paying attention to tone of voice and facial expressions. Then participants were asked whether they would like to provide advice to the participant on dealing with college life. In the feedback condition, the participants were told that the woman would read the advice on her next trip to the lab where she would videotape a response the participant could view later. In the no-feedback condition, participants were told that they would have no further contact with the woman, whether they decided to give advice or not.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Whether the participant chose to write advice to the woman and the number of words the participant wrote were the outcome variables. Participants were also asked the extent to which they experienced 8 emotions indicative of empathic concern (i.e., compassionate, touched) and 8 emotions indicative of personal distress (i.e., alarmed, upset). Scores on personal distress were subtracted from scores on empathic concern to create a measure of *relative empathic concern* – that is, a measure of empathic concern unconfounded with personal distress.

Main Results: A median split on relative empathic concern allowed for analysis of a 2 X 2 factorial design with 2 levels of relative empathic concern (low and high) and two levels of feedback (feedback and no feedback).The four conditions were high

relative empathic concern/feedback, low relative empathic concern/feedback, high relative empathic concern/no feedback, and low relative empathic concern/no feedback. Planned comparison revealed that more helping occurred in the high relative empathic concern/feedback condition than in the other three conditions averaged (93% of respondents helping vs. 56% of respondents helping; Fisher's exact test, p < .007). Participants in the four conditions also wrote messages of considerably different length ($\underline{t}$s (52) $\exists$ 2.95, $\underline{p}$s < .005). In a 2 X 2 Analysis of Variance of empathy instruction X feedback condition on helping, main effects were revealed for feedback condition and empathy instruction (Fs > 4.18, ps < .05). Participants helped more when instructed to imagine the person's feelings than to observe her actions (77% vs. 54%) and helped more when told they would receive feedback than when told they would not receive feedback (81% vs. 50%). There was no interaction between the variables.

Conclusion: "The effect of empathic concern on motivation to help in this situation appears limited to conditions in which the witness expects renewed exposure to the help recipient. Moreover, the favorable effect of feedback is specific to persons high in empathy. We attribute the special responsiveness of empathic (participants) to the feedback manipulation to an enhanced sensitivity to empathic joy."

Commentary: Smith, Keating, & Stotland (1989) challenge both the empathy-altruism hypothesis (Batson, et al., 1981) and the negative state relief model (Cialdini et al., 1987) with a proposal that altruistic acts may be motivated by a "sensitivity to the vicarious joy at the resolution of the victim's need." They suggest that feedback in the presence of either dispositional or situationally induced empathy instead of simply empathic concern or personal distress drive the relationship between the variables. This relationship held for willingness to help, but no interaction was significant for the length of message dependent variable, indicating amount of helping. Sibicky et al. (1995) also found that altruistic people do not simply act to ease their own empathic concern, but take into consideration the outcome of their actions for the person needing help. While feedback may be desirable and even important in people's willingness to help, this study fails to acknowledge adequately the role of egoistic motives and does not firmly establish the role of joy in the influence of feedback.

Correspondence: None Available

Staub, E. (1974). Helping a distressed person: Social, personality, and stimulus determinants. In L. Berkowitz (ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol 7, 203-341). New York: Academic Press.

Objective: To examine the social and situational determinants of helping behavior

Design: Studies 1, 2, and 3: Field experiment
Study 4: Ratings of film clips

Setting: Cambridge, Massachusetts

Participants: Study 1: Participants were 60 passers-by on a street in lower-middle-class residential areas in Cambridge, Massachusetts. During the experiment, there was no other person within 50 feet of the participant or confederate.

Study 2: Participants were 58 passers-by on a street in lower-middle-class residential areas in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Study 3: Participants were 40 passers-by on a street in lower-middle-class residential areas in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Study 4: Participants were 82 undergraduates.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: In this naturalistic field experiment, naïve participants walking down a sidewalk alone encountered a confederate who either: (1) lay down on the sidewalk about 40 feet from the corner - no information condition, (2) approached the same spot and grabbed his knee before collapsing – bad knee condition, or (3) approached the same spot and grabbed his heart before collapsing – bad heart condition. Following the collapse, the confederate either struggled to his feet and leaned against a wall (mild distress condition) or struggled to get up, but remained sitting on the ground (severe distress condition).

Study 2: In a similar manner to Study 1 participants encountered a confederate victim displaying either the severe distress with bad knee or severe distress with bad heart behavior. The difference in Study 2 was the addition of an easy escape vs. difficult escape manipulation. In the difficult escape condition the confederate victim was on the same side of the street as the participant. In the easy escape condition the confederate victim was on the opposite side of the street.

Study 3: The confederate in Study three followed the exact same procedures in Study 1 (same part of the same street) with the severe bad knee and severe bad heart conditions.

Study 4: Participants watched two film clips of each of two confederates enacting the severe bad heart condition.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: Two concealed experimenters confirmed that the participant noted the confederate victim and then noted whether the participant approached the victim and made a call to a roommate as requested by the victim.

Study 2: Outcome variables were the same as in Study 1.

Study 3: Outcome variables were the same as in Study 1.

Study 4: Participants rated the degree and nature of distress of the victim and then rated the personal characteristics of each victim.

Main Results: Study 1: Fifteen of the 60 participants approached the victim, but none of these participants were in the "bad heart" condition. Though there was not a difference in no information and bad knee conditions, approach was significantly lower in the bad heart condition than the other two conditions (Π^2 (1, n=60) = 8.10, $\underline{p}$ < .01). More participants made the requested telephone call when the participants was in severe distress than in mild distress (Π^2 (1, n=60) = 4.10, $\underline{p}$ < .05).

Study 2: More participants approached the victim in the difficult escape condition than the easy escape condition (71.8% vs. 26.9%; Π^2 (1, n=58) = 18.5, $\underline{p}$ < .001). In addition, more participants made the telephone call for the victim in the

difficult escape condition than the easy escape condition (50% vs. 7.6%; Π^2 (1, n=58) = 5.41, $\underline{p}$ < .02). In both escape conditions, more participants approached the victim in the bad heart condition than in the bad knee condition (67.8% vs. 36.6%; Π^2 (1, n=58) = 4.46, $\underline{p}$ < .05).

Study 3: Six of ten participants in the bad heart condition and four of ten participants in the bad knee condition approached the confederate, but the difference was not significant. The frequency of help in the bad knee condition was similar to Study 1, but the frequency of help in the bad heart condition was greater (Fisher exact p < .01).

Study 4: Participants described the confederate of Study 1 as slightly healthier ($\underline{F}$ (1,76) = 3.20, $\underline{p}$ < .07) and more attractive than the confederate of Study 2 ($\underline{F}$ (1,76) = 26.23, $\underline{p}$ < .001). Participant ratings did not differ in trustworthiness, dangerousness, or credibility of performance. Participants described the Study 2 confederate's behavior as a heart problem more often than the Study 1 confederate's behavior (Π^2 (1, n=82) = 6.40, $\underline{p}$ < .02). Participants tended to describe the Study 2 confederate as due to something else.

Conclusion: "A clear result was that when the victim was not in the path of a would-be helper he was helped less, perhaps because the social and personal costs of not helping were smaller. However, if involvement is forced on them by circumstances, psychological and social processes may be activated that will lead to helping behavior possibly even to a true concern for another's welfare and a desire to help him. [Study 4 results suggest that] a discrepancy between a person's general characteristics and his condition of need may create ambiguity, possibly suspicion, and as a consequence might reduce helping behavior."

Commentary: Staub's (1974) experiments are in line with the typical emergency helping experiments. Staub varied situational components such as proximity of emergency to participant and victim characteristics such as degree and type of victim distress. The researchers experimentally manipulated the costs of helping, thereby manipulating the willingness to help. This is similar to Kerber's study (1984) in which willingness to help in a non-emergency setting was affected by manipulation of scenarios involving rewards and costs. The author's addition of Study 4 to explain the differences in helping the "bad heart" confederate in Studies 1 and 2, improves the interpretation of the results. In particular, the author's suggestion that the attractiveness and apparent health of the Study 1 confederate led to confusion of participants and confounded their reactions introduces another situational variable which explains willingness to help in an emergency situation – congruence of the current emergency with stereotypes of emergency situations.

