



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago  
Loyola eCommons

Master's Theses

Theses and Dissertations

1962

# The Diplomacy Test of Empathy: A Validation Study

Jack H. Grossman  
*Loyola University Chicago*

## Recommended Citation

Grossman, Jack H., "The Diplomacy Test of Empathy: A Validation Study" (1962). *Master's Theses*. Paper 1760.  
[http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses/1760](http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/1760)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).  
Copyright © 1962 Jack H. Grossman

THE DIPLOMACY TEST OF EMPATHY

A VALIDATION STUDY

by

Jack H. Grossman

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of  
Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Master  
of Arts

August

1962

## LIFE

Jack H. Grossman was born in Warsaw, Poland, January 4, 1934.

He was graduated from Marshall High School, January, 1952 and from Roosevelt University, Chicago, Illinois, August, 1956, with the degree of Bachelor of Science.

From 1956 to 1958 the author was engaged in vocational guidance and counseling, but then entered the field of market research in various capacities. Since March, 1962, he has been associated with the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago as "Chief of Vocational Guidance and Counseling".

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author extends his sincere appreciation to Loyola's Delta Sigma Pi Fraternity for serving as subjects in this study. Particular thanks are due to Mr. Jack Billimak, the fraternity's president who was instrumental in obtaining the group's cooperation.

For the time, energy, and patience which was required in typing this manuscript, the author wishes to offer his appreciation and sincere gratitude to his wife, Joan.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE	1
Definition of empathy and its importance in human relations— Review of related literature— Why this study is being conducted.	
II. PROCEDURE	11
Subjects—Experimental Techniques— Statistical Technique.	
III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	17
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	22
V. BIBLIOGRAPHY	25
VI. COPY OF DIPLOMACY TEST OF EMPATHIC ABILITY	

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Mean Peer Ranks and Equivalent Ranks of Subjects	14
II. Ranks Assigned to Scores on Diplomacy Test	15
III. Number of Leadership Positions Held and Equivalent Ranks.	16
IV. Correlations Between Test Performance and Peer Ranks as Assigned By Low and High Test Scorers.	19

CHAPTER I  
BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

Definition of Empathy and Its Importance

In their daily social interactions some individuals appear to possess certain psychological qualities which contribute greatly to their success in relating to other people. One particular quality known as empathy has been cited by several investigators as the key to effective inter-personal relationships (3, 13, 14, 18, 20).

The concept of empathy, as used by these investigators, has undergone some change through the years. According to Allport (1), the term originally referred to the process of motor mimicry. For example, if one were to observe the facial expressions of an audience witnessing a sports event or listening to a speech he would probably see strains, smiles, grimaces and changes like those of the actual participant/s or entertainer/s. Based on the above definition; namely that empathy is motor mimicry, the audience in this example is being highly empathic. Allport states further that actors and mimics are often good judges of personality because people who can actively imitate facial expressions seem to be better judges of its meaning than those who can not.

The metamorphosis that the term empathy has undergone is reflected in Kerr's definition (15). It is the "ability to put yourself in the other person's position, establish rapport, and anticipate his reactions, feelings and behaviors". This definition does not necessarily exclude motor mimicry

but neither does it include it as an integral part of the conceptual framework. His definition does imply, however, that empathy is the result of sensitive and acute perception of other people in an effort to capture an underlying "feelingtone" which may be present. This sensitivity toward people is gained by observing their speech, facial expression, posture and body movements. It is, in fact, any process which enables an individual to successfully understand another person. According to Schultz (23), this quality can apparently be developed through practice: "The ability can best be achieved by asking yourself the question, what would I do and how would I feel in this particular situation?"

This ability to anticipate others reactions, feelings and behaviors is an essential tool for succeeding in such professions as teaching, group work, selling, public speaking, medicine, counseling and guidance, and any other professional field or area of employment where an individual is functioning in an influential role. We have all seen some teachers, for example, who are technically competent, but so unsure of their relations with others that they attempt to "cover up" by being grim or pedantic or hypercritical. Teachers of this sort usually succeed in generating feelings of boredom, hostility, or tenseness among students. Other teachers, on the other hand, are able to empathize with their students to the point of being able to determine whether they understand or are confused, whether they are receptive, or whether their mood calls for a change of pace and subject matter. In short, successful teachers are able to "sense" whether they are meeting the needs of their students and therefore adjust the program accordingly.



Good speakers are also very sensitive to the mood of their audience, and when they note symptoms of restlessness and boredom they change their position or tell a story, or at least move on to another topic which would arouse greater interest. In observing successful salesmen we note that their sales presentations are directed to the needs of the prospective customers or clients rather than the products or services per se. They are in effect saying "if I were the customer, why would I want the commodity being sold to me at this time?" By being empathic they can anticipate and be ready for any sales resistances they may encounter.

