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Abstract

What will motivate citizens to support efforts to address homelessness? Empathy can have positive effects on attitudes toward others and motivate altruistic behavior. Thus appeals designed to invoke empathy would seemingly be effective in motivating donations and moving policy preferences. Yet recent research by Feldman and colleagues (2014) casts doubt on this easy conclusion. Feldman et al. demonstrate the power of empathy in shaping support for social welfare policies across the political spectrum, demonstrating that individual level differences in empathetic ability affect peoples’ expressions of sympathy and support for government assistance when learning about a person in financial need (Feldman, Huddy, Wronski and Lown, 2014). At the same time, they find that empathetic ability does not always lead to increased sympathy or increased support for social welfare policy. Instead, the context within which one is seeking help matters. Moreover, this research fails to examine the effect that the race of beneficiaries may have on support though scholars have long recognized that attitudes toward groups structure public opinion (Converse 1964).

Here we explore the role that individual empathetic ability, race of beneficiaries, and the inclusion of an explicit empathetic appeal have on willingness to donate to the homeless and support for government efforts to address homelessness. We find substantial effects of empathetic ability on donation behavior and expressions of sympathy, but not on support for government efforts to address homelessness. We find no main effects of race or empathetic appeals on donating behavior, though providing empathetic information increases sympathy and thus may indirectly influence donations and policy. We also uncover interesting heterogeneity in how individuals react to a message about the homeless. We discuss implications for those seeking to generate donations and support for policies to end homelessness.
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According to the National Alliance to End Homelessness’s “State of Homelessness in American 2014” Report, overall homelessness has decreased slightly since 2012 as the country continues to slowly recover from the Great Recession. The national rate of homelessness fell to 19 homeless persons per 10,000 people in the general population. Yet this hides considerable variation in the numbers. In Washington DC, there were 106 homeless persons per 10,000 people, while Mississippi had 8 persons per 10,000 people. While 31 states saw declines between 2012 and 2013, twenty states saw an increase in the number of overall homeless. Clearly this remains a significant problem. For advocates seeking to address this issue, understanding what kinds of messages will resonate with the public is vitally important.

Charitable organizations seeking to help the homeless must persuade would be donors to contribute to the cause. And homeless advocacy organizations must gain public support as they seek to enact policies that will benefit the homeless and have an impact on the problem. What will motivate citizens to support efforts to address homelessness? Conventional wisdom tells us appeals to emotion should aid advocates in their attempts to gain public support. Work in social psychology has shown that empathy can have positive effects on attitudes toward others and motivate altruistic behavior (Batson, Chang, Orr and Rowland, 2002.) Thus appeals designed to invoke empathy would seemingly be effective in motivating donations and moving policy preferences. Advocates appear to share the conventional wisdom that appeals to emotion can be particularly effective. Many charitable organizations use humanizing appeals as part of their messaging strategy in order to elicit sympathy and support for their cause. They will highlight a particular individual story as illustrative of a broader issue or problem, seeing this as a compelling way to make their case. They select a particular example in order to maximize the persuasive appeal of their claim. In the case at hand, an organization might seek to tell the story of a specific homeless individual both to educate the public on the problem and to invoke empathy that will translate into support.

There have been a number of video projects shared on social media in which homeless individuals tell their stories. For example, the Homeless POV Project started by Kevin Adler captures homeless individual's stories to allow them to be shared and to allow them to reconnect with their families and help others learn more about homelessness. Rethink Homelessness – A Central Florida organization dedicated to eradicating homelessness – created videos offering homeless individuals an opportunity to tell their stories to the world. The video they created went
viral, receiving over 5 million YouTube views. Clearly the intention of these efforts is to better the lives of homeless individuals by humanizing them, telling their stories to change attitudes and opinions. This appears to be a clear example of an effort to use humanizing stories to invoke empathy and thus support for the cause. How effective will such an approach be? That likely depends on taking account of other factors research has shown to influence support for liberal social welfare policy.

Factors affecting support for social welfare policy

American public opinion reflects an interesting paradox regarding social welfare policies: while individuals are supportive of some forms of assistance (e.g. social security, disaster relief), they are strictly opposed to others (e.g. welfare). What might explain this? Two important lines of research explore the mechanisms by which this dichotomy might emerge and both suggest that empathy and perceptions of deservingness play key roles.

Recent research has demonstrated the power of empathy in shaping support for social welfare policies across the political spectrum, wherein individual level differences in empathetic ability affect peoples’ expressions of sympathy and support for government assistance when learning about a person in financial need (Feldman, Huddy, Wronski and Lown, 2014). Yet, empathetic ability does not always lead to increased sympathy or increased support for social welfare policy - context within which seeking help matters. Feldman and colleagues find both the type of support and individual ideological predispositions matter: liberals high in empathy are more likely to express sympathy and support for government assistance when the person is framed as needing government assistance whereas conservatives high in empathy express less sympathy and less support for government assistance. The reverse is true when the individual is framed as needing charitable assistance.

Feldman’s work establishes the importance of empathy (specifically empathetic predispositions) in explaining support for social welfare policy but also shows how empathy will not uniformly translate into support for those in need. While their work demonstrates key considerations that influence sympathy and support (ideology and the type of help), it fails to examine the potential effect of the race of the individual in need. Scholars have long recognized that attitudes toward groups structure public opinion (Converse 1964). When group cues are clear and salient, beliefs and feelings about social groups seen as beneficiaries are important components of policy choice (Conover 1988; Nelson and Kinder 1996). In the case of welfare policy, Gilens (1999)
convincingly demonstrates that a lack of support for welfare is related to negative racial stereotypes and media coverage that plays into those stereotypes in its portrayal of undeserving blacks as the main beneficiaries of welfare spending. This line of research suggests that highlighting individual stories in an attempt to invoke empathy may prime more group based thinking. In such cases the effects of an appeal then depend on beliefs and feelings about that group the individual represents.

We draw together these lines of research to explore the effects of empathy and the race of the perceived beneficiaries on individual willingness to help the homeless. One might expect efforts to invoke empathy for homeless individuals would be an effective way to increase support for homeless policy and for charities seeking to address the problem. And many charitable organizations use humanizing appeals in order to elicit sympathy and support for their cause. Yet these lines of research cast doubt on that easy conclusion.