Correspondence: Ervin Staub, Department of Psychology, Tobin Hall Box 37710, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003-7710

Switzer, G. E., Dew, M. A., Butterworth, V. A., Simmons, R. G., Schimmel, M. (1997). Understanding donor's motivations: A study of unrelated bone marrow donors. Social Science & Medicine, 45(1), 137-147.

Objective: To investigate the reported motivations of bone marrow donation

Design: Cross-sectional survey

Setting: Nation-wide

Participants: Participants were 343 individuals who donated bone marrow through the National Marrow Donors Program between December 1987 and December 1991. All participants were unrelated to recipients of the donations. Participants were contacted three times - pre-donation, 1-2 weeks post-donation, and 1 year post-donation. Sixty-six percent of the donors were men, 65% were currently married and had at least 1 child, 99% were high school graduates, 52% had completed some college, 43% were Protestant, 35% were Catholic, 3% were Jewish, and 19% did not consider themselves affiliated with any of these religions. Age ranged from 22 to 55 years old, with a mean of 38 years old.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Pre-donation participants completed the several questions about background characteristics: gender, age, religion, marital status, whether the donor had any children, and educational level. Then participants answered the open-ended question, "In your own words, what do you feel your reasons are for donating?" Up to four responses were categorized for each participant into six categories. Exchange related motives were related to consideration of the rewards of donating and the costs of donating. Idealized motives concerned responses that were made automatically without any consideration of potential costs or even their own motivations. Normative motives concerned social obligation or duty. Positive feeling motives concerned the good feeling it gave to perform the helping act. Empathy related motives concerned feelings toward the recipient. Experienced-based motives concerned other experiences of donating blood, volunteerism, or personal experiences that made the person aware of the need for bone marrow.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: At each of the three time periods, there were sets of questionnaires. Pre-donation participants were asked about feelings of ambivalence toward donation (i.e., "I sometimes feel unsure about donating."; Simmons et al., 1977). Scale scores ranged from 0 to 7 where 0 was no ambivalence and 7 was completely ambivalent. One to two weeks after donation participants were asked several questions about physical difficulties associated with donation (0=no difficulties to 10=high physical difficulty). Psychological reactions to donation were measured shortly after donation and again 1 year after donation (i.e., happiness with donation, worries about own health; 0 = no difficulties, 4=high difficulties). Also at one year participants completed measures of self-esteem (Rosenberg & Simmons, 1972), feelings that one is a better person as a result of the donation, and concern about the recipient.

Main Results: The types of motives the participants reported were as follows: Exchange-related motives (45%), idealized helping motives (37%), normative motives (26%), positive feeling motives (25%), empathy related motives (18%), experience based motives (8%), and uncategorizable motives (9%). Because relatively few of the motives mentioned were experience-based or uncategorizable, these categories were dropped from further analysis. Female donors reported more empathy (23% vs. 13% Π^2 (1, n=342) = 5.02, $\underline{p}$ < .05) and positive feeling (31% vs. 21% Π^2 (1, n=342) = 3.83, $\underline{p}$ < .05) than male donors. Younger donors were more likely to report exchange related (48% vs. 38% Π^2 (1, n=343) = 3.66, $\underline{p}$ = .056) and idealized motives (41% vs. 31% Π^2 (1, n=343) = 3.67, $\underline{p}$ < .055) than older donors. Protestants were more likely to report normative motives than other religious groups (30% vs. 22% Π^2 (1, n=343) = 2.91, $\underline{p}$ < .088).

A series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted with background characteristics entered in the first block, donor motives entered in the second block, and each of the donation reactions (i.e., ambivalence, physical difficulties) entered individually as dependent variables. After controlling for background characteristics, donors who expressed exchange related and positive feeling motives reported more ambivalence pre-donation ($\square$s = .13 and -.18, respectively; $\underline{p}$s < .05) than those who did not express these motives. After controlling for background characteristics, donors who expressed idealized motives reported more psychological difficulty shortly after donation than those who did not report idealized motives ($\square$ =.18, $\underline{p}$ < .01). Similarly, after controlling for background characteristics, donors who expressed idealized motives reported more psychological difficulty one year after donation than those who did not report idealized motives ($\square$ =.14, $\underline{p}$ < .05). After controlling for background characteristics, donors who expressed empathy related and positive feeling motives were more likely to report feeling like a better person ($\square$s = .12 and .14, respectively; $\underline{p}$s < .05) than those who did not express these motives. Finally, after controlling for background characteristics, donors who expressed empathy related motives reported more concern for the recipient one year after donation than those who did not report empathy related motives ($\square$ =.22, $\underline{p}$ < .001).

Conclusion: Among the background characteristics, gender had the greatest effect on motives reported. Female donors reported more expected positive feelings, empathy related motives, and the desire to help someone than did males. In addition, "Donors who reported exchange motives (weighing costs and benefits) and donors who reported simple (or idealized) helping motives experienced the donation as less positive in terms of higher pre-donation ambivalence and negative post-donation psychological reactions than did remaining donors. Donors who reported positive feeling and empathy motives had the most positive donation reactions in terms of lower ambivalence and feeling like better persons post-donation."

Commentary: Switzer et al. (1991) investigated the underlying motivations of prosocial behavior. Two of these motivations can be interpreted as predecessors of altruism – empathy-related motives and positive feeling motives – identified in other studies (Batson et al., 1989; Ben-Artzi & Mikulincer, 1996). Though these two motives were unrelated to physical and psychological effects for the donors, they both led to feeling like a better person for their sacrifice. Donating bone marrow out of some

abstract ideal without considering the consequences, however, led to more psychological difficulty post donation. Unlike Schwartz (1970) who found that activating social norms related to prosocial behavior led to increased helping, Switzer et al. found that normative motives were unrelated to either the rewards or costs associated with helping. More research is needed in this area to clarify the relationship between normative pressures toward prosocial behavior and the consequences of those pressures.

Correspondence: Galen E. Switzer, 3811 O'Hara Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Unger, L. S. & Thumuluri, L. K. (1997). Trait empathy and continuous helping: The case of voluntarism. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 12(3), 785-800.

Objective: To examine the relationship between trait empathy and volunteering

Design: Cross-sectional survey

Setting: Eight Midwestern cities

Participants: Participants were 372 adults in eight Midwestern cities. The sample was similar to the U.S. population, though males and blacks were somewhat underrepresented. Questionnaires were distributed by undergraduate college students to their friends and relatives. All of the students were given age and gender quotas.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Participants completed the Davis (1983) Interpersonal Reactivity Index which has four subscales – perspective taking, fantasy, empathic concern, and personal distress.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Participants were asked if they had "done volunteer work in the past year without pay for a nonprofit organization." They were then asked to indicate how many hours per month and the types of organizations with which they volunteered. "Participants were categorized as continuous volunteers if they (a) answered yes to the first question, (b) averaged at least one hour per month of volunteering, and (c) indicated that they had worked for certain types of nonprofit organizations." The main dependent variable is a dichotomous variable of whether or not the participant was a continuous volunteer.

Main Results: Sixty percent of the respondents reported that they had done volunteer work in the past year. Structural equation modeling was used to estimate the relationship between the four subscales of the Davis empathy measure (Perspective Taking, Empathic Concern, Personal Distress, and Fantasy) and Status as a continuous volunteer. All subscales of the Davis empathy measure were allowed to intercorrelate. While the model's Π^2 estimate did not indicate a good fit ($\Pi^2(371)$ = 742.56), other statistics better used to asses the goodness of fit of the structural model indicated that, indeed, the hypothesized model fit well (GFI = .92, AGFI = .90, RMSR = .08). Perspective Taking was directly related to volunteerism (($_1$ = .16, t = 1.91).