The danger that non-empathic persons face is that of being chronically disappointed in others because they are not aware of how others feel, which is frequently at odds with what they say. Furthermore, a non-empathic individual may also become alienated from his peer group, since he may be viewed as being cold and disinterested in anyone other than himself.

The purpose of this study is to attempt to validate a recently developed test designed to measure this quality known as empathy.

### Review of Related Literature

As is the case with so many personality traits, some efforts have been made to measure this important quality known as empathy. Probably the most commonly used approach has been to require S's to predict the responses of other persons on a rating scale or personality test. Dymond (7) was one of the first to attempt a measure of empathic ability by asking S's to predict the self rating of other people on six traits. These were: 1) self confidence

2)superior-inferior 3)selfish-unselfish 4)friendly-unfriendly 5)leader-follower 6)sense of humor.

Employing these six traits the specific procedure that she used to test two individuals (A and B) for their empathy with each other was as follows:

Individual A

1. A rates himself
2. A rates B as he (A) sees him
3. A rates B as he thinks B would rate himself
4. A rates himself as he thinks B would rate him.

Individual B

1. B rates himself
2. B rates A as he (B) sees him
3. B rates A as he thinks A would rate himself
4. B rates himself as he thinks A would rate him.

Empathic ability as measured by the Dymond scale is defined on the basis of a deviation score. That is, the best empathizer is the individual whose prediction deviates least from the self ratings of the other persons whose responses are being predicted. The only test of validity was a comparison of empathy scores with independent judgments of a person's empathic skill on the basis of TAT protocols. The correlations were satisfactory, although as Dymond states, "hardly evidence on which to state that this is a valid test of empathic ability".

Hastdorf and Bender (12) criticized Dymond's study by pointing out that part of the success an individual may have in predicting another person's response

on a rating scale may be due to projection rather than empathy. In their own study, using the Allport-Vernon Study of Values, they obtained two scores: 1. an empathy score, which was the difference between the prediction of the other's responses and the criterion ( the other's actual test responses), 2. and a projection score, which was the difference between the prediction of the other's responses and the subject's own responses. The difference between the Raw Empathy Score and the Projection Score was termed the "Refined Empathy Score".

Variations of the technique originated by Dymond and perfected by the above-mentioned investigators have also been used to study the characteristics of empathy as well as its functional importance in human relations (6,8,9,11,17). These references are merely cited as background information, but they have not been significant to the development of this thesis. Furthermore, all of these techniques are limited in their usage, since they have not been standardized and cannot be administered to individuals as part of a screening test battery.

A completely different approach to measuring empathic ability was first developed by Kerr in 1947 and revised in 1951 in collaboration with B.J.Speroff (15). This was a group type paper and pencil test consisting of three sections, each measuring a person's ability to anticipate certain typical reactions of defined normative populations. In experimenting with the Empathy Test the authors employed nine different independent criteria. These are described in the test manual in which the experimental results are summarized with the following optimistic statement: "The authors are of the opinion

that the Empathy Test should prove to be useful in test batteries for the selection of managerial personnel, identification of potential leaders, counselors and therapists, graduate students and workers in psychology and social sciences, and salesmen in such fields as insurance, real estate, securities, and automobiles".

Bell and Hall (4) found a positive correlation, significant at the 1% level of confidence, between performance on the Empathy Test and leadership position, as measured by peer ratings. The technique employed by these investigators, which is similar to the one being used in this thesis, was as follows: Groups met once to discuss a problem of interest to all participants. After the discussion they were asked to rank the other individuals in the group in terms of their leadership by indicating their preference for a leader should the group meet again. It is interesting to note also that these investigators found Kerr's and Dymond's tests to be uncorrelated.

Tobalski (25) found Kerr's test to be significantly related with sales records ( $r = .44$ ) and with merit ratings ( $r = .71$ ) of automobile salesmen. In addition, Van Zelst (26), in a study conducted among union leaders, found the Empathy Test to be significantly related to leadership, popularity among associates, and knowledge of leadership principles.

Several unsuccessful attempts at validating the Empathy Test were also cited in the literature. One of these (22) employed a technique which is also similar to that used in this study. Rose, Frankel, and Kerr set out to determine the relationship of empathic ability to the tendency to be chosen in friendship nominations among teen agers. They administered to each of two

junior high school classes the sociometric nominations form, which listed alphabetically all the names of the students in the class. The list was headed: "Check the names of five people you like best and underline the names of five people you like least". A sociometric popularity score was computed by subtracting the number of unfavorable nominations squared from the number of favorable nominations squared. These scores, which were computed for each individual, were then correlated with scores on the Empathy Test and were found not to be statistically significant.

These investigators explained their failure to find a relation between empathic status and sociometric popularity by pointing out that "at this young age level there is perhaps a 'lag' in the effect which empathic maturation exercises upon sociometric status". The authors did not feel that this unsuccessful attempt to validate the test was a function of either the technique or the test per se.

