

UC Davis

UC Davis Previously Published Works

Title

Empathy and Close Social Ties in Late Life.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0sh6t4pm>

Journal

The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences,
75(8)

Authors

Huo, Meng

Fuentecilla, Jamie

Birditt, Kira

et al.

Publication Date

2020-09-14

DOI

10.1093/geronb/gbz044

Peer reviewed

Original Research Report

Empathy and Close Social Ties in Late Life

Meng Huo, MA,^{1,*} Jamie L. Fuentecilla, PhD,¹ Kira S. Birditt, PhD,² and Karen L. Fingerman, PhD¹

¹Department of Human Development and Family Sciences, The University of Texas at Austin. ²Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

*Address correspondence to: Meng Huo, MA, Department of Human Development and Family Sciences, the University of Texas at Austin, 108 E Dean Keeton St, Stop A2702, Austin, TX 78712-1248. E-mail: mhuo@austin.utexas.edu

Received: November 25, 2018; Editorial Decision Date: April 1, 2019

Decision Editor: Derek Isaacowitz, PhD

Abstract

Objectives: Older adults with stronger social ties often lead longer, healthier, and happier lives, but these ties may differ based on older adults' ability to share and understand others' emotions (i.e., empathy). This study asked how empathy was associated with the way that older adults construct and engage in their social worlds.

Method: We drew on the *Daily Experiences and Well-being Study* to examine how older adults' empathy was associated with the structure (e.g., network size and contact), function (e.g., support), and quality (e.g., affection and conflict) of their close social ties. Participants ($N = 333$) self-rated empathy and listed their social partners using three concentric convoy circles.

Results: Empathy was not associated with older adults' social network structure, but more empathic older adults exchanged support with more social partners and reported greater affection for their social partners. We did not observe a significant link between older adults' empathy and conflict with social partners.

Discussion: Examining empathy advances our understanding of individual differences in older adults' close social ties. This study suggests that empathy may play a promising role with regard to promoting older adults' social experiences and strengthening their close ties.

Keywords: Contact, Empathy, Quality, Social ties, Support

Older adults with stronger social ties often lead longer, healthier, and happier lives (Charles & Carstensen, 2010; Holt-Lunstad, Smith, & Layton, 2010). It is crucial to understand what factors may underlie these strong ties. Human bonding typically relies on individuals' awareness and responses to others in social context. Thus, empathy, the ability to share and understand others' emotions, may be a central feature of older adults' social lives and a cornerstone of successful aging (Decety & Svetlova, 2012). Indeed, individual differences in empathy may explain the different ways that older adults behave in their social worlds. More empathic older adults may be more attuned to others' emotions and sustain better quality ties with

more people. Less empathic older adults, on the contrary, may ignore key social cues and incur ostracism (Batson, 2011; Gröhn, Rebutal, Diehl, Lumley, & Labouvie-Vief, 2008; Kang, Ham, & Wallraven, 2017). To date, however, little research has tested these associations between empathy and older adults' close social ties in real-life settings.

Addressing this research question may advance our understanding of older adults' social lives. Older adults prioritize their close ties with family and friends, which may serve as older adults' primary source of social connections and support (Charles & Carstensen, 2010). We examined whether and in what ways empathy was associated with these important social ties. For example, we asked whether

more empathic older adults had a greater number of close social ties and/or were more involved (e.g., contact and support) in these ties than their less empathic counterparts. We also assessed links between older adults' empathy and the qualities of their close ties. Findings offer promising insights into interventions targeting older adults who lack close social ties or incur isolation.

Empathy and Close Social Ties in Late Life

Human beings are innately social and empathy may be a requisite for them to lead a successful social life (Decety & Svetlova, 2012). We were interested in whether individual differences in empathy explained variation in older adults' close social ties. Thus, we measured empathy as a personality-like trait that varies across individuals rather than a performance-based experience that varies momentarily (Beadle, Sheehan, Dahlben, & Gutchess, 2015; Grün et al., 2008; Sze, Gyurak, Goodkind, & Levenson, 2012). Several theoretical perspectives guided our hypotheses. For example, the perception-action model (Preston & De Waal, 2002) suggests that more empathic individuals *share* others' emotions more automatically than their less empathic counterparts. While sharing emotions, more empathic individuals may feel greater concern and understand others' perspectives more accurately, which allows them to behave more appropriately in social context (De Waal, 2008; Ickes & Hodges, 2013).

To gain a more complete understanding of empathy and close social ties in late life, we also drew on the well-established convoy model to assess these ties (Antonucci, Ajrouch, & Birditt, 2014). The convoy is a dynamic social network of close social partners that surrounds the individual. Individuals typically exhibit great variation in the structure (e.g., network size and contact frequency), function (e.g., support exchanges), and quality (e.g., affection and conflict) of their social ties (Antonucci et al., 2014; Fiori et al., 2007). Here, we examined how older adults' empathy was associated with each aspect of social convoys.

Social Network Structure

We first examined how empathy may shape the structure of older adults' close social ties. Older adults typically show great variation in their network size, with gains and losses of social ties over the life course (Cornwell & Laumann, 2015; Fiori et al., 2007; Rook & Charles, 2017). Individual differences in empathy likely explain such variation. Indeed, empathy is a central ability underlying a variety of prosocial behaviors that facilitate relationship formation and maintenance. For example, more empathic individuals are more likely to show gratitude toward others' kindness and forgive others' inappropriate behaviors (Algoe, Haidt, & Gable, 2008; Breen et al., 2010; Giammarco & Vernon, 2014). Thus, more empathic older adults may have accumulated a greater number of social ties and also tend

to establish new ties if they lose someone close in late life. Here, we expected more empathic older adults to report a greater number of social partners than less empathic older adults.