As noted above, work in social psychology has shown that empathy can have positive effects on attitudes toward others and motivate altruistic behavior (Batson, Chang, Orr and Rowland, 2002.) At the same time, some work shows differences in empathetic reactions to in-group and out-group members, with empathetic responses far more likely for in-group members (CITE). Indeed, experimental work by Gubler, Karpowitz, Monson and Romney (2013) which tries to motivate more favorable policy views toward an outgroup (Latino immigrants) through exposure to a video designed to create empathy by humanizing undocumented immigrants found that those who favor their in-group and denigrate the out-group (those high on Ingroup-Centric Beliefs) are less likely to respond with empathy and not likely to adopt more favorable immigration policy views if they experience empathy. They also find that those who do not express empathy in the face of the humanizing treatment more strongly support policies that will harm undocumented immigrants.

This work highlights the importance of group cues and signals another potential barrier to invoking empathy as a path to support.

Like Feldman et al. (2014) we are interested in understanding the role that individual level

---

2 Gross 2008 finds the use of an individual story designed to invoke empathy to enhance a persuasive appeal is not uniformly effective. She finds that an episodic frame featuring the sympathetic story of an individual sentenced under mandatory minimum sentencing in an editorial advocating against the policy was emotionally engaging and that expressions of sympathy were associated with opposition to mandatory minimums (the position advocated being advocated in the persuasive message). However, the conditional effect of using an individual in the persuasive appeal was to dampen the persuasive effect relative to a thematically framed editorial.

3 Our study builds on their work by employing a behavior measure, and looking at charitable help and not just governmental policy prescriptions.
empathetic ability plays in explaining support for addressing homelessness but we extend the work in three important ways: First, we employ a behavioral measure of support for homeless individuals in order to understand what types of messages motivate actual giving behavior and whether the impact of those messages depends on empathetic predispositions. We see this as a harder test than simply expressing support for government policy or charitable efforts to help the homeless. Second, we build in a race manipulation to directly test the potential effects of altering the race of beneficiaries on expressions of sympathy, contributions and policy support. We know from Feldman’s work that expressions of sympathy and support are conditional on ideology, but we do not know whether they are conditional upon the race of the recipient as other literature suggests. We expect the race of the individuals who benefit will matter – with more expressed sympathy and giving when the target recipient is a member of the in-group. Third, we vary the inclusion of an explicit empathetic appeal emphasizing external locus of control (by describing the circumstances of the individual’s homelessness as no fault of their own) to determine the effects of such information. Prior work shows that when welfare recipients are viewed as being responsible for their situation, support for public charity and spending on social welfare programs diminishes (Kluegel & Smith 1986; Skitka & Tetlock 1993). Thus, we expect the explicit empathetic appeal will enhance expressions of sympathy and raise contributions.

Our experimental designs use an online video that featured white or black homeless individuals holding a sign that in the empathy information condition explains the circumstances that led to their homelessness. The video ends with the claim “It’s Time to Rethink Homelessness” and can be understood as representing the kind of video appeal an organization might use to encourage support for addressing the issue of homelessness. The video was modeled after the online video done by ReThink Homelessness (http://www.lifebuzz.com/rethink/). This design allows us to manipulate the individuals portrayed as likely beneficiaries by varying the race of the individuals shown, and to manipulate the presence of empathy inducing information that should make the individuals seem less responsible for their plight. To understand the role of empathetic ability (individual level predisposition) we employ the “Reading the Mind in the Eyes” measure described in more detail below. By providing a better understanding of the types of messages that motivate individuals, as well as the role of individual characteristics in predicting responsiveness, our research has important practical implications for those engaged in strategic messaging.

Measuring Empathetic Ability
Individually vary in their level of empathetic ability – broadly defined as the extent to which they can understand, feel, and appropriately respond to another’s emotional state. In response, psychologists have developed myriad scales to assess empathy (Davis1980; Baron-Cohen & Wheelright 2004), including attitudinal and behavioral measures of one’s ability to accurately read others’ emotions, to feel the same emotion as another person, to help a person in need, and to support humanitarian values (Batson et al 2002; Laurent & Hodges 2008; Barr & Higgins-D’Alessandro 2007; Feldman and Steenbergen 2001). Recently, though, researchers have focused on direct behavioral measures of empathy, instead of self-report scales, in order to get around social desirability pressures inherent in asking individuals about their ability and willingness to feel the pain of others.

Of these, the “Reading the Mind in the Eyes” (MIE) test, developed by Baron-Cohen and colleagues (2001), has been considered the most valuable. The test measures an individual’s ability to correctly label an emotion expressed by someone else. Respondents are shown a picture of a pair of eyes and then asked to choose the emotion being conveyed by the person, choosing from one of four emotion words in a multiple choice format. It has been used primarily to differentiate those with and without Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD), where those with ASD have considerable difficulty on the test and score poorly.

Increasingly, however, the test is used among normal populations (Baker et al 2014; Kidd and Castano 2013; Norenzayan et al. 2012). While this endeavor is still in its early stages, the effects of MIE are impressive. For example, Feldman and colleagues (2015) report that MIE predicts sympathy and support for government assistance for individuals in need among liberals, and charity assistance for those in need among conservatives. Similarly, we employ the MIE scale and assess its relationship to charitable and government support for homeless individuals in need, in order to avoid the social desirability pressures commonly associated with self-reported empathy.

Expectations and Hypotheses

Our design allows us to test for main and interactive effects of our two key experimental variables (the race of the group seen as benefiting and the inclusion of an explicit empathetic appeals designed to enhance sympathy) on expressions of sympathy, giving and policy support. We also examine how these effects may differ based on individual differences in empathetic ability. Because effects related to race of beneficiary imply differences based on whether the beneficiary is a member of the in-group or an out-group, we restrict our analyses to whites only. Based on the extant
In this research we offer the following hypotheses:

**H1. Empathetic Ability Matters.** Individual empathetic ability will influence expressions of sympathy and support; those low in empathetic ability are less likely to feel sympathy and will donate less.

**H2. Beneficiary Race Matters.** White homeless individuals (in-group) will elicit more sympathy and generate more in donations than black homeless individuals (members of out-group). Individuals with higher levels of empathetic ability will be more likely to express that sympathy and will donate more money when they receive the white homeless treatment video than the black homeless treatment video.