Siegel (24) also found the test to be insensitive in discriminating between "fellows" of the Division of Experimental Psychology and "fellows" of the Division of Clinical and Abnormal Psychology of the American Psychological Association. "Assuming that 'clinicians' are higher on empathy than the experimentalists, the Empathy Test did not reflect this difference."

Bell and Stolper (5) investigated the relationship between scores on the Empathy Test and the ability to estimate group opinion as measured by the Sensitivity to Other Persons Test and found no significant relationship. The most recent study employing Kerr's test was conducted by Patterson (21). He used seven different variables (the Empathy Test being one of them),

presumably tapping the concept of empathy, in a study conducted among rehabilitation counselor trainees. Since the Empathy Test failed to correlate with any of the other variables, the author concluded that the results "raise a serious question as to whether it is in fact a test of empathy".

As a result of further research Kerr recently developed a new test which is designed to achieve the same purpose as the former one, namely to measure empathic ability but, according to the author, has greater reliability and validity. In his manual of instructions Kerr states:

"The Diplomacy Test of Empathy is the third major development in a fourteen year empathy research program which began in 1947 with the publication of the first objective test of empathy. This new test attempts to achieve an optimum balance of validity and reliability from the most valid items and factors of the previously published empathy tests." (16)

Since the Diplomacy Test of Empathy is quite new, no studies employing this test have been published to date. However, the author reports four validation studies in his manual, the results of which are summarized for the benefit of the reader.

1. Objective mean salary increase criterion: in order to obtain a theoretical broad spectrum of empathic ability that would present sufficient range to test the relationship of empathic ability to average annual salary increase, two groups of overlapping but divergent empathic ability were combined. One group consisted of 32 top executives participating in the Summer, 1960 Estes Park, Colorado, Management Seminar of the University of Chicago (Median Diplomacy Test Score 44). The other group consisted of 44 of the 67 personnel of the Barrett-Christie Company, Chicago, a mill supply firm (Median Diplomacy score 39). All cases in each sample of which the salary increase information was available were utilized. The correlation between the Diplomacy Test scores and the average annual salary increases on the combined total of 81 business people is .31. This is an acceptable level of cross-validation against this complexly-determined criterion.

2. Promising foremen contrasted with student engineers: theoretically, a group of foremen sent by employers for a special University of Chicago Industrial Relations Center management training class because of their upgrading potential should score higher than a group of student engineers. A group of 28 student engineers was compared with a class of 15 such foremen. Median score of the former was 42 and of the foremen was 48; the tetrachoric coefficient of correlation is .67 in favor of the foremen.

3. Sales and management personnel contrasted with other business personnel: a first pilot cross-validation of this type between the Barrett-Christie Company's 26 sales personnel and its 39 non-sales personnel yielded a coefficient of .40 in favor of sales personnel. Then, as data from many companies later became available, this study was replicated with 402 sales and management personnel (176 salesmen, 80 sales managers, 117 lower management men, 29 upper management men) and 1096 other non-sales, non-management personnel; the resulting coefficient of .41 suggests a highly stable relationship against this type of criterion.

4. Election to offices of leadership: A total of 102 business people (47 University of Chicago Management Seminararians including 24 at the Estes Park, Colorado, 1960 Summer Conference, and 55 of the entire 67 personnel of the Barrett-Christie Company) supplied individual histories of experience in elective offices as follows. "Write in the number of times you have held each of the following positions in school or other organizations: Treasurer; secretary; board chairman; committee chairman; fund drive chairman; homecoming chairman." In each instance, the number of elective positions held was summated and the 102 summations were plotted against the corresponding Diplomacy Test scores. The resulting coefficient is .47, identical to the magnitude obtained against Criterion 3 above.

"These data strongly suggest that a usefully valid test has been developed." (16)

### Why This Study is Being Conducted

The purpose of the present study was to attempt to validate this test by determining the relationship of empathic ability, as measured by the Diplomacy Test of Empathy, to two different criteria:

1. Empathic status of fraternity brothers who have known each other for at least one year. That is, the relative position (as judged by the S's) each of the fraternity brothers occupies in the group in terms of their ability to understand and feel with other people.

2. Total number of elective positions held by each subject. This criterion is identical to that of four noted above.



## CHAPTER II

### PROCEDURE

#### Subjects

A total of thirty Loyola University undergraduate students, who belong to the Delta Sigma Pi Fraternity, served as subjects for this study. These students ranged in age from 19 to 21 and were chosen as S's on the basis of their having known each other for at least one year. This eligibility criterion was established on the assumption that individuals who have known each other and who have had an opportunity to socialize with each other for this length of time should also be more capable of judging each others empathic abilities in relation to the group.