We also examined variability in the number of social partners in older adults' innermost convoy circle (i.e., the partners that individuals cannot imagine life without; Antonucci et al., 2014). Research has revealed that retaining ties to these social partners is especially critical to older adults' well-being (e.g., these ties may provide a sense of self-worth and serve as the primary source of emotional connections; English & Carstensen, 2014; Fung, Carstensen, & Lang, 2001). Here, we asked whether empathy was associated with the size of this innermost network and considered competing hypotheses. On the one hand, more empathic older adults may have bigger social networks in general, which also include more social partners in the innermost circles. On the other hand, more empathic older adults may limit their innermost networks. More empathic individuals are often more devoted to their social partners (Batson, 2011). Following resource depletion theory (Davey, Janke, & Savla, 2005; Fingerman et al., 2015), more empathic older adults may focus on fewer social partners in the innermost circles to guarantee that they have sufficient time, energy, and resources to involve with these partners.

Further, we asked whether empathy was associated with the frequency of contact with social partners. One study revealed a link between older adults' empathy and more active engagement with social partners (e.g., visiting relatives and eating out; Bailey et al., 2008). Another study found that compared with less empathic participants, more empathic adults (aged 21–89 years) perceived their contact as more pleasant and meaningful throughout the day (Grün et al., 2008), which may facilitate more future contact. Taken together, it may be that more empathic older adults feel more comfortable interacting with friends and family, or that the way these older adults behave attracts more social partners to initiate contact. We expected more empathic older adults to have more frequent contact with social partners than less empathic older adults.

Relationship Functions

Close social ties often function as a primary source of support, thus we asked whether empathy was associated with older adults' support exchanges. In this study, we considered three types of support that are frequently exchanged in close ties: emotional support, practical support, and advice (Huo, Fuentesilla, Birditt, & Fingerman, 2019; Swartz, 2009). Emotional support refers to being available when someone is upset. Practical support refers to running errands or offering transportation. Advice refers to giving suggestions in the face of problematic situations.

The literature has linked empathy to support provision. The empathy–altruism hypothesis argues that empathy

may elicit altruistic behaviors in the hope of improving others' welfare (Batson, 2011). Previous studies have also shown that more empathic older adults offer more frequent support to other people, including strangers in the laboratory and also their close social partners (Beadle et al., 2015; Huo et al., 2019; Sze et al., 2012). Yet, it remains unclear how empathy facilitates older adults' support provision within their social networks. We assessed each type of support separately and expected more empathic older adults to provide emotional support, practical support, and advice to more social partners than less empathic older adults.

In addition, more empathic older adults may receive support from more social partners. Following equity/reciprocity theory (Gleason & Iida, 2015), these empathic older adults, who typically offer more help than less empathic older adults, may receive more support from their social partners in return. Moreover, more empathic older adults may be more aware of others' helping behaviors, which increases these older adults' gratitude and encourages more helping behaviors from their social partners (Algoe et al., 2008; Breen et al., 2010). Thus, we expected more empathic older adults to receive support from more of their social partners than less empathic older adults. Further, we speculated this link may be especially evident with regard to emotional support, given our recent work showing that more empathic older adults were more likely to receive emotional support on a daily basis (Huo et al., 2019).

Relationship Qualities

We then turned to the qualities of older adults' close ties and asked whether empathy was associated with older adults' affection and conflict with their social partners. More empathic older adults may enjoy better quality social ties. Indeed, a 4-wave longitudinal study included participants aged 10–87 years in Wave 1 and revealed a consistent link between empathy and more positive relations with others across 12 years (Grühn et al., 2008). This link also holds true in a plethora of research examining romantic couples (e.g., Cohen, Schulz, Weiss, & Waldinger, 2012; Paleari, Regalia, & Fincham, 2005). For example, a study conducted in the United Kingdom examined empathy in heterosexual couples aged 16–56 years and found that empathy was positively associated with relationship satisfaction (Cramer & Jowett, 2010). As such, we expected more empathic older adults to experience greater affection for their social partners than less empathic older adults.

It is unclear, however, whether empathy is associated with less conflict. Some studies have found that empathy reduces conflict in adolescents' and young adults' relationships (Cramer & Jowett, 2010; Van Lissa, Hawk, Branje, Koot, & Meeus, 2016). More empathic individuals may show better conflict resolution strategies, such that they anticipate and avoid conflict before it becomes too severe (Simpson, Ickes, & Oriña, 2001). Also, in the face of tensions, more empathic individuals often focus on

solving problems rather than arguing or fighting with the other party (Carlo et al., 2012; Rizkalla, Wertheim, & Hodgson, 2008).

Yet, empathy can also increase conflict. Indeed, accurately detecting others' thoughts and emotions is not always beneficial, especially when the thoughts or emotions are threatening or harmful for social ties (Ickes & Hodges, 2013). For example, accurate awareness of social partners' unpleasant feelings may undermine relationships (Ickes & Hodges, 2013). Instead, an inaccurate but more cooperative view of the other party's feelings may help resolve conflicts at times (Rusbult, Finkel, Kumashiro, 2009). Here, we considered these competing hypotheses.

Other Factors Associated With Empathy and Social Ties in Late Life

This study also considered other participant characteristics that may be associated with empathy and social ties. We included older adults' age, gender, and self-rated health. Findings on age and empathy are mixed. Cross-sectional studies have found either a decline or an inverse U-shaped curve of empathy with age (Denckla, Fiori, & Vingerhoets, 2014; O'Brien, Konrath, Grühn, & Hagen, 2013). Yet, longitudinal research has documented no age differences in empathy across the life span (Grühn et al., 2008). In addition, women typically report higher levels of empathy and greater involvement in social ties (O'Brien et al., 2013). Prior work has also established that social ties are associated with better health (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010).