**H3. Explicit Empathy Appeal Matters.** An explicit empathetic appeal explaining the reasons for homelessness should increase expressions of sympathy and donations relative to the no information condition. In the no information condition the amount donated should be conditional on the race of the homeless people in the video and individual empathetic ability; the empathetic appeal condition should minimize differences between videos featuring black homeless individuals and white homeless individuals.

**Methodology**

To understand the role race and empathetic appeals might play in explaining support for addressing homelessness we use two online survey experiments. One was run on Mechanical Turk in the Spring of 2015. A second was a nationally representative online survey experiment administered in the Summer of 2015 through GfK and funded by Time-Sharing Experiments in the Social Sciences. Although details of the overall design and specific measures vary somewhat across the two studies (as detailed below), both include measures assessing empathetic ability, the experimental treatment, measures of expressed sympathy for individuals in the video, attributions of responsibility for their homelessness, and support for government efforts to solve the problem of homelessness. Most importantly, in each study participants are provided additional compensation for their participation and offered the opportunity to make a donation to a charity that serves homeless individuals in Washington DC or keep this additional compensation.

---

4 Mechanical Turk provides a validated platform for recruiting diverse subjects in social science experiments (Berinsky et al. 2012; Buhrmeister, Kwang, & Gosling 2011).
5 We are grateful to TESS for their support of this research.
Experimental Treatment

In both studies participants are assigned to one of four treatment conditions in which they watch a video depicting homeless individuals in an urban setting (See Figure 1). In this two by two experimental design we vary: (1) the race of the individuals featured showing either whites or African-Americans and (2) the inclusion of additional empathy inducing information regarding the reason the person is homeless. Each video opens with the following statements appearing sequentially on screen: “Homelessness in the nation’s capital is on the rise” and “We asked homeless people in Washington DC to write down something about themselves” (both appearing over black background) which then fades to “These are their words” (appearing over one of the individuals featured in the video writing a sign). The videos then show four individuals holding signs, while each person says “I am homeless”. 6 We vary the race of the individuals across conditions such that the video shows only whites or only African-Americans to test whether the perceived beneficiaries of homeless support matters. We also vary the information provided on why the individual is homeless – providing either no information beyond the statement that the person is homeless or providing information that suggests responsibility for homelessness does not lie with the individual. Prior work shows support for public charity and spending on social welfare programs diminishes when individuals are seen as responsible for their own problems (Kluegel & Smith 1986; Skitka & Tetlock 1993) so this manipulation allows us to assess the effects of such information. The video was approximately 1 minute long, and ends with the statement “It is Time to Rethink Homelessness.” Though the video makes no specific request for support, it is clearly constructed as the type of video appeal an organization might create to increase awareness of homelessness.

Figure 1 Here

6 The treatments are modeled on a video campaign that asked homeless individuals in Orlando FL to write down something about themselves (http://www.lifebuzz.com/rethink/). We use actors to represent homeless individuals, though their reasons for homelessness represent the stories of actual homeless individuals. There are two male and two female individuals in each video. We matched the individuals on age and gender by race and these paired individuals wore the same clothes. The sign held by a given individual is also held by the matched gender/age individual of the opposite race. The videos show individuals outdoors standing on sidewalks or sitting on a bench in Washington DC during the winter and are depicted in winter clothing. We do not depict people sleeping on the street or suffering from mental illness.
**Study Design**

*Experiment 1: TESS Study Design and Sample.* The TESS experiment was fielded between July 24 and August 4, 2015 and is focused on assessing how race, empathetic predispositions and empathetic appeals influence charitable donations, our behavioral measure of support to end homelessness. We begin the study by assessing participants’ empathetic ability using the Mind-In-The-Eyes measure described above (Baron-Cohen, et al. 2001). Subjects are then assigned to one of the four treatment conditions and view the video. After watching the video, participants are told about Miriam’s Kitchen, a private charity that provides food and other services to homeless individuals in Washington DC. They are told that they can donate some, or all, of the $10 compensation they receive for their participation directly to Miriam’s Kitchen to help chronically homeless individuals. Following the donation question they are asked how much sympathy they felt for the individuals in the video, whether they think the homeless individuals are responsible for their own situation or whether economic factors like the recession are responsible, and how much effort they would like the federal government to devote to solving the problem of poverty, hunger and homelessness.

The TESS experiment was administered by GfK whose online panel is representative of the US population. We recruited only white respondents as our interest was in understanding how reactions might vary based on whether homeless individuals were seen as members of the in-group or of a racial outgroup (i.e. African-Americans). We had a total of 742 qualified completes. Because participants in the study were not required to watch the entire video before they could click to the next question, we have a number of individuals moved to the donation question without receiving the full treatment. For purposes of our analysis, we focus mainly on the 691 respondents who saw enough of the video to get a partial empathy information treatment. Specifically, we include

---

7 This test measures respondents’ ability to correctly label an emotion expressed by someone else, by showing them a picture of a pair of eyes and asking them to choose, from four emotion words, the emotion being conveyed by the person. Research by Feldman and colleagues (2014) has shown that the variance of this measure is evenly distributed across the ideological spectrum, and consistently predicts preferences for government social welfare policies.

8 GfK uses probability based recruitment (RDD and address based) to obtain a panel that is representative of the population of the United States. Individuals recruited into the panel without internet access are provided a web-enabled device and free internet. Thus, our TESS experiment is run with a high quality, sample representative of the national population. Qualification rate for survey is 76%.

9 Randomization checks show our treatment conditions are balanced on empathic ability, partisan identification, ideology, attendance at religious services, age, education, gender, marital status, home
respondents who saw 26 seconds or more of the video (this means they viewed at a minimum the first individual homeless person holding a sign). The treatment accurately mimics how such a campaign appeal might work, individuals can and do avoid the appeals they prefer not to receive. However, since we are interested in understanding the effects of race and empathy information, we restrict our analyses to individuals who view enough to get minimally treated with both manipulations. Demographic characteristics for the samples are reported in Table 1.