Empathic Concern was directly related to volunteerism (($_1$ = .17, $\underline{t}$ = 1.92). Personal distress was directly related to volunteerism (($_1$ = .11, $\underline{t}$ = 2.13). However, Fantasy was not significantly related to volunteerism (($_1$ = -.06, $\underline{t}$ = -1.10).

Conclusion: "The results indicate that the Perspective Taking, Empathic Concern, and Personal Distress dimensions of trait empathy positively influence volunteerism. These findings extend the prosocial literature, where the investigation of empathy and altruistic behavior has focused primarily on one-time helping rather than ongoing prosocial behavior."

Commentary: Unger & Thumuluri's (1997) study found important relationships between trait empathy and continuous volunteering. Other research in this bibliography that addresses empathy and volunteering has found equivocal results. Clary & Orenstein (1991) examined both motives and abilities associated with volunteering. They found that volunteers who were not accepted to remain as volunteers had lower levels of Perspective Taking. They also found that Empathic Concern was related to altruistic motivation for seeking volunteer work. Penner & Finkelstein (1998) found that length of service and time spent volunteering were correlated with other-oriented empathy and helpfulness. To extend this line of research it would be good to investigate the interplay of trait empathy with normative pressures like social responsibility (Berkowitz & Lutterman, 1968) and instrumentality and expressiveness (Smith & Nelson, 1975).

Correspondence: Lynnette Unger or Lakshmi Thumuluri, Department of Marketing, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056

Wegner, D. M., Vallacher, R. R., Kiersted, G. W., & Dizadji, D. (1986). Action identification in the emergence of social behavior. Social Cognition, 4(1), 18-38.

Objective: To explore the relationship between the level of ambiguity at which people describe their actions and the consistency of future actions

Design: Laboratory experiment

Setting: Trinity University

Participants: Study 1: Participants consisted of 39 undergraduate students at Trinity University. They received course credit in introductory psychology in exchange for their participation. There were 27 females and 12 males.

Assessment of Predictor Variables: Study 1: Participants were first engaged in a filler task designed to keep their attention for a period of time. Then participants were asked to complete a questionnaire describing their activities. Participants who described their activity at a low level (i.e., "completing a questionnaire") or in terms of the details of the task were designated as Low-level identification participants. Participants who described their activity at a higher level (i.e., "participating in an

experiment") or in terms of the overall nature of the task were designated as absence of low-level identification participants. Next, participants were given questionnaires with items concerning either helping with the experiment (the altruism condition) or about gaining extra credit for participation (the egoistic condition). This was a situational manipulation to focus participants on either altruistic or egoistic explanations for their behavior.

Assessment of Outcome Variables: Study 1: A representative from the psychology department then asked the participants to fill out a questionnaire, supposedly for administrative purposes separate from the experiment. The participants ranked ten psychology activities (i.e., "learning about psychology books in the library", "helping by participating in a study", and "participate in a project for extra credit") on their preference for the activities. The ranking of the altruistic (i.e., "helping by participating in a study") and egoistic choices (i.e., "participate in a project for extra credit") were the outcome variables.

Main Results: Study 1: While all participants demonstrated a preference for getting extra credit among the ranked psychology activities, participants who had been primed to think about altruism and identified their participation at a low level ranked helping higher ($\underline{M}$ = 5.45) than getting extra credit ($\underline{M}$ = 3.80; $\underline{F}$ (1,34) = 5.00, $\underline{p}$ < .05). In a complementary fashion, participants who had been primed to think egotistically and identified their participation at a low level ranked getting extra credit higher ($\underline{M}$ = 7.10) than helping ($\underline{M}$ = 5.36; $\underline{F}$ (1,34) = 5.56, $\underline{p}$ < .05). All effects for higher-level (low-level absent) participants were nonsignificant (all F's < 1.0).

Conclusion: In this experiment, making an altruistic or egoistic choice was dependent on the participant's understanding of what they had just been doing. Participants who had a very general, low-level conception of what they were doing were susceptible to suggestion that the activity was either altruistic or egoistic. "They adopted the new identification of their action, and then went on to choose subsequent action consistent with that identification."

Commentary: Like the Schwartz (1970) study, participants understanding of their actions as altruistic in the current study (Wegner et al., 1986) led to increased willingness to act prosocially. The difference in the two studies in not just a difference in the methods of influencing attitudes and behavior; the current study found that some participants were more susceptible to influence because they had not engaged in complex cognitions about their actions. This has implications for the ability to influence or encourage altruistic behavior. Individuals with low-level, detail-oriented understanding of their tasks can be influenced to think that they have behaved altruistically. They are thereby encouraged to continue behaving altruistically because they wish to maintain consistency of behavior. Individuals who understand their behavior at higher levels are not so easily influenced. It would be interesting to see if this concept of action identification is related to intelligence, cognitive complexity, or level of boredom with the experiment – all of which may be confounding factors.

Correspondence: Daniel M. Wegner, Department of Psychology, University of Virginia, Gilmer Hall, Room 104E, Charlottesville, VA 22903

List of Articles by Subject

Agape
Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1987)
Leak, G. K. (1993)
Mallandain, I., & Davies, M. F. (1994)

Altruistic Motivation
Clary, E. G. & Orenstein, L. (1991)
Kerber, K. W. (1984)
Noonan, A. E., Tennstedt, S. L., & Rebelsky, F. G. (1996)
Omoto, A. M. & Snyder, M. (1995)
Penner, L. A., & Finkelstein, M. A. (1998)
Schütz, A., & Tice, D. M. (1997)
Switzer, G. E., Dew, M. A., Butterworth, V. A., Simmons, R. G., Schimmel, M. (1997)

Behavioral Dependent Variables (i.e., Helping/Emergency Helping/Prosocial Behavior)
Archer, R. L., Diaz-Loving, R., Gollwitzer, P. M., Davis, M. H., & Foushee, H. C. (1981)
Bierhoff, H. W., Klein, R., & Kramp, P. (1991)
Burnstein, E., Crandall, C., & Kitayama, S. (1994)
Carlson, Charlin, & Miller (1988)
Darley, J. M. & Batson, C. D. (1973)
Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986)
Eisenberg, N., Miller, P. A., Schaller, M., Fabes, R. A., Fultz, J. Shell, R. & Shea, C. L.
        (1989)
Farver, J. A. M., & Branstetter, W. H. (1994)
Gergen, K. J., Gergen, M. M., & Meter, K. (1972)
Jackson, L. M. & Esses, V. M. (1997)
Kerber, K. W. (1984)
Senneker, P., & Hendrick, C. (1983)
Staub, E. (1974)

Caregivers
Noonan, A. E., Tennstedt, S. L., & Rebelsky, F. G. (1996)

Cross-Cultural
Burnstein, E., Crandall, C., & Kitayama, S. (1994)
Den Ouden, M. D., & Russell, G. W. (1997)
Johnson, R. C., Danko, G. P., Davill, T. J., Bochner, S., Bowers, J. K., Huang, Y-H,
        Park, J. Y., Pecjak, V., Rahim, A. R. A., & Pennington, D. (1989)
Mohan, J., & Bhatia, S. (1987)
Sharma, V., & Rosha, J. (1992)

Developmental Issues
Berndt, T. J., & Das, R. (1987)
Fabes, Eisenberg, & Miller (1990)
Farver, J. A. M., & Branstetter, W. H. (1994)
Leung, J. J., & Foster, S. F. (1985)
Litvack-Miller, W., McDougall, D., & Romney, D. M. (1997)

Dispositional Empathy

Archer, R. L., Diaz-Loving, R., Gollwitzer, P. M., Davis, M. H., & Foushee, H. C. (1981)