We also controlled for older adults' education, minority, and marital status. People with higher education attainment tend to show greater empathy (Phillips, MacLean, & Allen, 2002). Studies have also shown that these upper socioeconomic status adults enjoy more satisfying marriages (Conger, Conger, & Martin, 2010; Fingerman et al., 2015). Regarding minority status, studies suggest that individuals report greater empathy toward ingroup members (e.g., Cikara, Bruneau, & Saxe, 2011), but few studies have examined racial differences in empathy. There are racial differences, however, in terms of social networks. Compared to White adults, Black adults typically have smaller social networks that include more family than nonfamily members (Ajrouch, Antonucci, & Janevic, 2001; Fiori et al., 2017). Marital status may also influence older adults' social experiences, such that married older adults provide more support to their adult children, whereas widowed older adults require more support (Fingerman et al., 2015; Isherwood, Luszcz, & King, 2016).

Finally, we also considered two personality traits that are associated with empathy—agreeableness and neuroticism (Graziano, Habashi, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007; Haas, Ishak, Denison, Anderson, & Filkowski, 2015; Mooradian, Davis, & Matzler, 2011). Highly agreeable people typically report greater empathy and engage in more cooperative behaviors (Graziano et al., 2007; Haas et al., 2015). Highly neurotic

people, by contrast, tend to process emotions in a negative manner and behave aggressively in social situations. Thus, it may be harder for highly neurotic people to sustain social ties (Robinson, Ode, Moeller, & Goetz, 2007).

The Current Study

We tested the following hypotheses:

Ho1: Empathy and social network structure

Ho1a: More empathic older adults may have a greater number of social partners than less empathic older adults.

Ho1b: We considered competing hypotheses and asked whether more empathic older adults have a greater or smaller number of partners in the innermost convoy circle.

Ho1c: More empathic older adults may have more frequent contact with their social partners than less empathic older adults.

Ho2: Empathy and relationship functions

Ho2a: More empathic older adults may provide support to a greater number of their social partners than less empathic older adults.

Ho2b: More empathic older adults may receive support from a greater number of their social partners than less empathic older adults.

Ho3: Empathy and relationship qualities

Ho3a: More empathic older adults may experience greater affection for their social partners than less empathic older adults.

Ho3b. We did not specify a hypothesis regarding conflict with social partners and empathy but examined this issue.

Method

Sample and Procedures

We used data from the *Daily Experiences and Well-being Study*, whose procedures were approved by the University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board. Data collection occurred in 2016–2017 and included 333 older adults aged 65 and older (65–92, $M_{age} = 74.15$). Both a priori and post hoc power analyses assured that a sample of 333 had adequate power ($power = 0.88$) to test an effect as small as 0.03. Participants resided in the greater metropolitan Austin, Texas area, including urban, suburban, and rural areas. Criteria for study inclusion were residing in the community and not being employed full time for pay. We oversampled older adults in areas with high-density minority population, so that 33% participants self-identified as ethnic or racial minorities (e.g., African Americans, Hispanic, or Latinos). We also recruited participants with the full range of socioeconomic status, although the sample was slightly better educated than the general older population in the greater

Table 1. Descriptive Information of Participants ($N = 333$).

Characteristics	M	SD	Range
Age	74.15	6.57	65–92
Education ^a	5.88	1.59	1–8
Health ^b	3.54	1.02	1–5
Empathy ^c	3.78	0.66	1–5
Agreeableness ^d	3.45	0.49	1–4
Neuroticism ^e	2.42	0.68	1–5
Social network structure			
Total network size ^f	15.02	6.95	0–30
Inner circle size ^g	4.67	2.97	0–10
Contact frequency ^h	5.08	0.99	1–8
Relationship function			
Provided emotional support ⁱ	5.40	2.78	0–10
Provided practical support ⁱ	3.48	2.47	0–10
Provided advice ⁱ	4.59	2.78	0–10
Received emotional support ⁱ	4.63	2.86	0–10
Received practical support ⁱ	3.28	2.42	0–10
Received advice ⁱ	3.56	2.59	0–10
Relationship quality			
Affection ^j	3.63	0.63	1–5
Conflict ^j	1.68	0.56	1–5
<i>Proportion</i>			
Females	0.55		
Minority ^k	0.33		
Marital status ^l	0.59		

^aOn a scale from 1 (*no formal education*), 2 (*elementary school*), 3 (*some high school*), 4 (*high school*), 5 (*some college/vocation or trade school*), 6 (*college graduate*), 7 (*post college but no additional degree*), to 8 (*advanced degree*).

^bOn a scale from 1 (*poor*), 2 (*fair*), 3 (*good*), 4 (*very good*), to 5 (*excellent*).

^cAveraged ratings of five empathy items from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*a great deal*).

^dAveraged ratings of five agreeableness items from 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*a lot*).

^eAveraged ratings of four neuroticism items from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*a great deal*).

^fTotal number of social partners that participants reported using the three concentric convoy circles.

^gNumber of social partners (up to 10 social partners) listed in the inner circle.

^hFrequency of contact that older adults had in person or via telephone with up to 10 social partners, coded from 1 (*less than once a year or never*) to 8 (*daily*).

ⁱNumber of social partners (up to 10 social partners) with whom participants provided or received each type of support at least once a month.

^jAveraged ratings of three affection items and two conflict items from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*a great deal*).