#### Experimental Technique

An alphabetical listing of all thirty fraternity brothers was printed in advance and distributed to each subject, and the following instructions were read:

"Suppose that you are a personnel man of a company who has just been asked to locate a person to fill a recently created vacancy. The position requires an individual who is extremely sensitive to and aware of the needs of other people. He possesses this sensitivity because he is able to put himself in other people's positions, establish rapport, and, therefore, be able to anticipate their feelings, reactions, and behaviors. In short, the man you are looking for really understands other people because he can feel with them.

Let's assume that your list of applicants are those that are printed before you. They are names of all of you who are participating in this study. Out of the thirty names listed I would like you to indicate the top fifteen people you would consider as possible candidates for the position by placing a plus sign next to each of their names. In other words which fifteen of these names before you would be most qualified for the

position requiring the kind of person I have just described to you ? Be sure to include yourself if you sincerely believe that you meet the qualifications."

To be certain that subjects understood the qualifications of the person who was to fill the hypothetical vacancy, the description was repeated. After subjects completed this part of the test, they were asked to rank the names they had chosen. These were their instructions:

"Now, would you please rank the names you have chosen in the order of your preference. That is, the candidate whom you feel would be most qualified, on the basis of your judgment, would be ranked first and so on until all fifteen candidates are ranked.

Let's assume for the moment that the fifteen people whom you designated as being the most likely candidates for this position are not available to you. Your list of applicants now consist of those names remaining, that is those people whom you originally disqualified. I would like you to rank these names just as you did before; start with one and continue until you have completed ranking each person in the order of their qualifications."

The three step approach in ranking the thirty candidates was used for the following reasons:

1. It was felt that designating the top fifteen candidates with a plus sign would facilitate the task of ranking.
2. It was felt that S's would find it easier and would be more accurate in ranking fifteen people than thirty.

The mean peer rank derived for each individual was the numerical expression of his empathic status in the group.

After the nomination sheets were collected a copy of the Diplomacy Test of Empathic Ability was distributed to each subject. Prior to taking the test they were instructed to indicate in their test booklet the total number of

offices they have held in schools or other organizations since high school. These were to include such positions as chairman of a committee, president, secretary, treasurer, etc. This measure is the other criterion employed in this study and is identical to the "election to offices of leadership" criterion used by Kerr (page 9 number 4).

The directions printed on the test were then read aloud to the group. However, instead of writing their answers on an answer sheet as the directions indicated, they were instructed to write in their test booklet. Although they were encouraged to ask questions regarding any problems that arose during the course of the test, none were raised. Hence, it seems logical to assume that all S's knew what was expected of them.

#### Statistical Technique

Each individual's empathic status, as defined earlier, was computed by first changing the ranks of one to fifteen which were assigned to the negative nominees, to equivalent ranks of sixteen to thirty. A mean peer rank, which ranged from a high of 6.7 to the lowest mean rank of 26.6, was computed for each individual. These were in turn converted to equivalent ranks ranging from one to thirty. These are shown in Table I

The equivalent peer ranks were then correlated with ranks assigned to scores on the Diplomacy Test (Table II) according to the following formula:

$$1 - \frac{\sum D^2}{N(N-1)}$$

In addition, this formula was used to measure the relationship between the number of leadership positions held, which were also converted to ranks (Table III), and performance on the Diplomacy Test.

Table 1  
Mean Peer Ranks and Equivalent Ranks of Subjects

<u>Subjects</u>	<u>Mean*</u> <u>Ranks</u>	<u>Equivalent</u> <u>Peer Ranks</u>
A	14.5	13
B	14.7	14
C	11.4	7
D	20.1	25.5
E	6.7	1
F	16.9	18
G	18.0	21.5
H	13.5	12
I	15.9	15
J	16.6	16
K	7.2	2
L	12.0	9
M	19.7	24
N	8.8	5
O	17.2	19
P	20.6	27
Q	20.1	25.5
R	23.4	29
S	18.0	21.5
T	26.6	30
U	11.8	8
V	10.4	6
W	16.8	17
X	19.3	23
Y	7.7	3.5
Z	12.6	10
A'	7.7	3.5
B'	17.7	20
C'	12.7	11
D'	21.9	28

\*Self ratings were omitted from calculations so that  $N = 29$ .

Table II

## Ranks Assigned to Scores on Diplomacy Test

<u>Subjects</u>	<u>Scores on Diplomacy Test</u>	<u>Equivalent Ranks</u>
A	48	5
B	51	1
C	46	10.5
D	36	27
E	39	25
F	47	8
G	42	20.5
H	46	10.5
I	50	2.5
J	43	19
K	45	12.5
L	44	15.5
M	47	8
N	34	30
O	42	20.5
P	48	5
Q	44	15.5
R	50	2.5
S	35	28.5
T	44	15.5
U	44	15.5
V	47	8
W	40	22.5
X	35	28.5
Y	39	25
Z	44	15.5
A'	39	25
B'	40	22.5
C'	48	5
D'	45	12.5