Batson, C. D., Bolen, M. H., Cross, J. A., & Neuringer-Benefiel, H. E. (1986)

Carlo, G., Eisenberg, N., Troyer, D., Switzer, G., & Speer, A. L. (1991)

Clary, E. G. & Orenstein, L. (1991)

Davis, M. H., Luce, C., & Kraus, S. J. (1994)

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Schaller, M., Miller, P, Carlo, G., Poulin, R., Shea, C., & Shell, R. (1991)

Eisenberg, N., Miller, P. A., Schaller, M., Fabes, R. A., Fultz, J. Shell, R. & Shea, C. L. (1989)

Fabes, Eisenberg, & Miller (1990)

Litvack-Miller, W., McDougall, D., & Romney, D. M. (1997)

McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. . (1994)

Penner, L. A., & Finkelstein, M. A. (1998)

Romer, D., Gruder, C. L., & Lizzadro, T. (1986)

Rushton, J. P., Fulker, D. W., Neale, M. C., Nias, D. K. B., & Eysenck, H. J. (1986)

Sibicky, M. E., Schroeder, D. A., & Dovidio, J. F. (1995)

Switzer, G. E., Dew, M. A., Butterworth, V. A., Simmons, R. G., Schimmel, M. (1997)

Unger, L. S. & Thumuluri, L. K. (1997)

Empathy-Altruism Debate

Batson, C. D., Batson, J. G., Todd, R. M., Brummett, B. H., Shaw, L. L. & Aldeguer, C. M. R. (1995a)

Batson, C. D., Duncan, B. D., Ackerman, P, Buckley, T., & Birch, K. (1981)

Batson, C. D., Klein, T. R., Highberger, L., & Shaw, L. L. (1995b)

Batson, C. D., & Weeks, J. L. (1996)

Carlo, G., Eisenberg, N., Troyer, D., Switzer, G., & Speer, A. L. (1991)

Cialdini, R. B., Brown, S. L., Lewis, B. P., Luce, C., & Neurberg, S. L. (1997)

Neuberg, S. L., Cialdini, R. B., Brown, S. L., Luce, C., Sagarin, B. J., & Lewis, B. P. (1997)

Smith, K. D., Keating, J. P., & Stotland, E. (1989)

Gender

Bierhoff, H. W., Klein, R., & Kramp, P. (1991)

Carlo, G., Eisenberg, N., Troyer, D., Switzer, G., & Speer, A. L. (1991)

Den Ouden, M. D., & Russell, G. W. (1997)

Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986)

Fabes, Eisenberg, & Miller (1990)

Gergen, K. J., Gergen, M. M., & Meter, K. (1972)

Johnson, R. C., Danko, G. P., Davill, T. J., Bochner, S., Bowers, J. K., Huang, Y-H, Park, J. Y., Pecjak, V., Rahim, A. R. A., & Pennington, D. (1989)

Leung, J. J., & Foster, S. F. (1985)

Rushton, J. P., Fulker, D. W., Neale, M. C., Nias, D. K. B., & Eysenck, H. J. (1986)

Schenk, J., & Heinisch, R. (1986)

Schütz, A., & Tice, D. M. (1997)

Senneker, P., & Hendrick, C. (1983)

Kin/Reciprocal Altruism and Sociobiology

Ashton, M. C., Paunonen, S. V., Helmes, E., & Jackson, D. N. (1998)

Burnstein, E., Crandall, C., & Kitayama, S. (1994)

Rushton, J. P., Fulker, D. W., Neale, M. C., Nias, D. K. B., & Eysenck, H. J. (1986)

Measurement of Altruism

Rushton, J. P., Chrisjohn, R. D. & Fekken, G. C. (1981)

Sawyer, J. (1966)

Monetary Allocations

Den Ouden, M. D., & Russell, G. W. (1997)

Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., & Lester, S. W. (1996)

Leung, J. J., & Foster, S. F. (1985)

Litvack-Miller, W., McDougall, D., & Romney, D. M. (1997)

Mood and Emotion

Batson, C. D., & Weeks, J. L. (1996)

Ben-Artzi, E., & Mikulincer, M. (1996)

Carlson, Charlin, & Miller (1988)

Eisenberg, N., Miller, P. A., Schaller, M., Fabes, R. A., Fultz, J. Shell, R. & Shea, C. L. (1989)

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Schaller, M., Miller, P, Carlo, G., Poulin, R., Shea, C., & Shell, R. (1991)

Organ, D. W. & Ryan, K. (1995)

Switzer, G. E., Dew, M. A., Butterworth, V. A., Simmons, R. G., Schimmel, M. (1997)

Moral Behavior

Batson, C. D., Batson, J. G., Todd, R. M., Brummett, B. H., Shaw, L. L. & Aldeguer, C. M. R. (1995a)

Batson, C. D., Klein, T. R., Highberger, L., & Shaw, L. L. (1995b)

Schwartz, S.H. (1970)

Organ Donation

Lefcourt, H. M., & Shepherd, R. S. (1995)

Schwartz, S.H. (1970)

Switzer, G. E., Dew, M. A., Butterworth, V. A., Simmons, R. G., Schimmel, M. (1997)

Organizational Behavior

Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., & Lester, S. W. (1996)

Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., & Lester, S. W. (1997)

McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994)

Organ, D. W. & Ryan, K. (1995)

Personality Measures - The Big 5

Axelrod, S. R., Widiger, T. A., Trull, T. J., & Corbitt, E. M. (1997)

Ashton, M. C., Paunonen, S. V., Helmes, E., & Jackson, D. N. (1998)

Bybee, J., Luthar, S., Zigler, E., & Merisca, R. (1997)

Magee, M., & Hojat, M. (1998)

Organ, D. W. & Ryan, K. (1995)

Personality Measures - Eysenck

Chau, L. L., Johnson, R. C., Bowers, J. K., Darvill, T. J., & Danko, G. P. (1990)

Johnson, R. C., Danko, G. P., Davill, T. J., Bochner, S., Bowers, J. K., Huang, Y-H,
      Park, J. Y., Pecjak, V., Rahim, A. R. A., & Pennington, D. (1989)

Mohan, J., & Bhatia, S. (1987)

Rushton, J. P., Fulker, D. W., Neale, M. C., Nias, D. K., & Eysenck, H. J. (1989)

Personality Measures - Other

Bierhoff, H. W., Klein, R., & Kramp, P. (1991)

Magee, M., & Hojat, M. (1998)

McAdams, D. P., Hoffman, B. J., Mansfield, E. D., & Day, R. (1996)

Ribal, J.E. (1963)

Romer, D., Gruder, C. L., & Lizzadro, T. (1986)

Sharma, V., & Rosha, J. (1992)

Smith, B. M. M. & Nelson, L. D. (1975)

Perspective Taking

Davis, M. H., Luce, C., & Kraus, S. J. (1994)

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Schaller, M., Miller, P, Carlo, G., Poulin, R., Shea, C., &
Shell, R. (1991)

Lefcourt, H. M., & Shepherd, R. S. (1995)

Religiosity

Chau, L. L., Johnson, R. C., Bowers, J. K., Darvill, T. J., & Danko, G. P. (1990)

Darley, J. M. & Batson, C. D. (1973)

Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1987)

Jackson, L. M. & Esses, V. M. (1997)

Johnson, R. C., Danko, G. P., Davill, T. J., Bochner, S., Bowers, J. K., Huang, Y-H,
      Park, J. Y., Pecjak, V., Rahim, A. R. A., & Pennington, D. (1989)

Leak, G. K. (1993)

Situational Factors

Archer, R. L., Diaz-Loving, R., Gollwitzer, P. M., Davis, M. H., & Foushee, H. C. (1981)

Burnstein, E., Crandall, C., & Kitayama, S. (1994)

Carlo, G., Eisenberg, N., Troyer, D., Switzer, G., & Speer, A. L. (1991)