Table 1 About Here

Experiment 2: MTurk Study Design and Sample. For our MTurk study, we used a two wave panel design where the experiment was embedded in wave 2 of the survey. The first wave of the survey, a short 2-3 minute questionnaire asked respondents for their ideology, party identification, attitudes toward various groups (including racial groups and the homeless) and racial predispositions. The survey was fielded between March 24th and March 29th with more than 80% of the responses coming the first three days. 1525 people completed the wave 1 survey. Using a two wave design allowed us to measure key predispositions outside the experimental treatment context. In addition, because Mechanical Turk samples tend to over-represent Democrats, conducting wave 1 sample allowed us to oversample Republicans when inviting people to participate in wave 2. Specifically, we invited all respondents from wave 1 who identified as Republican or Independent as well as a random sample of those who identified as Democrat to participate in wave 2 (for a total of 650 invitations). This allowed us to obtain a sample for the experiment that better represents the party breakdown in the country. Wave 2 was fielded for four days from April 3rd through April 6th; providing a minimum of five days between survey waves. A total of 537 individuals completed both waves.

The wave 2 survey began by assessing respondents’ empathetic ability using the Mind-In-The-Eyes measure. They were then assigned to one of the four treatment conditions. Following the treatment video, respondents were asked about their emotional responses to the individuals in the video, attributions of responsibility for homelessness, and policy views. In the MTurk study they ownership, household income, region, volunteering and charitable donations. On the question of whether participants approve or disapprove of how Obama is handling race relations, there is a slight imbalance (F=2.13, p=.096) with those in the black empathy condition being slightly more likely to approve of how handling race relations than those in the other three conditions.
were given the opportunity to make a $1 donation to a charity that serves homeless individuals in Washington DC or keep this additional $1 for participating in the study. Lastly, respondents were given a series of questions measuring their views on how deserving homeless individuals are of government and charitable help, individualism values, support for limited government and demographics.

Our final MTurk sample includes 537 individuals who completed both waves of the survey, however our analysis focuses on the 425 white participants. The MTurk sample is younger, more male, less religious, more likely to report having donated money to a charity in the past year and has less household income than a nationally representative sample. Fifty five percent of the sample has a household income of $50,000 or less. Despite over-sampling Republicans from wave 1, which did help better approximate the national party breakdown relative to many MTurk studies, our realized sample is still less likely to identify as Republican when compared with a national sample of white Americans. (See Table 1 for Sample Demographic Characteristics).

Key differences between the TESS and MTurk studies include additional measures of personal predispositions (individualism, support for limited government, racial resentment, homeless and social welfare policy preferences, and perceived deservingness of homeless individuals for government or charitable assistance), the fact that respondents in the MTurk study had to view the full video before moving on in the survey but TESS respondents could click forward before viewing the complete video, the nature of the donation variable ($10 in TESS versus $1 in MTurk, where TESS respondents chose a variable amount to donate, while MTurk respondents made a dichotomous donation choice), and a difference in the specific eyes used for the Mind-In-The-Eyes measure as noted below. The final difference is the ordering of the donation question relative to the sympathy and government policy question: in the TESS study the donation question comes first; in the MTurk study the donation question follows the sympathy and policy questions.

---

10 Eighty percent of the full sample identified their race as white. A randomization check in the whites only sample shows that our treatment conditions are balanced on family income, partisan identification, ideology, racial resentment, support for limited government and feelings toward homeless people. We have slight imbalances on gender ($F=2.47$, $p=.06$) and on the black feeling thermometer ($F=2.59$, $p=.05$). In the case of gender we have more women than men in the black information condition compared to the black no information condition; in the case of the black feeling thermometer those in the white no information condition feel less warmly toward blacks than those in the white information condition. In full sample the latter is not significant imbalance though the former is.
Measures

Our key dependent variables include emotional responses to the homeless individuals depicted in the videos, support for government efforts to address homelessness, and donations to a charitable organization that serves the homeless. The specific emotional response, sympathy for the homeless is measured by asking respondents “How much sympathy do you feel for the individuals in the video?” on a 5-point scale from “no sympathy at all” to “a great deal of sympathy.” Sympathy is coded 0-1 where higher values reflect more sympathy, and respondents generally expressed sympathy for the homeless individuals in the video (among TESS respondents 60% reported quite a bit of sympathy or a great deal of sympathy; among MTurk respondents 75% said they had quite a bit of sympathy or a great deal of sympathy).12

To assess government policy preferences toward the homeless we ask participants: “How much effort would you like the federal government to devote to solving the problem of poverty, hunger, and homelessness?” on a 4-point scale coded from 0=only a little effort to 1=a great deal of effort.13

Finally, we examine willingness to donate to a homeless charity, using a behavioral measure that allows respondents to spend real money that they could have otherwise received.14 After reading a description of Miriam’s Kitchen, a private charity that provides food and other services to homeless individuals in Washington DC, participants were reminded that additional study participation funding had been made available to them, and offered the opportunity to donate this additional compensation to Miriam’s Kitchen.15 In the TESS study, where respondents could

---

11 In the MTurk study we also ask respondents whether they felt anger or anxiety toward the homeless individuals in the video, but these emotional responses are not examined.
12 TESS mean .68, standard deviation .26; MTurk mean .75, standard deviation .23.
13 TESS mean .53, standard deviation .31; Mturk mean .53, standard deviation .34. In the Mturk study we have an additional policy question that asks: Do you think it is a good or bad idea for the government to cut back substantially on social welfare programs and encourage private charities to take care of Americans in need of assistance, like homeless individuals?” (Response options: good idea, bad idea).
14 This is modeled upon the dictator game (Camerer 2003), which has been used previously to assess the effects of empathy on generosity (Zak, Stanton & Ahmadi 2007).
15 Text read as follows: Homeless individuals receive assistance from private charities across the country. These charities provide them with food, shelter and other services. Miriam’s Kitchen is a private charity that provides food and other services for homeless individuals in the Washington DC area. Miriam’s Kitchen strives to end chronic homelessness. They provide healthy meals and social services while working to connect homeless individuals to permanent supportive housing based on
donate anywhere from $0 to $10 (in one-dollar increments) of the additional $10 they are given, 71% of participants donated something and 50% donated the full amount, with a mean donation of $5.98 (sd = $4.42). In the MTurk study, where respondents were given the dichotomous choice to donate or keep an additional $1 in study compensation, just over 40% chose to donate their $1 bonus to Miriam’s Kitchen. These two dependent variables allow us to contrast support for government policy versus charitable assistance in helping the homeless, accounting for respondents’ dispositions towards government or religious charity intervention in social welfare cases.