Table III

## Number of Leadership Positions Held and Equivalent Ranks

<u>Subjects</u>	<u>Number of Leadership Positions Held</u>	<u>Equivalent Rank</u>
A	4	13.5
B	1	26.5
C	1	26.5
D	8	3
E	5	10
F	11	1
G	5	10
H	5	10
I	6	7
J	2	21
K	2	21
L	4	13.5
M	6	7
N	2	21
O	4	13.5
P	2	21
Q	0	29.5
R	6	7
S	2	21
T	0	29.5
U	1	26.5
V	8	3
W	2	21
X	1	26.5
Y	2	21
Z	7	5
A'	4	13.5
B'	8	3
C'	3	16.5
D'	3	16.5

## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The scores on the Diplomacy Test ranged from a high of 51 to a low of 34 with the mean being 43.4. Comparing this mean with the norms provided by Kerr in his manual we find that it falls in the 67th percentile among general business people ( $N = 891$ ), 55th percentile among lower management personnel ( $N = 117$ ), 52nd among salesmen ( $N = 176$ ), 42nd among sales managers ( $N = 80$ ) and 39th percentile among upper management who are earning more than \$10,000 per annum ( $N = 29$ ).

The rank coefficient between the Diplomacy Test of Empathic Ability and equivalent peer ranks was  $-.11$ , indicating a very slight negative relationship. However, since this value is not statistically significant, we cannot, on the basis of this criterion, make any judgments regarding the predictive value of the test.

The objective criterion against which the Diplomacy Test was measured, namely the number of leadership positions held, also proved unsuccessful in yielding a significant correlation. A rank correlation coefficient of  $.13$  was found between the number of leadership positions held (converted to equivalent ranks) and scores on the test.

Anticipating a possible criticism that both peer ranks and number of leadership positions held were measures of popularity, hence not truly legitimate criteria for validation of a test of empathic ability, the criteria were correlated. A rank correlation coefficient of  $.02$  suggests that the peer rankings were quite independent of the number of leadership positions held

since high school. This finding strongly suggests that subjects did not wittingly rank their peers in terms of their relative popularity but rather in terms of their ability to fulfill the requirements of the hypothetical position described earlier. Whether subjects are, in fact, capable of making these judgments is another question which will be discussed later.

As an outgrowth of this study another approach in attempting to validate the Diplomacy Test of Empathic Ability was conceived. Since an empathic person is also a good judge of character he should be more accurate than a non-empathic person in judging his peers' ability to meet the qualifications for the hypothetical position. Hence, if Kerr's test is a valid measure of empathic ability, high scorers should exhibit greater accuracy in their rankings than low scorers. That is, the rank correlations between peer rankings and test scores should be higher for high scorers of the Diplomacy Test than the low scorers, if the test is in fact a valid measure of empathy.

To test this hypothesis rank correlations were computed for eight high and seven low scorers. The results are shown in Table IV. This hypothesis is not supported by the data.

It is interesting to note that the correlations between test scores and peer rankings by the seven low scorers were all negative; three of the negative correlations were significant at the .01 level of confidence. At the same time, however, the rank correlations among high scorers were not consistent. In fact two of the eight subjects' rankings correlated negatively, at the .05 level of confidence, to actual test scores. These findings are not consistent and, to be sure, somewhat equivocal for them to have any meaning.



Table IV

Correlations Between Test Performance and Peer  
Ranks as Assigned by Low and High Test Scorers.

<u>High Scorers and (Rank)</u>	(Test)	<u>Rho</u>
B	(1)	-.12
I	(2.5)	.16
R	(2.5)	.28
A	(5)	.35
P	(5)	.05
C'	(5)	-.36*
F	(8)	.07
M	(8)	-.38*

  

<u>Low Scorers and (Rank)</u>	(Test)	<u>Rho</u>
N	(30)	-.54**
S	(28.5)	-.30
X	(28.5)	-.06
D	(27)	-.57**
E	(25)	-.04
A'	(25)	-.23
Y	(25)	-.46**

\* Significant at .05 level of confidence

\*\* Significant at .01 level of confidence

One obvious fact revealed by this data is that high scorers on the Diplomacy Test are not more accurate than low scorers in ranking their peers in terms of their empathic status as measured by the Diplomacy Test.

### Discussion of Results

The disparity between the results of the present study and the validation tests employed by Kerr raises two questions. 1) Is this test really a useful instrument for measuring empathic ability? 2) Were the criteria employed in this study valid in terms of what we were attempting to measure?

Before castigating the Diplomacy Test perhaps it would be more fruitful to first examine the possible shortcomings of the criteria. The first criterion, namely peer rankings, relied on the ability of the subjects to judge others. This ability is not necessarily developed among all people, as is suggested by this study. In fact this trait not only depends on many factors but is possessed by people in different degrees. Hence, to assume that the thirty subjects participating in this study would be able to rank their peers in terms of their relative ability to meet specific qualifications for a job is not fully justified. If it is true that the subjects did not possess this ability it would at least in part explain the results obtained.