Gergen, K. J., Gergen, M. M., & Meter, K. (1972)

McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994)

Romer, D., Gruder, C. L., & Lizzadro, T. (1986)

Staub, E. (1974)

Social Cognition

Bybee, J., Luthar, S., Zigler, E., & Merisca, R. (1997)

Carlson, Charlin, & Miller's (1988)

Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., & Lester, S. W. (1996)

Wegner, D. M., Vallacher, R. R., Kiersted, G. W., & Dizadji, D. (1986)

Social Responsibility

Batson, C. D., Bolen, M. H., Cross, J. A., & Neuringer-Benefiel, H. E. (1986)

Berkowitz, L. & Lutterman, K.G. (1968)

Bierhoff, H. W., Klein, R., & Kramp, P. (1991)

Eisenberg, N., Miller, P. A., Schaller, M., Fabes, R. A., Fultz, J. Shell, R. & Shea, C. L. (1989)

Omoto, A. M. & Snyder, M. (1995)

Penner, L. A., & Finkelstein, M. A. (1998)

Schwartz, S. H. (1970)

Socialization

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Schaller, M., Miller, P, Carlo, G., Poulin, R., Shea, C., & Shell, R. (1991)

Sympathy

Den Ouden, M. D., & Russell, G. W. (1997)

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Schaller, M., Miller, P, Carlo, G., Poulin, R., Shea, C., & Shell, R. (1991)

Eisenberg, N., Miller, P. A., Schaller, M., Fabes, R. A., Fultz, J. Shell, R. & Shea, C. L. (1989)

Volunteerism

Clary, E. G. & Orenstein, L. (1991)

Omoto, A. M. & Snyder, M. (1995)

Penner, L. A., & Finkelstein, M. A. (1998)

Schwartz, S. H. (1970)

Smith, B. M. M. & Nelson, L. D. (1975)

Unger, L. S. & Thumuluri, L. K. (1997)

References

❖ Article included in Annotated Bibliography

Adorno, T. W. Frenkel-Brunswick, E. Levinson, D. J. Sanford, R. N. (1950). The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper.

Allport, G., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 432-433.

Altemeyer, B. (1981). Right-wing authoritarianism. Winnipeg: Univ. of Manitoba Press.

Altemeyer, B. (1988). Enemies of freedom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Altemeyer, R. A. & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest and prejudice. International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 2, 113-133.

❖ Archer, R. L., Diaz-Loving, R., Gollwitzer, P. M., Davis, M. H., & Foushee, H. C. (1981). The role of dispositional empathy and social evaluation in the empathic mediation of helping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 786-790.

Aron, A., Aron, E. N., & Smollan, D. (1992). Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 241-253.

❖ Ashton, M. C., Paunonen, S. V., Helmes, E., & Jackson, D. N. (1998). Kin altruism, reciprocal altruism, and the Big Five personality factors. Evolution & Human Behavior, 19(4), 243-255.

Atkinson, J. W. (1958). (Ed.). Motives in fantasy, action, and society. Princeton: Van Nostrand.

❖ Axelrod, S. R., Widiger, T. A., Trull, T. J., & Corbitt, E. M. (1997). Relations of Five-Factor Model antagonism facets with personality disorder symptomatology. Journal of Personality Assessment, 69(2), 297-313.

Batson, C. D. (1997). Self-other merging and the empathy-altruism hypothesis: Reply to Neuberg et al. (1997). Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73, 517-522.

Batson, C. D., Sager, K., Garst, E., Kang, M., Rubchinsky, K., & Dawson, K. (1997). Is empathy-induced helping due to self-other merging? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73, 495-509.

❖ Batson, C. D., Batson, J. G., Todd, R. M., Brummett, B. H., Shaw, L. L. & Aldeguer, C. M. R. (1995a). Empathy and the collective good: Caring for one of the others in a social dilemma. <u>Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 68</u>(4), 619-631.

❖ Batson, C. D., Bolen, M. H., Cross, J. A., & Neuringer-Benefiel, H. E. (1986). Where is the altruism in the altruistic personality? <u>Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 50</u>(1), 212-220.

❖ Batson, C. D., Duncan, B. D., Ackerman, P, Buckley, T., & Birch, K. (1981). Is empathic emotion a source of altruistic motivation? <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40,</u> 290-302.

❖ Batson, C. D., Klein, T. R., Highberger, L., & Shaw, L. L. (1995b). Immorality from empathy-induced altruism: When compassion and justice conflict. <u>Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 68</u>(6), 1042-1054.

Batson, C. D., O'Quin, K., Fultz, J., Vanderplas, M., & Isen, A. (1983). Influence of self-reported distress and empathy on egoistic versus altruistic motivation to help. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45</u>, 706-718.

Batson, C. D., Sager, K., Garst, E., Kang, M., Rubchinsky, K., & Dawson, K. (1997). Is empathy-induced helping due to self-other merging? <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73</u>, 495-509.

Batson, C. D, & Schoenrade, P. (1991). Measuring religion as quest: Validity concerns. <u>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 30</u>, 416-429.

Batson, C. D. & Shaw, L. L. (1991). Evidence for altruism: Toward a pluralism of prosocial motives. <u>Psychology Inquiry, 2</u>, 107-122.

❖ Batson, C. D., & Weeks, J. L. (1996). Mood effects of unsuccessful helping: Another test of the empathy-altruism hypothesis. <u>Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 22</u>(2), 148-157.

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. <u>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42</u>, 155-162.

❖ Ben-Artzi, E., & Mikulincer, M. (1996). Lay theories of emotion: IV. Reactions to negative and positive emotional episodes. <u>Imagination, Cognition & Personality, 16</u>(1), 89-113.

Berkowitz, L., & Daniels, L. R. (1964). Affecting the salience of the social responsibility norm : Effects of past help on the response to dependency relationships. <u>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 68</u>, 275-281.

❖ Berkowitz, L. & Lutterman, K. G. (1968). The traditional socially responsible personality. <u>Public Opinion Quarterly, 32</u>, 169-185.

❖ Berndt, T. J., & Das, R. (1987). Effects of popularity and friendship on perceptions of the personality and social behavior of peers. Journal of Early Adolescence, 7(4), 429-439.

❖ Bierhoff, H. W., Klein, R., & Kramp, P. (1991). Evidence for the altruistic personality from data on accident research. Journal of Personality, 59(2), 263-280.

Brändstatter, H. (1988). Sechzehn Persönlichkeits-Adjektivskalen (16 PA) als Forschungsinstrument anstelle des 16 PF. Zeitschrift für Experimentelle und Angewandte Psychologie, 35, 370-391.

❖ Burnstein, E., Crandall, C., & Kitayama, S. (1994). Some neo-Darwinian decision rules for altruism: Weighing cues for inclusive fitness as a function of the biological importance of the decision. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 773-789

Buss, A. H. & Plomin, R. (1975). A temperament theory of personality development. New York: Wiley.

Buss, A. H. & Plomin, R. (1984). Temperament: Early developing personality traits. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

❖ Bybee, J., Luthar, S., Zigler, E., & Merisca, R. (1997). The fantasy, ideal, and ought selves: Content, relationships to mental health, and functions. Social Cognition, 15(1), 37-53.

❖ Carlo, G., Eisenberg, N., Troyer, D., Switzer, G., & Speer, A. L. (1991). The altruistic personality: In what contexts is it apparent? Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 61(3), 450-458.

❖ Carlson, M., Charlin, V., & Miller, N. (1988). Positive mood and helping behavior: A test of six hypotheses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 211-229.

Catell, R. B. (1956). A shortened "Basic English" version (Form C) of the 16 PF Questionnaire. Journal of Social Psychology, 44, 257-278.

❖ Chau, L. L., Johnson, R. C., Bowers, J. K., Darvill, T. J., & Danko, G. P. (1990). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity as related to conscience, adjustment, and altruism. Personality & Individual Differences, 11(4), 397-400.