^kCoded as 1 (*a racial minority*), 0 (*not a minority*).

^lCoded as 1 (*married/remarried*), 0 (*not married*).

Austin area (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). Table 1 describes background information regarding the sample.

Participants completed a 2-hr face-to-face interview and received \$50 in compensation. During this interview, participants provided their background characteristics (e.g., age, gender, education, and health), rated their empathy levels, and reported on their close social ties. Participants were then invited for a 5- to 6-day intensive data collection, during which they reported their experiences with social partners throughout each day. This study did not include data from the intensive data collection.

Measures

Empathy

We measured empathy using a 5-item scale adapted from the widely used Interpersonal Reactivity Index (empathic concern and perspective taking subscales; Davis, 1983). Example items were as follows: "I often have tender and concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me" and "Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place." Participants rated the extent to which these five statements described them on a scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*a great deal*). The scale initially included eight statements but interviewer notes and recordings revealed participants' difficulties in understanding three reverse-scored statements (e.g., "Sometimes I do not feel sorry for other people when they are having problems"). Including these reverse-scored items lowered the scale reliability (to $\alpha = .60$). Thus, we excluded these reverse-scored items and generated an empathy score for each participant by averaging their ratings across five items ($\alpha = .73$).

Social convoy

Participants also indicated their close social ties using three concentric convoy circles (Antonucci et al., 2014). In each circle, participants offered names of (a) people they felt so close to that it was hard to imagine life without them; (b) people to whom they might not feel quite that close to, but who were still very important to them; or (c) people they had not already mentioned but who were close enough and important enough in their lives that these people should also be included in the diagram. On average, each participant listed 15.02 social partners ($SD = 6.95$, ranged from 0 to 30; total $n = 5,002$), a higher number than reported by samples in other studies (e.g., $n = 11.30$ in Ajrouch, Fuller, Akiyama, & Antonucci, 2018; $n = 10.82$ in Fiori et al., 2007). To avoid fatigue, participants specified details (e.g., contact, support, and relationship qualities) with up to 10 social partners (Fiori et al., 2007). In total, 30% participants ($n = 99$) had 10 or fewer social partners. For the other 70% of participants ($n = 234$) who listed more than 10 social partners, they elaborated on the 10 closest partners.

Social network structure

Structural indicators included the total number of social partners that participants listed in the convoy, the number of social partners listed in the inner circle of the convoy, and the average frequency of participants' contact with their social partners. The total number of social partners was the sum of partners that participants listed across all three circles. Participants also reported the frequency of their contact with up to their 10 closest social partners, indicating how often they see or have contact with each social partner via phone or by text from 1 (*less than once a year or never*) to 8 (*daily*). We generated a mean score of contact frequency averaging across up to 10 social partners.

Relationship functions

Functional indicators involved participants' support exchanges with social partners (up to 10 social partners). Participants indicated whether they provided or received (a) emotional support, (b) practical support, and (c) advice with each social partner at least once a month with 1 (*yes*) and 0 (*no*). We calculated the total number of social partners who provided and received each type of support at least once a month. We examined each type of support in separate analyses. Across different types of support, 2% ($n = 6$) to 8% participants ($n = 26$) reported exchanging support at least once a month with all 10 closest social partners.

Relationship qualities

We measured the quality of participants' social ties via affection and conflicts (up to 10 social partners). Participants indicated affection by rating how much they (a) can share their very private feelings and concerns with each social partner, (b) can rely on each social partner for help if participants have a serious problem, and (c) feel loved and cared for by each social partner (Fingerman et al., 2011). Participants reported their conflicts by rating (a) how much each social partner is critical of the participant and what the participant does and (b) how much each social partner gets on the participant's nerves (Birditt, Manalel, Sommers, Luong, & Fingerman, 2018). Responses were coded on a scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*a great deal*). We averaged participants' ratings of affection and conflicts across social partners ($\alpha_{\text{affection}} = .76$, $\rho_{\text{conflicts}} = .54$). Here, we calculated the Spearman-Brown formula, which is a more appropriate reliability indicator for 2-item scales (Eisinga, Grotenhuis, & Pelzer, 2013).

Control variables

During the 2-hr interview, participants provided their demographic characteristics. Age was reported in years. Gender was coded as 1 (*male*) and 0 (*female*). Participants indicated their education on a scale of 1 (*no formal education*), 2 (*elementary school*), 3 (*some high school*), 4 (*high school*), 5 (*some college/vocational or trade school*), 6 (*college graduate*), 7 (*post-college but no additional degree*), and 8 (*advanced degree*). Participants self-rated their physical health from 1 (*poor*), 2 (*fair*), 3 (*good*), 4 (*very good*), and 5 (*excellent*; Idler & Kasl, 1995). Participants also reported whether they were married, remarried, cohabitated, divorced, or single. We recoded marital status as 1 (*married/remarried*) and 0 (*not married*). Participants indicated whether they were Hispanic/Latino and their racial group (e.g., Native American, African American, Asian, and White). We generated a variable to measure minority status by assigning a 1 to participants who were Hispanic/Latino or non-White (e.g., Black or Asian) and a 0 to participants who were non-Hispanic Whites.

Regarding personality traits, participants completed measures of personality developed for the full adult age

range. Participants rated how well each of the five agreeableness items (e.g., helpful, softhearted, and sympathetic; Mroczek & Almeida, 2004) described them from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*a great deal*). They also rated four neuroticism items (e.g., moody, nervous; Lachman & Weaver, 1997) on a scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*a lot*). We calculated the agreeableness score ($\alpha = .77$) and neuroticism score ($\alpha = .70$) by averaging the ratings.