The reason for the lack of correlational significance between number of leadership positions held as defined in this study and scores on the Diplomacy Test is somewhat more difficult to explain, since, this criterion is identical to the one employed by Kerr. Nevertheless, one can perhaps accuse the subjects of not reporting the truth. However, since this criticism could also be directed to Kerr's subjects, it cannot be considered as truly

valid. If there is some other objection to this criterion it is not apparent to the writer. It seems quite clear, therefore, that if this objective criterion is acceptable the Diplomacy Test cannot be considered a valid measure of empathic ability.

When the peer ranks of each subject, as assigned by both high and low scorers on the Diplomacy Test, were correlated with the subjects' ranks on the basis of their test performance, we again find some inconsistencies and have to necessarily raise the question of validity. It would seem that if the Diplomacy Test is valid, high scorers should certainly be more accurate in their ranking ability than low scorers. The results, of course, did not support this hypothesis.

In view of the fact that the ability of low scorers to judge their peers was negatively correlated to their (peers) test results in all the the seven cases cited, it seems quite possible the Diplomacy Test may be a sensitive instrument in selecting non-empathic persons. However, since the evidence is too weak to be tenable, further information than is presented in this study is needed to make a stronger case.

## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Summary

This study was an attempt to validate Kerr's most recent instrument designed to measure empathic ability. The Diplomacy Test of Empathic Ability, according to the author, is a valid measure of an individual's "ability to put himself in the other person's position, establish rapport, and anticipate his reactions, feelings and behavior". He states in his manual that this test has been validated against four different criteria: objective mean salary increase, promising foremen contrasted with student engineers, sales and management personnel contrasted with other business personnel, and election to offices of leadership. On the basis of these validation studies the author claims to have developed a test which "implies an individual's pro-  
fundity of understanding of other's feelings and tastes - and it suggests his potential for interacting diplomatically and tactfully with others".

In the present study a total of thirty male members of a fraternity, who have known each other for at least one year, were used as subjects. The subjects were asked to rate their peers, who were listed on a rating form, in terms of their relative ability to fill a hypothetical position requiring a person who is highly empathic. Specifically, the qualifications were as follows: "an individual who is extremely sensitive to and aware of the needs of other people. He possesses this sensitivity because he is able to put himself in other people's positions, establish rapport and, therefore, be able to anticipate their feelings, reactions, and behaviors. In short, the individual

who is to fill this position really understands other people because he can feel with them."

The mean peer ranks, which were computed for each subject, were then correlated with their ranks on the basis of their test performance. In addition, the test ranks were also correlated with the number of leadership positions the subjects held since high school.

Since neither of the correlations was significant, it was felt that it might be worthwhile to compare the peer rankings of those individuals who scored high on the Diplomacy Test with the rankings of the low scorers. In particular, the peer rankings of these two groups were compared with the actual scores attained by the thirty subjects. The justification for this comparison was that if the test is a valid measure of empathic ability high scorers should be more accurate in estimating the subjects' qualifications for the hypothetical position than low scorers.

The results of this investigation also failed to justify the statement made by Kerr that the Diplomacy Test is a valid measure of empathic ability.

#### Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Research

This attempt to validate the Diplomacy Test was unsuccessful. On the basis of this study it seems logical to conclude that if Kerr's test, is in fact, a discriminating measure of empathic ability, the criteria and techniques employed in this study failed to confirm its validity. Perhaps a more logical conclusion, rather than castigating either the test or this study, is that further research is indicated.

Specifically, it is suggested that additional comparisons of test performance be made between "successful" industrial leaders and "non-successful" industrial workers. Furthermore, similar comparisons between other professional workers e.g. teachers, psychologists, social workers, etc., and students training for these professions should provide more concrete evidence for accepting or rejecting Kerr's Diplomacy Test of Empathic Ability.