Cheek, J. M., & Buss, A. H. (1981). Shyness and sociability. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 41, 330-339.

Christie, R. & Geis, G. (Eds). (1968). Studies in Machiavellianism. New York: Academic Press.

Cialdini, R. B., Schaller, M., Houlihan, D., Arps, K., Fultz, J., & Beaman, A. L. (1987). Empathy-based helping: Is it selflessly or selfishly motivated? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 749-758.

❖ Cialdini, R. B., Brown, S. L., Lewis, B. P., Luce, C., & Neurberg, S. L. (1997). Reinterpreting the empathy-altruism relationship: When one into one equals oneness. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 73(3), 481-494.

❖ Clary, E. G. & Orenstein, L. (1991). The amount and effectiveness of Help: The relationship of motives and abilities to helping behavior. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17(1), 58-64.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). NEO-PI-R professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI): professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24, 349-354.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). The approval motive. New York: Wiley.

Dalbert, C., Montada, L., & Schmitt, M. (1987). Glaube an eine gerechte Welt als Motiv: Validierungskorrelate zweier Skalen (Belief in a just world as motive: Validity correlates of two scales). Psychologische Beiträge, 29, 596-615.

❖ Darley, J. M. & Batson, C. D. (1973) "From Jerusalem to Jericho": A study of situational and dispositional variables in helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27 100-108.

Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. JSAJ Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 10(4), 85.

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 113-126.

❖ Davis, M. H., Luce, C., & Kraus, S. J., (1994) The heritability of characteristics associated with dispositional empathy. Journal of Personality, 62, 369-391.

deCharms, R., & Rosenbaum, M. E. (1960). Status variables and matching behavior. Journal of Personality, 4, 492-502.

❖ Den Ouden, M. D., & Russell, G. W. (1997). Sympathy and altruism in response to disasters: A Dutch and Canadian comparison. Social Behavior and Personality, 25(3) 241-248.

Derman, D., French, J. W. & Harman, H. H. (1978). Guide to Factor Reference Temperament Scales 1978. Princeton: Educational Testing Service.

❖ Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. Psychological Bulletin, 100, 282-308.

Edwards, A. L. (1954). Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. New York: The Psychological Corporation.

❖ Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Schaller, M., Miller, P, Carlo, G., Poulin, R., Shea, C., & Shell, R. (1991). Personality and socialization correlates of vicarious emotional responding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61, 459-470.

❖ Eisenberg, N., Miller, P. A., Schaller, M., Fabes, R. A., Fultz, J. Shell, R. & Shea, C. L. (1989). The role of sympathy and altruistic personality traits in helping: A reexamination. Journal of Personality, 57(1), 41-67.

Esses, V. M., Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Values, stereotypes, and emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.) Affect, cognition and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception (pp. 137-166). San Diego: Academic Press.

Eysenck, H. J. & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). Manual for the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service.

Eysenck, H. J. & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1978). Manual of Eysenck personality Questionnaire. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Eysenck, S. B. G., Eysenck, H. J., & Barrett, P. (1985). A revised version of the psychoticism scale. Personality and Individual differences, 6, 21-29.

❖ Fabes, RA, Eisenberg, N. & Miller, P. (1990). Maternal correlates of children's vicarious emotional responsiveness. Developmental Psychology, 26, 639-648.

❖ Farver, J. A. M., & Branstetter, W. H. (1994). Preschoolers' prosocial responses to their peers' distress. Developmental Psychology, 30(3), 334-341.

Feagin, J. (1964). Prejudice and religious types: a focused study of Southern Fundamentalists. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 4, 3-13.

Fleming, J. S. & Courtney, B. E. (1984). The dimensionality of self-esteem II: Hierarchical facet model for revised measurement scales. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 404-421.

Francis, L. J. (1989). Measuring attitude toward Christianity during childhood and adolescence. Personality and Individual Differences, 10, 695-698.

Fultz, J., Schaller, M., & Cialdini, R. B. (1988). Empathy, sadness, and distress: Three related but distinct vicarious affective responses to another's suffering. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 14, 312-325.

❖ Gergen, K. J., Gergen, M. M., & Meter, K. (1972). Individual orientations to prosocial behavior. Journal of Social Issues, 8, 105-130.

Gerrard, M. & Gibbons, F. X. (1982). Sexual Experience, sex guilt, and sexual moral reasoning. Journal of Personality, 50, 345-359.

Giles, W. F. & Mossholder, K. W. (1990). Employee reactions to contextual and session components of performance appraisal. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 371-377.

Glass, G. V., McGaw., B., & Smith, M. L. (1981). Meta-analysis in social research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Halberstadt, A. G. (1986). Family socialization of emotional expression and nonverbal communication styles and skills. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 827-836.

Hamilton, W. D. (1964). The genetical evolution of social behavior, Part I and II. Journal of Theoretical Biology, 7, 1-52.

Harter, S. (1982). The perceived competence scale for children. Child Development, 53, 87-97.

Heist, P. & Yonge, G. (1968). Omnibus Personality Inventory manual. New York: The Psychological Corporation.

Hendrick, S., Hendrick, C., Slapion-Foote, M. J., & Foote, F. H. (1985). Gender differences in sexual attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 1630-1642.

❖ Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1987). Love and sex attitudes and religious beliefs. Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology, 5(3), 391-398.

Hightower, A. D., Work, W. C., Cowen, E. L., Lotyczewski, B. S., Spinell, A. P., Guare, J. C., & Rohrbeck, C. A. (1986). The Teacher-Child Rating Scale: A brief objective measure of elementary children's school problem behaviors and competencies. School Psychology Review, 15, 393-409.

Hoffman, M. L. (1975). Developmental synthesis of affect and cognition and its implications for altruistic motivation. Developmental Psychology, 11, 607-622.

Hoffman, M. L. (1977). Empathy, its development and prosocial motivations. In H. E. Howe (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (pp. 169-217). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Howes, C. (1988). Peer interaction of young children. Monographs for the Society of Research in Child Development, 53(1, Serial No. 217).

Hyler, S. E., & Reider, R. O. (1987). PDQ-R: Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire-Revised. New York: New York State Psychiatric Institute.

Ilgen, D. R., Fisher, C. D., & Taylor, M. S. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 349-371.

Jackson, D. (1967). Personality Research Form Manual. Goshen, NY: Research Psychologists Press.

Jackson, D. N. (1974). Personality Research Form Manual, (2nd ed.). Port Huron, MI: Research Psychologists Press.

Jackson, D. N. (1977). Jackson Vocational Interest Survey Manual. London: Research Psychologists Press.

Jackson, D. N. (1984). Personality Research Form Manual (3rd ed.). Port Huron, MI: Research Psychologists Press.

Jackson, D. N. (1994). Jackson Personality Inventory – Revised Manual. Port Huron, MI: Sigma Assessment Systems.

❖ Jackson, L. M. & Esses, V. M. (1997). Of scripture and ascription: the relation between religious fundamentalism and intergroup helping. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23(8) 893-906.

John, D., & Keil, W. (1972). Selbsteinschätzung und Verhaltensbeurteilung (Self-assessment and behavior assessment). Psychologische Rundschau, 23, 10-29.

❖ Johnson, R. C., Danko, G. P., Davill, T. J., Bochner, S., Bowers, J. K., Huang, Y-H, Park, J. Y., Pecjak, V., Rahim, A. R. A., & Pennington, D. (1989). Cross cultural assessment of altruism and its correlates. Personality and Individual Differences, 10, 855-868.

Jones, E. E. & Pittman, T. S. (1982). Toward a general theory of strategic self-presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), Psychological perspectives on the self (pp. 231-263). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Khanna, R., Singh, P., & Rushton, J. P. (1993). Development of the Hindi version of a self-report altruism scale. Personality and Individual Difference, 14, 267-270.