Our other key independent variable, individuals’ empathetic predispositions, was measured using the Mind in the Eyes scale (described earlier). Respondents identified the emotions for 10 pairs of eyes, creating a scale of empathetic ability based upon the number correctly identified emotions (recoded 0-1, where higher values indicate greater empathy). Each study also included measures of ideology and party identification, using the standard 7-point scales; demographic characteristics; and in MTurk study we have a measure of racial resentment from the wave 1 survey.

the individuals’ needs. More information about this charity can be found at http://www.miriamskitchen.org/.
Second graph read as follows in TESS: At the start of this study, you were informed that you will receive $10 for your participation. However, if you wish, you can donate some, or all, of that amount directly to Miriam’s Kitchen. These funds will go directly towards helping chronically homeless individuals. In the box below please indicate the amount of your $10 participation fee, in whole dollars, that you would like to donate to Miriam’s Kitchen.
In MTURK second graph read as follows: Additional funding has been made available to provide a bonus to participants in this study. You will receive an additional $1 for your participation. However, if you wish, you can donate that amount to Miriam’s Kitchen. These funds will go directly towards helping chronically homeless individuals. Would you like to donate this $1?
16 TESS Cronbach’s alpha = 0.29; MTurk Cronbach’s alpha = 0.22. These lower reliability coefficients are expected with a reduced number of items relative to the validated 36-item full and 18-item short MIE scales. However the reduction was necessary due to TESS’ length constraints. In a follow-up study using the white Mturk respondents, we assessed empathetic ability using the standard 18-item MIE short measure to validate our modified 10-item MIE scale. Of the 425 white respondents who took the original study, 310 completed this follow-up survey. The reliability of the 18-item scale (α = 0.566) was consistent with MIE measures in similar studies (see Feldman, et al. 2015). Further, the correlation between MIE versions was 0.46 (p<.01), and both produced comparable correlations with other variables of interest including: party id, ideology, racial resentment, individualism, and our dependent variables. Thus, the low reliability of the 10-item measure is attributed to the length and difficulty of the shorter scale, introducing more noise through increased respondent guessing. Because our original short scale focused on more difficult items, we revised the items used to assess empathetic ability in the TESS study, substituting three easier items. In Mturk study 47% read 7 or more of the emotions correctly (mean=0.62, sd=0.16); in the TESS study 60% read 7 or more of the emotions correctly (mean=0.67, sd=0.17).
that can serve as an indicator of racial predispositions (coded 0-1, where higher values represent greater racial resentment, mean=0.55, sd=0.28).

**Manipulation Check**

To discern whether our empathetic appeal treatment – providing additional information on signs held by the homeless individuals depicted - worked as expected, we examined whether individuals in the empathy information conditions compared to the no information conditions were less likely to say that the individuals in the video as responsible for their own homelessness and more likely to say that economic factors like the recession were responsible than individuals. In the TESS study, we assessed this with a single item “When discussing homelessness in America, some people think that homeless individuals are completely responsible for their own situation, while others think that economic factors, like the recession, are completely responsible. Thinking about the individuals in the video, please rate on a scale from 1 to 7 whether you think the homeless individuals are responsible for their own situations or whether you think economic factors are responsible for their situations?” Those in the empathy information conditions are significantly more likely to say economic factors are responsible (t=4.28, p<.01). In MTurk study, we assessed these attributions separately using two questions: 1) how responsible did respondents think the individuals in the video were for their own homelessness, and 2) how responsible they think were economic factors like the recession. Those who get the empathetic information treatments were significantly less likely to say individuals were responsible (t=4.12, p<.01) and significantly more likely to say economic factors were responsible (t=3.82, p<.01).

**Results**

**Main Effects and Intent to Treat**

We begin by examining the main effects of the experimental treatments, focusing solely on the nationally-representative TESS study. We expect the race of the homeless beneficiaries and the inclusion of empathetic appeal information in the video treatments would affect donation behavior, with greater willingness to donate more money in the white conditions and in the empathetic information conditions. At first glance, the results show significant effects of race and empathetic information on donation behavior in the aggregate, with respondents, on average, donating more in the Whites No Information condition than in the Blacks No Information condition (left set of columns in Figure 2). However, this pattern reflects heterogeneity among respondents based upon their exposure to the treatment video. While only a few respondents did not receive the full
treatment (N=51), their donations were highly influenced by the brief exposures they received. Those who skipped ahead without watching the full video, receiving either no treatment or a glimpse of the race treatment without any empathy information, exhibited donation behavior conditional on the race of the homeless individuals (see middle set of columns in Figure 2). Contrastingly, no significant effects of race or empathetic information on homeless charity donation emerge among treated respondents (see right set of columns in Figure 2). However, the amount of time an individual spends watching the video treatments influences the donation amount (see Figure 3). In the White and empathy conditions, respondents donate more than those in the Black no information condition when only seeing the first few seconds of the video. When viewing the entire treatment video, the donation amounts converge across conditions, suggesting that heuristic and systematic processing of the homeless video leads to heterogeneous behavioral outcomes across conditions.

[Figures 2 & 3]

**Differential Influences by Ideology**

---

17 Individuals skipping the video before treatments were distributed evenly across conditions, and reflected Independents and Moderates who are not typically engaged in politics.