Analytic Strategy

This study examined how older adults' empathy was associated with the structure, function, and quality of their social ties. We estimated multiple regressions controlling for participant age, gender, education, self-rated health, marital status, minority, agreeableness, and neuroticism. The predictor was participant empathy. For older adults' network structure, we included three outcomes in separate models: (a) the total number of social partners, (b) the number of social partners in the innermost convoy circle, and (c) the average frequency of participants' contact with up to 10 closest social partners. For the function of older adults' close ties, we predicted the number of social partners who provided and received emotional support, practical support, and advice from participants at least once a month (six outcomes in separate models). For relationship qualities, we treated participants' average affection and conflict across the 10 social partners as two separate outcomes.

Results

On average, older adults sustained contact with their social partners a few times per month; approximately a third of social partners were listed in the inner circle of the convoy. Older adults provided and received support from about 4 to 5 social partners. Older adults reported relatively high affection and low conflict with their close social partners. [Supplementary Table 1](#) presents bivariate correlations of demographic characteristics and relationship indicators.

Social Network Structure

We tested links between older adults' empathy and social network structure, considering network size and contact frequency. Empathy was not associated with the total network size ($B = 0.94, p = .11$), the number of social partners in the innermost network ($B = 0.14, p = .60$), or the average frequency of contact that older adults had with their social partners ($B = -0.01, p = .90$; [Supplementary Table 2](#)).

Relationship Function

We then examined whether older adults' empathy was associated with their support exchanges. As shown in [Table 2](#), more empathic older adults provided emotional support

($B = 0.55, p = .02$) and advice ($B = 0.47, p = .04$) at least once a month to more social partners than less empathic older adults. Empathy was not associated with providing practical support ($B = 0.23, p = .29$; [Supplementary Table 2](#)). Interestingly, more empathic older adults also received emotional support ($B = 0.71, p = .003$), practical support ($B = 0.42, p = .04$), and advice ($B = 0.68, p = .003$) at least once a month from more social partners.

Relationship Quality

We also estimated multiple regressions to examine the qualities of older adults' close social ties. Older adults' empathy was associated with greater affection for their social partners ($B = 0.26, p < .001$) but not linked to conflict with social partners ($B = -0.01, p = .91$; [Supplementary Table 2](#)).

Post Hoc Tests

We examined the circumstances under which older adults reciprocated support (i.e., they provided and received support at least once a month from the same social partner). The support that was reciprocated did not have to be of the same type. We counted the number of social partners who reciprocated support with older adults and treated this number as the outcome. A multiple regression model revealed that more empathic older adults reciprocated support with more social partners than less empathic older adults ($B = 0.52, p = .02$).

We also reestimated models predicting older adults' affection controlling for their conflict with social partners, and vice versa. Findings remained the same, such that empathy was only associated with affection ($B = 0.27, p < .001$; [Supplementary Table 3](#)).

Discussion

Scholars have long proposed the central role that empathy plays in successful social lives, but links between older adults' empathy and close social ties remain understudied. Some recent studies examined older adults' empathy and prosocial behaviors either in laboratory settings or on a daily basis ([Beadle et al., 2015](#); [Grühn et al., 2008](#); [Huo et al., 2019](#); [Sze et al., 2012](#)). Yet, this study used an overarching approach and examined social networks of older adults. We asked whether and how empathy was associated with the structure, function, and quality of this network. Findings suggest that being more empathic is not associated with larger social network or more contact. Yet, more empathic older adults appear to be involved in more support exchanges and experience greater affection for their social partners.

Interestingly, empathy was not associated with older adults' network structure. That is, more empathic older adults hold a similar number of social ties (including ties in the innermost networks) and engage in contact as often

Table 2. Multiple Regressions Predicting the Function and Quality of Older Adults' Close Social Ties by Empathy

Parameter	Provided support				Received support							
	Emotional		Advice		Emotional		Practical		Advice		Affection	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Intercept	3.81	2.48	2.00	2.53	1.72	2.63	0.02	2.26	2.85	2.45	3.04***	0.58
Participant empathy ^a	0.55*	0.23	0.47*	0.23	0.71**	0.24	0.42*	0.21	0.68**	0.22	0.26***	0.05
Participant covariates												
Age	-0.06**	0.02	-0.06*	0.02	-0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	-0.03	0.02	-0.01*	0.01
Gender ^b	-1.73***	0.32	-1.23***	0.33	-1.55***	0.34	-0.85*	0.29	-1.06**	0.32	0.03	0.07
Education ^c	0.09	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.18	0.11	-0.06	0.09	0.03	0.10	0.00	0.02
Health ^d	0.21	0.15	0.19	0.16	-0.09	0.16	-0.23	0.14	-0.19	0.15	0.06	0.04
Marital status ^e	0.88**	0.32	0.74*	0.33	0.26	0.34	0.77*	0.29	0.32	0.32	-0.12	0.08
Minority status ^f	0.86*	0.34	0.85**	0.34	0.81*	0.36	0.56	0.31	0.44	0.33	-0.01	0.08
Agreeableness ^g	0.77*	0.31	0.95**	0.32	0.53	0.33	0.22	0.29	0.01	0.31	0.16*	0.07
Neuroticism ^h	0.02	0.22	0.21	0.22	0.24	0.23	0.05	0.20	0.36	0.22	-0.09	0.05
F	9.20***		7.00***		6.76***		3.61***		4.31***		6.87***	
Adjusted R ²	.19		.14		.14		.07		.09		.14	

Note. Older adults $N = 333$. Outcome variables were (a) the number of social partners receiving support from participants at least once a month, (b) the number of social partners providing support to participants at least once a month, and (c) participants' affection for up to 10 closest social partners.