In addition, it is suggested that a validation study be conducted in which students' rating of teachers in high schools are compared with teachers' scores on the Diplomacy Test. If this study were designed to yield ratings on most of the factors relating to empathy, tighter control would be exercised so that the researcher would be able to identify specific factors significantly relating to the concept of empathy. For example, one statement in the rating form might be; "teacher really understands my problems and tries to help me", another one might be "teacher is well liked by students." Statements like these, which could be categorized, would result in a more complete validation study of the Diplomacy Test than the one reported in this thesis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allport, G.W. Pattern and Growth in Personality, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, Pp.533-537.
2. Alpert, H., "The relationship of empathy to reading comprehension in selected fields", Dissertation Abstract, 1955, 15, 2093.
3. Bass, Bernard M., Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior, Harper & Brothers, 1960, Pp. 167-172.
4. Bell, G.B. & Hall, H.E., "The relationship between leadership and empathy", J. of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 156-157.
5. Bell, G.B. and Stolper, R., "An attempt at validation of The Empathy Test", J. of Applied Psychology, 1955, 39, 442-443.
6. Chambers, F.M., "Empathy and Scholastic Success", Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1957, 36, 282-284.
7. Dymond, R.F., "A scale for the measurement of Empathic Ability", J. of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 127-133.
8. Foa, U.G., "Empathy or Behavioral Transparency", J. of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 62-66.
9. Force, R.C., "Empathy: tests for selecting personnel to deal with people in trouble", J. of Social Therapy, 1956, 2, 46-50.
10. Guilford, J.P., Personality, New York, McGraw, Hill Book Co., 1959, Pp.147-151.
11. Halpern, H.M., "Predictive empathy and the study of values", J. of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 104.
12. Hastdorf, A.H. & Bender, I.E., "A caution respecting the measurement of empathic ability", J. of Abnormal Psychology, 1952, 47, 574-576.
13. Hawkes, G.R., "Personal values and the empathic response: their inter-relationships", J. of Educational Psychology, 1954, 45, 469-476.
14. Jarrard, L.E., "Empathy: the concept and industrial applications", Personnel Psychology, 1956, 9, 157-167.
15. Kerr, W.A. & Speroff, B.J., "The Measurement of Empathy" (Manual), Chicago: Psychometric Affiliates, 1951.
16. Kerr, W.A., "Diplomacy Test of Empathy, Form "A", (Manual). Chicago: Psychometric Affiliates, 1960.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (CONT.)

17. Lifton, W.M., "The role of empathy and aesthetic sensitivity in counseling", J. of Counseling Psychology, 1958, 5, 267-275.
18. McMurry, R.N., "Empathy: managements greatest need", Advanced Management, 1953, 18 (7), 6-11.
19. Miller, F.G. and Remmers, H.H., "Studies in industrial empathy", Personnel Psychology, 1950, 3, 33-40.
20. Parker, C.A., "Empathy", Personnel Guidance Journal, 1955, 34, 89-93.
21. Patterson, C.H. "A Note On the Construct Validity of the Concept of Empathy", Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1962, 803-807.



DIPLOMACY TEST  
of Empathic Ability

by Willard A. Kerr  
Industrial Relations Center  
University of Chicago

Copyright 1960

PSYCHOMETRIC AFFILIATES

Directions: this is a test of not what you think and feel but of your knowledge of what OTHERS think and feel. In other words, it measures your ability to put yourself in the OTHER PERSON'S POSITION and think and feel as he does. Skip no item but answer as directed. Write only on the Answer Sheet. Please note that each of the first 22 items requires TWO answers, a "Most" answer and a "Least" answer.

Instructions: Place this test over all except the extreme right column of the Answer Sheet. Have arrows meet. Now, in each group of 3 possible answers, "X-out" one M ( most ) and one L (least ).

1. Most and Least annoying to persons aged 25 - 39:
  - a. A person bragging about himself-----
  - b. A salesman trying to force me to buy something-----
  - c. Hearing sarcasm-----
  
2. Most and Least copies printed per issue:
  - d. Popular Mechanics-----
  - e. McCalls-----
  - f. Forbes-----
  
3. Most and Least important in a job to the average man:
  - g. Job security-----
  - h. "Boss"-----
  - i. Fellow employees-----
  
4. Most and Least employees think is the best way of getting ahead where they work:
  - j. Staying long with the company-----
  - k. Being a good politician-----
  - l. Showing energy and willingness to work-----
  
5. Most and Least old employees worried sometime in their lives about:
  - m. Appearance-----
  - n. Alcholism-----
  - o. Work associates-----
  
6. Most and Least men worried earliest in their careers about:
  - A. Job security-----
  - B. Lack of confidence in meeting people--
  - C. Alcholism-----
  
7. Most and Least important in jobs in the opinions of married men:
  - D. Supervisor-----
  - E. Type of work=-----
  - F. Advancement-----

DIPLOMACY TEST

- 2 -

COLUMN TWO

- 3. Most and Least people worry seriously about:
- 9. Most and Least women are interested in that which is:
- 10. Most and least people move to another City to:
- 11. Most and Least used in talk:
- 12. Most and Least people think it cheerful, jovial, joyful:
- 13. Most and Least people who have and who have not been fired agree to be a JUST CAUSE:
- 14. Most and Least old people worried sometime in their lives about:
- 15. Most and Least employees say they are NOW satisfied in their PRESENT JOB with:
- 16. Most and Least employees feel pay to be very important in their jobs when they are aged:
- 17. Most and Least men worried earliest in their careers about:
- 18. Most and Least copies printed per issue:

- G. Neighbors-----
- H. Sex morality-----
- I. Money-----
- J. Expensive-----
- K. Social-----
- L. Governmental-----
- M. Join relatives or friends-----
- N. Look for or accept work-----
- O. Get better housing-----
- P. Nouns-----
- Q. Prepositions-----
- R. Verbs-----
- S. Brown-----
- T. Blue-----
- U. Yellow-----
- V. Being absent from work too much-----
- W. Refusing to do the work assigned-----
- X. Purposely damaging materials or equipment-----
- a. Neighbors-----
- b. Envyng others-----
- c. Religious convictions-----
- d. Pay-----
- e. Freedom to complain or suggest-----
- f. Effect of company on personal happiness-----
- g. 25 - 29-----
- h. 30 - 34-----
- i. 35 - 39-----
- j. Marital difficulties-----
- k. Economic matters-----
- l. Health-----
- m. Coronet-----
- n. Modern Romances-----
- o. Business Week-----

Chicago 510, Illinois  
Box 1625  
Psychometric Affiliates

- 19. Most and Least copies printed per issue:
  - p. Life-----
  - q. Factory Management & Maintenance-----
  - r. Ladies Home Journal-----
  - s. Pay-----
  - t. Fellow employees-----
  - u. Comfortable working conditions-----
  - v. Policemen-----
  - w. Railroad section hands-----
  - x. Musicians-----
- 20. Most and Least women regard as most important in jobs:
  - y. A person with a gushing manner-----
  - z. A person not noticing what I say-----
  - aa. Coaxing me to do something I don't want to do-----
- 21. Most and Least highly intelligent people per occupation:
- 22. Most and Least annoying to persons aged over 40:

Instructions: each of the remaining questions require only ONE answer.

- 23. Asked what they think most important in jobs, workers say:
  - A. Working conditions-----
  - B. Pay-----
  - C. Advancement opportunity-----
  - D. Congenial co-workers-----
  - E. 3 - 5 -----
  - F. 7 - 9 -----
  - G. 11 - 13 -----
  - H. 0 - 3 -----
  - I. 4 - 7 -----
  - J. 8 - 11 -----
  - K. 12 - 15 -----
- 24. Boys and girls are most likely to have front teeth missing when they are aged:
  - L. Stealing things-----
  - M. Being drunk on the job-----
  - N. Refusing to do work assigned-----
  - O. Work associates-----
  - P. Work efficiency-----
  - Q. Health-----
  - R. Morality of self-----
  - S. Too thin or watery-----
  - T. Tastes like fresh orange juice-----
  - U. Just the right sweetness-----
  - V. Not like fresh juice, but still pretty good-----
- 25. Children and parents have most disagreements about food when the children are aged:
- 26. People who have been "fired" and those who have not been "fired" from their jobs disagree most on which reason being a justification for discharge:
- 27. Men aged 35 are most likely to worry about:
- 28. What is the typical reaction to canned orange juice:

COLUMN FOUR

- 29. Most degrees are granted to women in:
  - a. Biology-----
  - b. Architecture-----
  - c. Music-----
  - d. English-----
  
- 30. Which do workers think is the poorest reason for promotion?
  - e. Being very loyal to the company-----
  - f. Having a good family reputation-----
  - g. Studying for self-improvement-----
  - h. Very good-----
  - i. Average-----
  - j. Below average-----
  - k. Very hard-----
  
- 31. Legislators introduce more bills to curb Communists when times are:
  - l. Germans and Poles-----
  - m. French and Poles-----
  - n. Poles and Italians-----
  - o. Germans and Italians-----
  - p. Biology-----
  - q. Chemistry-----
  - r. Pharmacy-----
  - s. Sociology-----
  
- 32. The most numerous groups of foreign-born Americans:
  - t. Being a good talker-----
  - u. Being a hard worker-----
  - v. Wide experience in various kinds of work---
    - w. 72%-----
    - x. 82%-----
    - y. 92%-----
  
- 33. Fewest female college graduates obtain their degrees in:
  - A. Acquisitive-----
  - B. Conventional-----
  - C. Formal-----
  - D. Independent-----
  - E. 9-----
  - F. 7-----
  - G. 5-----
  - H. 3-----
  
- 34. Which is thought by workers to be the BEST reason for promotion?
  - E. 9-----
  - F. 7-----
  - G. 5-----
  - H. 3-----
  
- 35. What per cent of workers think "not being able to do the work" is a good reason for discharge?
  - E. 9-----
  - F. 7-----
  - G. 5-----
  - H. 3-----
  
- 36. The most productive scientists see themselves as:
  - E. 9-----
  - F. 7-----
  - G. 5-----
  - H. 3-----
  
- 37. How many farm families in 10 owned their farms in 1950?
  - E. 9-----
  - F. 7-----
  - G. 5-----
  - H. 3-----

Now, return BOTH papers to the Test Administrator.

Thank you!

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Jack H. Grossman has been read and approved by three members of the Department of Psychology.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the thesis is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts.

February 16, 1968  
Date

Edmund J. Marx  
Signature of Adviser