18 We see a significant effect of race when we restrict our analysis to those who view enough of the video to only see a race prime but do not get an information treatment (i.e. individuals viewing between 11 and 21 seconds of the video before skipping forward). Respondents in this small group (N=18), who see one of the individuals in the video sitting on a bench beginning to write a sign as part of the background to the opening of the video, donate on average $4.40 more to whites than blacks (t=2.16, p<.05). This difference in donating behavior occurs despite exhibiting no differences in expressed sympathy. Such large differences may be related to the kind of individuals who prefer to turn a blind eye to the homeless and thus don’t continue to watch the video appeal. Perhaps individuals who get only a brief glimpse are less likely to engage in more controlled processing of the message. As such, unconscious biases and stereotypes may be what produce this in-group favoritism in their donating behavior. To the degree this “opting-out” behavior replicates how many individuals process the homeless they encounter in real life (not learning more about their stories, but seeing just their race and their homelessness), it suggests a great deal of in-group favoritism. Another interpretation is that getting people to see additional context about homelessness helps diminish their otherwise potentially large in-group biases. This variation in donation behavior among those who opt out may explain why we find a marginally significant effect of race on donating behavior in the full TESS sample (on average $0.55 more donated to whites than blacks, t=1.96, p<.10; there is no effect of empathy frame in full sample). Of course with only 18 individuals we cannot make much of this result, but it reveals a fruitful place for further investigation.
The initial null effects of the racial and empathetic information conditions across all treated respondents masks key differences in donation behavior conditioned by ideological predispositions. We examine the effect of the race and empathetic information conditions on charitable donating separately for self-identified liberals (those who say they are slightly liberal, liberal or extremely liberal, N=156) and self-identified conservatives (those who say they are slightly conservative, conservative or extremely conservative, N=288) in our TESS study (Figure 4). Liberals are more sensitive to the race of the homeless individuals in the video, but not as conventional wisdom would suggest. They donate significantly more when viewing white homeless individuals than when viewing black homeless individuals, all else equal ($6.97 compared to $5.38, t=2.29, p<.05). This effect holds when controlling for empathetic ability and expressed sympathy. In contrast, empathetic appeals matter more for conservatives’ donation behavior. Regardless of the race of the homeless, conservatives typically donated more money when told that these individuals were homeless due to circumstances beyond their control ($6.47 donated in the information conditions compared to $5.67 donated in the no information conditions, t=−1.57, p=0.12). However, this pattern disappears when including empathetic ability or sympathy in the model.

But do individuals respond differently across treatments when making a decision about a donation to private charity than when thinking about supporting government policy? Here we again see no main effects of our video manipulations when aggregated across ideology (Figure 5). Priming individuals to think more about white or black homeless individuals does not influence levels of support for government efforts; nor does providing information that provides respondents with situational reasons for homelessness. Liberals are, as we would expect, more supportive of government efforts than conservatives (higher bars for liberals than conservatives). Thus, while liberals are hesitant to donate a large portion of their endowment to homelessness when seeing black

---

19 Collapsing across empathy information, we find a main effect of the race treatment (t=2.30, p<.05). We see the same pattern, though effect of race not significant, when we look only among those who identify as democrats.

20 When we look only among those who identify as Republican we do not see the same pattern.

21 Only hint of difference is an effect of empathy between the two white race conditions – getting empathy information makes more willing to say should help than not getting empathy information when viewing whites (p=.05).

22 Not surprisingly, there is a significant main effect of both ideology and party identity on preferences for whether the government should do more to address problems of poverty, hunger and homelessness.
homeless individuals, they are quite supportive of government intervention to solve homelessness when African-American homeless are primed.

Expressed Sympathy, Empathetic Ability, and the Role of Predispositions

Emotional states and abilities, including sympathy and empathy, should play also a critical role in individuals’ choices to donate to homeless charity. In regards to sympathy towards the homeless, we find significant main effects of the empathetic information conditions (Figure 6, left set of columns). People are more sympathetic when provided with reasons for homelessness that draw attention to situational factors (breast cancer, lost factory job, bank foreclosure, and domestic abuse). Collapsing across empathy conditions, expressed sympathy differences are significant ($t=3.24, p<.01$)\(^{23}\) By contrast, there is no main effect of race on sympathy – people are no more likely to express sympathy for homeless individuals who share their racial identity than those who do not. While empathetic appeals seem to matter more when it come to sympathy for homeless individuals, these overall treatment effects are conditioned by individuals’ ideological orientations. [Figure 6]

Specifically, expressions of sympathy among liberals are not influenced by the videos (Figure 6), indicating that liberals’ lower levels of charitable giving when viewing black homeless individuals cannot be attributed to decreased sympathy after viewing members of an out-group. While expressed sympathy inclines individuals generally to donate, when accounting for expressions of sympathy, liberals give less to members of an out-group in need.\(^{24}\) Contrastingly, learning the stories of the homeless individuals in the video evokes sympathy for them among conservatives; whereas liberals are sympathetic to homeless individuals in the video irrespective of the information given to them. Among conservatives there is a main treatment effect of empathy information ($p<.05$) and a marginal treatment effect of race ($p<.10$) on expressed sympathy.

Given sympathy’s prevalence in response to the video treatments, it may serve as the psychological mechanism that links exposure to individuals in need to donation behavior. In this scenario, expressed sympathy, stemming from the empathetic information treatments, makes

---

\(^{23}\) The information conditions are both significantly different from the black no information condition ($p<.01$). However, the white no information condition does elicit more sympathy than the black no information condition such that the difference between it and the white information condition is only marginally significant ($p<.10$); and the difference between it and the black information condition is n.s ($p=.15$).

\(^{24}\) When examining liberals in the MTurk study, we do not find this pattern. In fact, MTurk liberals were more likely to donate after seeing African-Americans though the difference is not significant.
homeless individuals seem more deserving, thus translating into increased donations. We find this exact pattern of direct and indirect effects of experimental treatment on donating behavior via expressed sympathy (Table 2). First, sympathy has a substantive and statistically significant direct effect on donating behavior ($B=6.03, p<.01$). Next, both empathetic information treatments have significant direct effects on expressed sympathy, with indirect effects on amount donated via sympathy. We again find heterogeneity across ideology, consistent with the main effects described above. For liberals, there is a higher amount of expressed sympathy across all conditions, and no indirect effects of the treatments on donations via sympathy. Interestingly, there is a significant main effect of the White No Information condition ($B=1.88, p<.05$), suggesting that in-group cues increase liberals’ personal donation amounts independent of any sympathy mechanism.

Conservatives experience significantly increased sympathy in the empathetic information conditions (relative to the Blacks No Information condition), which in turn leads to increased donation amounts. For them, empathetic information about homeless individuals only increase donations via their sympathy towards these homeless people in need.