^aAveraged ratings of five empathy items from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*a great deal*).

^bCoded as 1 (*male*), 0 (*female*).

^cOn a scale from 1 (*no formal education*), 2 (*elementary school*), 3 (*some high school*), 4 (*high school*), 5 (*some college/vocation or trade school*), 6 (*college graduate*), 7 (*post college but no additional degree*), to 8 (*advanced degree*).

^dOn a scale from 1 (*poor*), 2 (*fair*), 3 (*good*), 4 (*very good*), to 5 (*excellent*).

^eCoded as 1 (*a racial minority*), 0 (*not a minority*).

^fCoded as 1 (*married/remarried*), 0 (*not married*).

^gAveraged ratings of five agreeableness items from 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*a lot*).

^hAveraged ratings of four neuroticism items from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*a great deal*).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

as less empathic older adults. Resource depletion theory (Davey et al., 2005) may still explain these nonsignificant findings, such that empathy perhaps influences how older adults allocate their resources among different social experiences. More empathic older adults may prefer to retain a manageable size of social ties but stay involved in more of these ties. For example, more empathic older adults may devote more time and energy to their social partners and respond to these partners' needs more readily than less empathic older adults.

Indeed, more empathic older adults may make a better use of their close social ties as a venue of support exchanges. We found that more empathic older adults provided and received support from more social partners than less empathic older adults. Findings offer additional evidence to the empathy–altruism hypothesis (Batson, 2011), revealing that more empathic older adults offer emotional support and advice to more social partners. We did not observe this link for practical support, which requires physical resources and proximity (Swartz, 2009). That said, being empathic may not necessarily facilitate offering practical help to more social partners.

We also found that more empathic older adults received each type of support from more social partners. As we have

discussed earlier, social partners of more empathic older adults often receive plenty of support from these older adults and they may feel obligated to reciprocate such support (Gleason & Iida, 2015). Post hoc tests offer preliminary evidence for this idea in that more empathic older adults reciprocate support with more social partners. Yet, this possibility should be interpreted with caution given that this study only relied on older adults' reports. Future research may consider both parties' perspectives and examine the reasons why social partners of more empathic older adults offer more support to these older adults. Moreover, given the homophily principle (i.e., similar people tend to stay together; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001), more empathic older adults may have a greater number of social partners who are also more empathic and more likely to help.

Further, this study extends our understanding of how empathy is associated with the qualities of older adults' social ties. In line with prior research (Grühn et al., 2008), more empathic older adults reported greater affection for their social partners. Findings cannot imply causality due to the cross-sectional nature of data. Being more empathic may improve older adults' relationship quality but there may also be a selection bias that older adults in closer ties

are more empathic. Future research is needed to understand the mechanism underlying this link.

We did not observe a link between empathy and conflict in late life, which was inconsistent with the literature using younger populations (Cramer & Jowett, 2010; Van Lissa et al., 2016). Scholars have argued that older adults generally tend to avoid conflicts (Birditt, Nevitt, & Almeida, 2015; Charles & Carstensen, 2010), and this tendency may not vary based on their empathy. It is also possible that empathy exacerbates conflict in certain group of older adults. Charles' strength and vulnerability integration model (Charles, 2010) posits that older adults incur greater emotional suffering when conflicts or distress becomes hard to avoid. Thus, the link between empathy and conflict may be more evident and salient among older adults who are exposed to chronic stress.

This study is subject to several limitations. We followed prior research (e.g., Grünh et al., 2008) and examined individual differences in empathy using older adults' self-reports. Yet, we acknowledge that self-reports of empathy may be biased and constrain our hypothesis testing. Because of social desirability, older adults may self-report themselves as more empathic and considerate than they truly are. These older adults may also view themselves as being more helpful and having closer social ties. This tendency to have positive self-views may also account for the reported links in certain participants. In addition, older adults' reports of contact, support exchanges, and relationship qualities were all limited to only up to 10 closest social partners. This has been widely used in prior research regarding social network (Ajrouch et al., 2018; Fiori et al., 2007) but it may also lead to biased estimates in this study. Further, as mentioned earlier, this study revealed correlational findings. Longitudinal data are needed to further explore the role of empathy in older adults' social ties and to incorporate empathy into interventions that benefit older adults' social lives and well-being.

Conclusion

This study innovatively introduces the concept of empathy in the literature regarding older adults' social lives. More empathic older adults may not necessarily have more social ties; yet, they engage in more support exchanges and have more positive feelings about social partners than less empathic older adults. That is, despite the correlational nature of this study, being more empathic may still have the potential to improve the function and quality of older adults' close social ties. Findings may inspire more work on individual differences in socioemotional aging and carry practical implications for relationship therapies in the long run.

Supplementary Material

Supplementary data are available at *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* online.

Funding

This study was supported by the National Institute on Aging (R01AG046460 to K. L. F.), the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (P2CHD042849 to the Population Research Center at The University of Texas at Austin) and the University of Texas at Austin (Donald D. Harrington Dissertation Fellowship to M. H.).

Conflict of Interest

The authors certify that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest or nonfinancial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this article.