❖ Kerber, K. W. (1984). The perception of non-emergency helping situations: Cost, rewards, and the altruistic personality. Journal of Personality 52, 177-187.

❖ Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., & Lester, S. W. (1996). The effect of other-oriented values on decision making: A test of propositions of a theory of concern for others in organizations. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 68(3), 234-245.

❖ Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., & Lester, S. W. (1997). Beyond helping: Do other-oriented values have broader implications in organizations? Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(1), 160-177.

Kramer, R. M., McClintock, C. G., & Messick, D. M. (1986). Social values and cooperative response to a simulated resource conservation crisis. Journal of Personality, 54, 576-592.

Krampen, G. (1981). IPC-Fragenbogen zu Kontrollüberzeugungen (IPC-questionnaire for measuring locus of control). Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe.

Larsen, R. J., & Diener, E. (1987). Affect intensity as an individual difference characteristic: A review. Journal of Research in Personality, 21, 1-39.

Larsen, R. J., Diener, E., & Cropanzano, R. S. (1987). Cognitive operations associated with individual differences in affect intensity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 767-774.

❖ Leak, G. K. (1993). Relationship between religious orientation and love styles, sexual attitudes, and sexual behaviors. Journal of Psychology & Theology, 21(4), 315-318.

Leary, M. R., (1983). A brief version of the fear of negative evaluation scale. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9, 371-375.

Lee, J. A. (1977) A typology of styles of loving. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3, 173-182.

❖ Lefcourt, H. M., & Shepherd, R. S. (1995). Organ donation, Authoritarianism, and perspective taking humor. Journal of Research in Personality, 29(1), 121-138.

Lerner, M. J. (1980). The belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion. New York: Plenum.

❖ Leung, J. J., & Foster, S. F. (1985). Helping the elderly: A study on altruism in children. Child Study Journal, 15(4), 293-309.

Levenson, H. M. (1972). Distinctions within the concept of internal-external control: Development of a new scale. Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association.

❖ Litvack-Miller, W., McDougall, D., & Romney, D. M. (1997). The structure of empathy during middle childhood and its relationship to prosocial behavior. Genetic, Social, & General Psychology Monographs, 123(3), 303-324.

Loehlin, J. C., & Nichols, R. C. (1976). Heredity, environment, and personality: A study of 850 sets of twins. Austin: University of Texas Press.

❖ Magee, M., & Hojat, M. (1998). Personality profiles of male and female positive role models in medicine. Psychological Reports, 82(2), 547-559.

❖ Mallandain, I., & Davies, M. F. (1994). The colours of love: Personality correlates of love styles. Personality & Individual Differences, 17(4), 557-560.

Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. <u>American Psychologist, 41</u>, 954-969.

Martin, R. A., & Lefcourt, H. M. (1984). The situational humor response questionnaire: A quantitative measure of the sense of humor. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47</u>, 145-155.

Mauger, P. A. & Adkinson, D. R. (1980). <u>Interpersonal Behavior Survey (IBS) Manual</u>. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.

McAdams, D. P. (1985). <u>Power, intimacy, and the life story: Personological identity</u>. New York: Guilford.

McAdams, D. P. (1993). <u>The stories we live by: Personal myths and the making of the self</u>. New York: Morrow.

❖ McAdams, D. P., Hoffman, B. J., Mansfield, E. D., & Day, R. (1996). Themes of agency and communion in significant autobiographical scenes. <u>Journal of Personality, 64</u>(2), 339-377.

McDevitt, S. C. & Carey, W. B. (1978). The measurement of temperament in 3-7-year-old children. <u>Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 19</u>, 245-253.

McGuire, W. J., & Padawer-Singer, A. (1976). Trait salience in the spontaneous self-concept. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33</u>, 743-754.

McNair, D. M., Lorr, M., & Droppleman, L. F. (1971). <u>Profile of mood states</u>. San Diego, CA: Educational and Industrial Testing Service.

❖ McNeely, B. L., & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology, 79</u>, 836-844.

Mehrabian, A. & Epstein, N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. <u>Journal of Personality, 40</u>, 525-543.

❖ Miller, P. A. & Jansen op de Haar, M. A. (1997). Emotional, cognitive, behavioral, and temperament characteristics of high-empathy children. <u>Motivation & Emotion, 21</u>(1), 109-125.

❖ Mohan, J., & Bhatia, S. (1987). Altruistic behaviour of engineers and teachers in relation to their personality. <u>Indian Journal of Applied Psychology, 24</u>(2), 87-90.

Moos, R. H., & Moos, B. S. (1981). <u>Family Environment Scale manual</u>. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychology Press.

Morey, L. C., Waugh, M. H., & Blashfield, K. B., (1985). MMPI scales for DSM-III personality disorders: Their derivation and correlates. <u>Journal of Personality Assessment, 49</u>, 245-251.

❖ Neuberg, S. L., Cialdini, R. B., Brown, S. L., Luce, C., Sagarin, B. J., & Lewis, B. P. (1997). Does empathy lead to anything more than superficial helping? Comment on Batson et al. (1997). Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 73(3), 510-516.

❖ Noonan, A. E., Tennstedt, S. L., & Rebelsky, F. G. (1996). Making the best of it: Themes of meaning among informal caregivers to the elderly. Journal of Aging Studies, 10(4), 313-327.

❖ Omoto A. M., & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 68, 671-687.

❖ Organ, D. M. & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. Personnel Psychology, 48, 775-802.

❖ Penner, L. A., & Finkelstein, M. A. (1998). Dispositional and structural determinants of volunteerism. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 74(2), 525-537.

Penner, L. A., Fritzsche, B. A., Craiger, J. P., & Freifield, T. R. (1995). Measuring the prosocial personality. In J. Butcher & C. D. Spielberger (Eds.), Advances in personality assessment (Vol. 10, pp. 147-163). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ravlin, E.C. & Meglino, B. M. (1987a). Effect of values on perception and decision making: A study of alternative work values measures. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 666-673.

Ravlin, E. C. & Meglino, B. M. (1987b). Issues in work values measurement. In W. C. Federick (Ed.), Research in corporate social performance and Policy, Vol. 9, pp. 158-183. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Reber, A. S. (1995). The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology (2nd ed.). London: Penguin Group.

Rest, J. R. (1979). Development in Judging Moral Issues. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

❖ Ribal, J. E. (1963). Character and meanings of selfishness and altruism. Sociology and Social Research, 47, 311-321.

Rokeach, M. (1973). The Nature of Human Values. New York: Free Press.

❖ Romer, D., Gruder, C. L., & Lizzadro, T. (1986). A person-situation approach to altruistic behavior. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 51(5), 1001-1012.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosenberg, M. & Simmons, R. G. (1972). Black and White Self-Esteem: The Urban School Child. American Sociological Association, Arnold and Caroline Rose Monograph Series. Washington, DC.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80,(1, Whole No. 9).

Rotter, J. B., Seeman, M., & Liverant, S. (1962). Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A major variable in behavior theory. In N.F. Washburne, (Ed.), Decisions, values and groups, Vol. 2. London: Pergamon Press, 1962.

Runge, T. E., Frey, D., Gollwitzer, P. M., Helmreich, R. L., & Spence, J. T., (1981). Masculine (instrumental) and feminine (expressive) traits. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 12, 142-162.

❖ Rushton, J. P. (1984). The altruistic personality: Evidence from laboratory, naturalistic, and self-report perspectives. In Ervin Staub, Daniel Bar-Tal, Jerzy Karylowski & Janusz Reykowski (eds). Development and Maintenance of Prosocial Behavior (pp. 271-290). New York: Plenum.

❖ Rushton, J. P., Chrisjohn, R. D. & Fekken, G. C. (1981). The altruistic personality and the self-report altruism scale. Personality and Individual Differences, 2, 293-302.