[Table 2]

Finally, building on prior work on empathy and social welfare preferences (see Feldman et al 2014), we anticipate that respondents’ innate empathetic abilities condition their donation behavior in the presence of the various treatments. Empathetic Ability, as measured by the Mind-in-the-Eyes test, has a significant effect on donation behavior (Table 3, column 1), even when controlling for the experimental treatments. Those high in empathetic ability donate far more than those low in empathetic ability. At the same time, the effect of empathetic ability on donating behavior is not uniform across conditions (Table 3, column 2 and Figure 7). Among those who are not viewing an in-group member or receiving an empathetic information appeal, empathetic ability effects are diminished. Or, put another way, empathetic information frames increase the effect of empathetic ability on donations relative to the black no information condition.

[Table 3 & Figure 7]

While empathetic ability has a straightforward effect on motivating donation decisions, its influence on attitudes toward government effort to help the homeless are sensitive to individuals’ ideological beliefs (Figure 8). Similar to prior empathy research, we find that liberals, aggregated

---

25 Modeling donation behavior separately by frame, there is no significant difference in donating behavior across empathetic ability among those in the black no information condition; though the effect is significant in each of the other conditions.
across all treatments, with higher levels of empathetic ability are more supportive of government assistance in solving homelessness. In contrast, conservatives, again aggregated across all treatments, with greater empathetic ability are increasingly opposed to government involvement in solving homelessness. Unlike its effects on government intervention, empathetic ability predicts expressions of sympathy, as we would predict (see Table 3, column 3). Controlling for empathetic ability we still see main effects of the empathetic information treatments on expressed sympathy. Those high in empathetic ability and those who receive an empathetic information appeal are significantly more likely to report feeling sympathy for the homeless individuals in the video.

We find a significant effect of Mind in the Eyes on donations in the MTurk study (Table 3, columns 4-6). Yet, in this data, another important predisposition relevant to our experimental manipulations – racial resentment – has strong and statistically significant effects across our key dependent variables, suggesting that racial predispositions also play a key role in individuals’ attitudinal and behavioral reactions to homelessness. In sum, donation behavior is significantly influenced by expressed sympathy and empathetic ability – those with more empathetic ability and who express more sympathy donate more. As such, any effect of empathetic information on donating behavior is mediated by expressed sympathy, whereas only empathetic ability and ideological orientations affect preferences for government support to help the homeless.

Discussion

In sum, we have uncovered a few key findings. First, predispositions matter. One’s innate ability to empathize with others plays a key role in donation decisions and expressions of sympathy, providing support for H1. Those who are predisposed to empathize are significantly more likely to donate. Though we do see some hints that viewing a member of your in-group or getting an empathetic appeal enhances the difference in donation between those inclined to empathize and those not inclined to empathize.

Second, while we find no main effects of beneficiary race or empathetic information appeals on donating behavior, the results in the full sample mask interesting heterogeneity in the reactions of ideological subgroups. Self-identified liberals are more sensitive to the race of homeless individuals featured in the video, donating more when the video features whites. They are equally likely to express sympathy across video treatments, so the effect of race on donating is not mediated by different levels of expressed sympathy. Self-identified conservatives are more likely to express sympathy when they are exposed to information that makes the homeless individual seem more
deserving and this translates into higher donations. Thus with respect to H2 and H3, we see that these effects are more conditional and the findings are more mixed.

Different factors seem to influence decisions to donate to a private charity and views on what the government should do to address homelessness. We don’t see significant overall differences between liberals and conservatives when it comes to the decision to donate, here other things matter as suggested by their different reactions to the videos. In the case of government policy, ideological differences loom large with liberals significantly more likely to say the government should make a greater effort than liberals. This is not surprising and is consistent with the smaller government orientation of conservatives. We do not see strong evidence that the race of beneficiaries and perceptions of individual responsibility influence support for government efforts to help the homeless. Reminding participants that homeless individuals are of a particular race through the video does not seem to influence their views on whether the government should do more. This appears to run counter to the literature showing strong group-centric effects in explaining policy support.

Finally, we have focused our results among those who viewed enough of the video to get at least some of both of our experimental treatments. Arguably, the ability to opt out of treatment accurately mimics how such a campaign appeal from a homeless organization might work. Individuals can and do avoid the appeals they prefer not to receive. Following this logic, we might look at the entire sample to understand the overall effect of the treatments. When we examine the full TESS sample we see a marginally significant effect of race on donation behavior (viewing African-Americans on average leads to $0.55 less in donations). This appears to be driven as we noted by those who view only enough of the sample to get a brief race prime but do not get additional information. Among this tiny group we found a substantial and statistically significant race effect where those who saw an African-American were significantly less likely to donate, despite exhibiting no difference in expressed sympathy for those in the video. To the degree this “opting-out” behavior replicates how many individuals process the homeless they encounter in real life (not learning more about their stories, but seeing just their race and their homelessness), it suggests a great deal of in-group favoritism. (In-group favoritism that appears to be diminished with additional information and perhaps more controlled processing.) This is a fruitful area for further inquiry.

Figure 1. Experimental Treatment Video Conditions
Black Homeless Individuals, No Information
(MTurk Study: N=129 full sample, N=107 whites only sample; TESS Study: N=169)

Black Homeless Individual, Empathy Inducing Information on Reason for Homelessness
(MTurk Study: N=136 full sample, N=112 whites only sample; TESS Study: N=179)

White Homeless Individuals, No Information
(MTurk Study: N=123 full sample, N=93 whites only sample; TESS Study: N=174)

White Homeless Individuals, Empathy Inducing Information on Reason for Homelessness
(MTurk Study: N=149 full sample, N=113 whites only sample, TESS Study N=169)

Note. In no information conditions signs read as follows: “I am Homeless.”, “I Have No Where To Live.” “My Home Now Is The Streets.” “I Never Thought I’d Be Homeless.”

Figure 2. Amount Donated by Condition (TESS Study)
Figure 3. Donation Across Time Spent on Treatment, by Condition

Figure 4. Amount Donated by Condition

Source: TESS Study, White Respondents who see at least 26 seconds of homeless video treatment.
Figure 5. Support for Government Homeless Intervention by Condition

Source: TESS Study, White Respondents who see at least 26 seconds of homeless video treatment.