References

- Ajrouch, K. J., Antonucci, T. C., & Janevic, M. R. (2001). Social networks among blacks and whites: The interaction between race and age. *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *56*, S112–S118. doi:10.1093/geronb/56.2.S112
- Ajrouch, K. J., Fuller, H. R., Akiyama, H., & Antonucci, T. C. (2018). Convoys of social relations in cross-national context. *Gerontologist*, *58*, 488–499. doi:10.1093/geront/gnw204
- Algoe, S. B., Haidt, J., & Gable, S. L. (2008). Beyond reciprocity: Gratitude and relationships in everyday life. *Emotion*, *8*, 425–429. doi:10.1037/1528-3542.8.3.425
- Antonucci, T. C., Ajrouch, K. J., & Birditt, K. S. (2014). The convoy model: Explaining social relations from a multidisciplinary perspective. *Gerontologist*, *54*, 82–92. doi:10.1093/geront/gnt118
- Bailey, P. E., Henry, J. D., & Von Hippel, W. (2008). Empathy and social functioning in late adulthood. *Aging and Mental Health*, *12*, 499–503. doi:10.1080/13607860802224243
- Batson, C. D. (2011). *Altruism in humans*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Beadle, J. N., Sheehan, A. H., Dahlben, B., & Gutches, A. H. (2015). Aging, empathy, and prosociality. *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *70*, 215–224. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbt091
- Birditt, K. S., Manale, J. A., Sommers, H., Luong, G., & Finger, K. L. (2018). Better off alone: Daily solitude is associated with lower negative affect in more conflictual social networks. *The Gerontologist*. Advanced online publication. doi:10.1093/geront/gny060
- Birditt, K. S., Nevitt, M. R., & Almeida, D. M. (2015). Daily interpersonal coping strategies: Implications for self-reported well-being and cortisol. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *32*, 687–706. doi:10.1177/0265407514542726
- Breen, W. E., Kashdan, T. B., Lenser, M. L., & Fincham, F. D. (2010). Gratitude and forgiveness: Convergence and divergence on self-report and informant ratings. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *49*, 932–937. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.07.033
- Carlo, G., Mestre, M. V., McGinley, M. M., Samper, P., Tur, A., & Sandman, D. (2012). The interplay of emotional instability, empathy, and coping on prosocial and aggressive behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *53*, 675–680. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.05.022

- Charles, S. T. (2010). Strength and vulnerability integration: A model of emotional well-being across adulthood. *Psychological Bulletin*, *136*, 1068–1091. doi:10.1037/a0021232
- Charles, S. T., & Carstensen, L. L. (2010). Social and emotional aging. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *61*, 383–409. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100448
- Cikara, M., Bruneau, E. G., & Saxe, R. R. (2011). Us and them intergroup failures of empathy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *20*, 149–153. doi:10.1177/0963721411408713
- Cohen, S., Schulz, M. S., Weiss, E., & Waldinger, R. J. (2012). Eye of the beholder: The individual and dyadic contributions of empathic accuracy and perceived empathic effort to relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *26*, 236–245. doi:10.1037/a0027488
- Conger, R. D., Conger, K. J., & Martin, M. J. (2010). Socioeconomic status, family processes, and individual development. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *72*, 685–704. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00725.x
- Cornwell, B., & Laumann, E. O. (2015). The health benefits of network growth: New evidence from a national survey of older adults. *Social Science and Medicine (1982)*, *125*, 94–106. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.09.011
- Cramer, D., & Jowett, S. (2010). Perceived empathy, accurate empathy and relationship satisfaction in heterosexual couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *27*, 327–349. doi:10.1177/0265407509348384
- Davey, A., Janke, M., & Savla, J. (2005). Antecedents of intergenerational support: Families in contact and families as context. In M. Silverstein, R. Giarrusso, & V. L. Bengtson (Eds.), *Annual review of gerontology and geriatrics, volume 2: Intergenerational relations across time and place* (pp. 29–54). New York, NY: Springer.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *44*, 113–126. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.113
- Decety, J., & Svetlova, M. (2012). Putting together phylogenetic and ontogenetic perspectives on empathy. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *2*, 1–24. doi:10.1016/j.dcn.2011.05.003
- Denckla, C. A., Fiori, K. L., & Vingerhoets, A. J. (2014). Development of the crying proneness scale: Associations among crying proneness, empathy, attachment, and age. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *96*, 619–631. doi:10.1080/00223891.2014.899498
- De Waal, F. B. (2008). Putting the altruism back into altruism: The evolution of empathy. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *59*, 279–300. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093625
- Eisinga, R., Grotenhuis, M. t., & Pelzer, B. (2013). The reliability of a two-item scale: Pearson, Cronbach, or Spearman-Brown? *International Journal of Public Health*, *58*, 637–642. doi:10.1007/s00038-012-0416-3
- English, T., & Carstensen, L. L. (2014). Selective narrowing of social networks across adulthood is associated with improved emotional experience in daily life. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *38*, 195–202. doi:10.1177/0165025413515404
- Fingerman, K. L., Kim, K., Davis, E. M., Furstenberg, F. F. Jr, Birditt, K. S., & Zarit, S. H. (2015). “I’ll give you the world”: Socioeconomic differences in parental support of adult children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *77*, 844–865. doi:10.1111/jomf.12204
- Fingerman, K. L., Pitzer, L. M., Chan, W., Birditt, K., Franks, M. M., & Zarit, S. (2011). Who gets what and why? Help middle-aged adults provide to parents and grown children. *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *66*, 87–98. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbq009
- Fiori, K. L., Rauer, A. J., Birditt, K. S., Brown, E., Jager, J., & Orbach, T. L. (2017). Social network typologies of black and white married couples in midlife. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *79*, 571–589. doi:10.1111/jomf.12330
- Fiori, K. L., Smith, J., & Antonucci, T. C. (2007). Social network types among older adults: A multidimensional approach. *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *62*, P322–P330. doi:10.1093/geronb/62.6.P322
- Fung, H. H., Carstensen, L. L., & Lang, F. R. (2001). Age-related patterns in social networks among European Americans and African Americans: Implications for socioemotional selectivity across the life span. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, *52*, 185–206. doi:10.2190/1ABL-9BES-M0X2-LR9V
- Giammarco, E. A., & Vernon, P. A. (2014). Vengeance and the Dark Triad: The role of empathy and perspective taking in trait forgivingness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *67*, 23–29. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.02.010
- Gleason, M. E. J., & Iida, M. (2015). Social support. In M. Mikulincer, P. R. Shaver, J. A. Simpson, & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *APA handbook of personality and social psychology, Volume 3: Interpersonal relations* (pp. 351–370). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Graziano, W. G., Habashi, M. M., Sheese, B. E., & Tobin, R. M. (2007). Agreeableness, empathy, and helping: A person × situation perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*, 583–599. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.4.583
- Grühn, D., Rebusal, K., Diehl, M., Lumley, M., & Labouvie-Vief, G. (2008). Empathy across the adult lifespan: Longitudinal and experience-sampling findings. *Emotion (Washington, D.C.)*, *8*, 753–765. doi:10.1037/a0014123
- Haas, B. W., Ishak, A., Denison, L., Anderson, I., & Filkowski, M. M. (2015). Agreeableness and brain activity during emotion attribution decisions. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *57*, 26–31. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2015.03.001
- Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., & Layton, J. B. (2010). Social relationships and mortality risk: A meta-analytic review. *PLoS Medicine*, *7*, e1000316. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316
- Huo, M., Fuentesilla, J. L., Birditt, K. S., & Fingerman, K. L. (2019). Older adults’ empathy and daily support exchanges. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/0265407519837372
- Ickes, W., & Hodges, S. D. (2013). Empathic accuracy in close relationships. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of close relationships*, 348–373. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Idler, E. L., & Kasl, S. V. (1995). Self-ratings of health: Do they also predict change in functional ability? *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B, Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *50*, S344–S353. doi:10.1093/geronb/50B.6.S344
- Isherwood, L. M., Luszcz, M. A., & King, D. S. (2016). Reciprocity in material and time support within parent–child relationships during late-life widowhood. *Ageing and Society*, *36*, 1668–1689. doi:10.1017/S0144686X15000537