❖ Rushton, J. P., Fulker, D. W., Neale, M. C., Nias, D. K., & Eysenck, H. J. (1989). Ageing and the relation of aggression, altruism and assertiveness scales to the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire. Personality & Individual Differences, 10(2), 261-263.

❖ Rushton, J. P., Fulker, D. W., Neale, M. C., Nias, D. K. B., & Eysenk, H. J. (1986). Altruism and Aggression: The heritability of individual differences. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 1192-1198.

Saucier, G. (1994). Mini-Markers: a brief version of Goldberg's unipolar Big-Five personality factors. Journal of Personality Assessment, 63, 506-516.

❖ Sawyer, J. (1966). The altruism scale: a measure of cooperative individualistic and competitive interpersonal orientation. American Journal of Sociology, 71, 407-416.

❖ Schenk, J., & Heinisch, R. (1986). Self-descriptions by means of sex-role scales and personality scales: A critical evaluation of recent masculinity and femininity scales. Personality & Individual Differences, 7(2), 161-168.

Schmitt, M. (1982). Empathie. Kinzepte, Entwicklung, Quantifizierung. (Empathy. Concepts, development, quantification) (Tech. Rep. No. 9). Trier, Germany: University of Trier, Department of Psychology.

Schmölders, G. (1966). Psychologie des Geldes. Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.

❖ Schütz, A., & Tice, D. M. (1997). Associative and competitive indirect self-enhancement in close relationships moderated by trait self-esteem. European Journal of Social Psychology, 27(3), 257-273.

Schwartz, S. H. & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology,53, 550-562 .

Schwartz, S. H. & Fleishman, J. A. (1982). Effects of negative personal norms on helping behavior. Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin,8, 81-86 .

Schwartz, S. H. & Howard, J. A. (1980). Explanations of the moderating effect of responsibility denial on the personal norm behavior relationship. Social Psychology Quarterly,43, 441-446 .

Schwartz, S. H. & Gottlieb, A. (1980). Bystander anonymity and reactions to emergencies. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology,39, 418-430 .

Schwartz, S. H. & Gottlieb, A. (1980). Participation in a bystander intervention experiment and subsequent everyday helping: Ethical considerations. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology,16, 161-171 .

Schwartz, S. H. & Fleishman, J. A. (1978). Personal norms and the mediation of legitimacy effects on helping. Social Psychology,41, 306-315 .

Schwartz, S. H. & Ames, R. E. (1977). Positive and negative referent others as sources of influence: A case of helping. Sociometry,40, 12-21 .

Schwartz, S. H. & David, A. B. (1976). Responsibility and helping in an emergency: Effects of blame, ability and denial of responsibility. Sociometry,39, 406-415 .

Schwartz, S. H. (1975). The justice of need and the activation of humanitarian norms. Journal of Social Issues,31, 111-136 .

Schwartz, S. H. (1974). Awareness of interpersonal consequences, responsibility denial, and volunteering. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 30, 57-63 .

Schwartz, S. H. (1973). Normative explanations of helping behavior: A critique, proposal, and empirical test. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9, 349-364 .

Schwartz, S. H.; Clausen, Geraldine T. (1970). Responsibility, norms, and helping in an emergency. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 16, 299-310 .

Schwartz, S. H. (1968). Words, deeds, and the perception of consequences and responsibility in action situations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10, 232-242.

❖ Schwartz, S.H. (1970). Elicitation of moral obligation and self-sacrificing behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 15, 283-293.

❖ Senneker, P., & Hendrick, C. (1983). Androgyny and helping behavior. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45</u>, 916-925.

❖ Sharma, V., & Rosha, J. (1992). Altruism as a function of self-actualation and locus of control. <u>Psychological Studies, 37</u>(1), 26-30.

  Shepherd, R. S. (1989). <u>What's so funny about death? Sense of humor, mood disturbance and beliefs as predictors of willingness to confront mortality</u>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Waterloo.

  Shostrom, E. (1964). <u>Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). A Test of self-actualization</u>. San Diego, CA: Educational and Industrial testing service.

❖ Sibicky, M. E., Schroeder, D. A., & Dovidio, J. F. (1995). Empathy and helping: Considering the consequences of intervention. <u>Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 16</u>(4), 435-453.

  Simmons, R. G., Schimmel, M. & Butterworth, V. A. (1993). The self-image of unrelated bone marrow donors. <u>Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 34</u>, 285-301.

  Singer, J. L., & Switzer, E. (1980). <u>Mindplay: The creative uses of daydreaming</u>. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

❖ Smith, B. M. M. & Nelson, L. D. (1975). Personality correlates of helping behaviour. <u>Psychological Reports, 37</u>, 307-316.

❖ Smith, K. D., Keating, J. P., & Stotland, E. (1989) Altruism Revisited. The effect of denying feedback on a victim's status to empathic witness. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57</u>, 641-650.

  Spence, J. T. & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). <u>Masculinity and Femininity</u>. Austin, TX: Univ. of Texas Press.

❖ Staub, E. (1974). Helping a distressed person: Social, personality, and stimulus determinants. In L. Berkowitz (ed.) <u>Advances in Experimental Social Psychology</u> (Vol 7, 203-341). New York: Academic Press.

❖ Stevick, R. A., & Addleman, J. A. (1995). Effects of short-term volunteer experience on self-perceptions and prosocial behavior. <u>Journal of Social Psychology, 135</u>(5), 663-665.

  Stotland, E., Matthews, K., Sherman, S. E., Hansson, R. O. & Richardson, B. Z. (1978). <u>Empathy, Fantasy and Helping</u>. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

❖ Strahilevitz, M., & Myers, J. G. (1998). Donations to charity as purchase incentives: How well they work may depend on what you are trying to sell. <u>Journal of Consumer Research, 24</u>(4), 434-446.

❖ Switzer, G. E., Dew, M. A., Butterworth, V. A., Simmons, R. G., Schimmel, M. (1997). Understanding donor's motivations: A study of unrelated bone marrow donors. Social Science & Medicine, 45(1), 137-147.

Taylor, J. A. (1953). A personality scale of manifest anxiety. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48, 285-290.

Temper, D. I. (1970). The construction and validation of a death anxiety scale. Journal of General Psychology, 82, 165-177.

Thauberger, P. C., Cleland, J. F., & Thauberger, E. M. (1979). The avoidance of ontological confrontation of death: a psychometric research scale. Essence, 3(1), 9-12.

Toi, M., & Batson, C. D. (1982). More evidence that empathy is a source of altruistic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 281-292.

Ullrich de Muynck, R., & Ullrich, R. (1978). Soziale Kompetenz: Meßmittel und Grundlagen (Social competence: Measurement instruments and foundations). Munich, Germany: Pfeiffer.

❖ Unger, L. S. & Thumuluri, L. K. (1997). Trait empathy and continuous helping, the case of volunteerism. Journal of Social Behavior & Personality, 12(3), 785-800.

❖ Watson, P. J., Morris, R. J., & Hood, R. W. (1989). Intrinsicness, religious self-love, and narcissism. Journal of Psychology & Christianity, 8(1), 31-37.

❖ Wegner, D. M., Vallacher, R. R., Kiersted, G. W., & Dizadji, D. (1986). Action identification in the emergence of social behavior. Social Cognition, 4(1), 18-38.

Weiner, B. (1980). A cognitive (attribution)-emotion-action model of motivated behavior: An analysis of judgments of help-giving. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 186-200.

Wiggins, J. S., & Broughton, R. (1985). The interpersonal circle: A structural model for the integration of personality research. In R. Hogan & W. H. Jones (Eds.), Perspectives in personality (Vol. 1, pp. 1-47). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Wilson, G. D. & Patterson, J. R. (1968). A new measure of conservatism. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 7, 264-269.

Zuckerman, M., Kolin, E., Price, L., & Zoob, D. (1964). Development of a sensation-seeking scale. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 28, 477-482.