Figure 6. Expressed Sympathy by Condition

Source: TESS Study, White Respondents who see at least 26 seconds of homeless video treatment.
Figure 7. Marginal Effects of Empathetic Ability on Donations Across Experimental Treatments

![Marginal Effect of Empathetic Ability on Donations](image)

Source: TESS Study, White Respondents who see at least 26 seconds of homeless video treatment.

Figure 8. Marginal Effects of Empathetic Ability on Government Support for Homelessness Across Experimental Treatments

![Marginal Effect of Empathy on Government Assistance for Homeless](image)

Source: TESS Study, White Respondents who see at least 26 seconds of homeless video treatment.
Table 1. Sample Demographics MTurk and TESS Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MTurk Full Sample (N=537)</th>
<th>MTurk Whites Only (N=425)</th>
<th>TESS (N=691)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>64% Male</td>
<td>62% Male</td>
<td>51% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>17% less than $20,000</td>
<td>19% less than $20,000</td>
<td>12% less than $20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37% $20,000 - 50,000</td>
<td>36% $20,000 - 50,000</td>
<td>29% $20,000 - 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23% $50,000 - 75,000</td>
<td>23% $50,000 - 75,000</td>
<td>16% $50,000 - 75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14% $75,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>14% $75,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>14% $75,000 - 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% More than $100,00</td>
<td>8% More than $100,00</td>
<td>29% More than $100,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Identification</td>
<td>40% Democratic and Democratic Leaners</td>
<td>37% Democratic and Democratic Leaners</td>
<td>42% Democratic and Democratic Leaners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20% Independent</td>
<td>19% Independent</td>
<td>4% Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40% Republican and Republican Leaners</td>
<td>44% Republican and Republican Leaners</td>
<td>54% Republican and Republican Leaners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>41% Extremely Liberal, Liberal or Slightly Liberal</td>
<td>38% Extremely Liberal, Liberal or Slightly Liberal</td>
<td>22% Extremely Liberal, Liberal or Slightly Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21% Moderate, Middle of the Road</td>
<td>21% Moderate, Middle of the Road</td>
<td>35% Moderate, Middle of the Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38% Extremely conservative, Conservative or Slightly Conservative</td>
<td>41% Extremely conservative, Conservative or Slightly Conservative</td>
<td>42% Extremely conservative, Conservative or Slightly Conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>45% 30 years old or less</td>
<td>37% 30 years old or less</td>
<td>20% 30 years old or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Giving</td>
<td>66% Donated to charity in past 12 months</td>
<td>68% Donated to charity in past 12 months</td>
<td>50% Donated to charity in past 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24% Volunteered their time for a charity</td>
<td>20% Volunteered their time for a charity</td>
<td>24% Volunteered their time for a charity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>70% Did not attend any religious service in the past month</td>
<td>70% Did not attend any religious service in the past month</td>
<td>65% Say they attend church less often than once or twice a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9% less than High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31% High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28% Some college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32% BA or higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20% Northeast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27% Midwest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35% South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18% West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion of the way Barak Obama handling race relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54% Disapprove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45% Approve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Mediational Model of Sympathy & Treatment Effects on Donation Amount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Liberals</th>
<th>Conservatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Effects</td>
<td>Indirect Effects</td>
<td>Direct Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DV = Donation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.849 (.505)***</td>
<td>.229 (1.146)</td>
<td>2.31 (.736)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathy</td>
<td>6.03 (0.618)***</td>
<td>7.15 (1.3)***</td>
<td>5.87 (.934)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Empathy</td>
<td>-.28 (.447)</td>
<td>.461 (.172)***</td>
<td>-.394 (.848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Empathy</td>
<td>-.112 (.454)</td>
<td>.527 (.176)***</td>
<td>.942 (.879)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White No Info</td>
<td>.344 (.448)</td>
<td>.228 (.168)</td>
<td>1.88 (.94)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DV = Sympathy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.633 (.02)***</td>
<td>.744 (.038)***</td>
<td>.572 (.032)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Empathy</td>
<td>.076 (.027)***</td>
<td>.012 (.052)</td>
<td>.098 (.044)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Empathy</td>
<td>.087 (.028)***</td>
<td>.05 (.054)</td>
<td>.137 (.044)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White No Info</td>
<td>.038 (.028)</td>
<td>-.042 (.058)</td>
<td>.067 (.043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Likelihood</td>
<td>-3024.8</td>
<td>-666.95</td>
<td>-1282.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where *** for p<.01, ** for p<.05, and * for p<.1

TESS study, White Respondents who see at least 26 seconds of homeless video treatment.
### Table 3. Effect of Experimental Treatments and Empathetic Ability on Donations

Note. Table entries are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard error in parentheses for TESS studies; logistic regression coefficients for MTurk Study as DV is donate or not donate $1. Where *** p<.01, * p<.1, ƚ p=.109

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TESS Study</th>
<th>Tess Study (DV=Sympathy)</th>
<th>MTurk Study</th>
<th>MTurk Study</th>
<th>MTurk Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.57 (.06)</td>
<td>0.58 (.11)</td>
<td>0.529 (.051)</td>
<td>0.44 (.05)</td>
<td>0.51 (.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic Ability</td>
<td>-0.06 (.08)</td>
<td>-0.06 (.16)</td>
<td>0.015 (.009)**</td>
<td>0.25 (.09)***</td>
<td>0.03 (.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Empathy Information</td>
<td>0.00 (.03)</td>
<td>0.05 (.15)</td>
<td>0.08 (.027)***</td>
<td>0.02 (.05)</td>
<td>-0.03 (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White No Information Condition</td>
<td>-0.03 (.03)</td>
<td>-0.6 (.15)</td>
<td>0.041 (.028)</td>
<td>-.03 (.05)</td>
<td>-0.06 (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Empathy Information</td>
<td>0.04 (.03)</td>
<td>-0.002 (.17)</td>
<td>0.086 (.028)***</td>
<td>-0.02 (.05)</td>
<td>-0.19 (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Empathy Information</td>
<td>-0.08 (.21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02 (.03)</td>
<td>-0.01 (.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Empathetic Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White No Information Condition</td>
<td>0.04 (.21)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02 (.03)</td>
<td>0.04 (.24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Empathy Information</td>
<td>0.06 (.23)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05 (.03)*</td>
<td>0.27 (.22)</td>
<td>-0.15 (.02)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Empathetic Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Resentment (MTurk only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R² / R²</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>