- Kang, J., Ham, B. J., & Wallraven, C. (2017). Cannot avert the eyes: Reduced attentional blink toward others' emotional expressions in empathic people. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, *24*, 810–820. doi:10.3758/s13423-016-1171-x
- Lachman, M. E., & Weaver, S. L. (1997). *The Midlife Development Inventory (MIDI) Personality Scales: Scale construction and scoring*. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University.
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *27*, 415–444. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.415
- Mooradian, T. A., Davis, M., & Matzler, K. (2011). Dispositional empathy and the hierarchical structure of personality. *American Journal of Psychology*, *124*, 99–109. doi:10.5406/amerjpsyc.124.1.0099
- Mroczek, D. K., & Almeida, D. M. (2004). The effect of daily stress, personality, and age on daily negative affect. *Journal of Personality*, *72*, 355–378. doi:10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00265.x
- O'Brien, E., Konrath, S. H., Gröhn, D., & Hagen, A. L. (2013). Empathic concern and perspective taking: Linear and quadratic effects of age across the adult life span. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *68*, 168–175. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbs055
- Paleari, F. G., Regalia, C., & Fincham, F. (2005). Marital quality, forgiveness, empathy, and rumination: A longitudinal analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*, 368–378. doi:10.1177/0146167204271597
- Phillips, L. H., MacLean, R. D., & Allen, R. (2002). Age and the understanding of emotions: Neuropsychological and sociocognitive perspectives. *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *57*, P526–P530. doi:10.1093/geronb/57.6.P526
- Preston, S. D., & de Waal, F. B. (2002). Empathy: Its ultimate and proximate bases. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *25*, 1–20; discussion 20. doi:10.1017/S0140525X02000018
- Rizkalla, L., Wertheim, E. H., & Hodgson, L. K. (2008). The roles of emotion management and perspective taking in individuals' conflict management styles and disposition to forgive. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *42*, 1594–1601. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2008.07.014
- Robinson, M. D., Ode, S., Moeller, S. K., & Goetz, P. W. (2007). Neuroticism and affective priming: Evidence for a neuroticism-linked negative schema. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *42*, 1221–1231. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.027
- Rook, K. S., & Charles, S. T. (2017). Close social ties and health in later life: Strengths and vulnerabilities. *American Psychologist*, *72*, 567–577. doi:10.1037/amp0000104
- Rusbult, C. E., Finkel, E. J., & Kumashiro, M. (2009). The Michelangelo phenomenon. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *18*, 305–309. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01657.x
- Simpson, J. A., Ickes, W., & Orina, M. (2001). Empathic accuracy and preemptive relationship maintenance. In J. H. Harvey & A. Wenzel (Eds.), *Close romantic relationships: Maintenance and enhancement* (pp. 27–46). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sze, J. A., Gyurak, A., Goodkind, M. S., & Levenson, R. W. (2012). Greater emotional empathy and prosocial behavior in late life. *Emotion (Washington, D.C.)*, *12*, 1129–1140. doi:10.1037/a0025011
- Swartz, T. T. (2009). Intergenerational family relations in adulthood: Patterns, variations, and implications in the contemporary United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *25*, 191–212. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.34.040507.134615
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2017). American community survey 1-year estimates. Retrieved from https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_17_1YR_S1501&prodType=table
- Van Lissa, C. J., Hawk, S. T., Branje, S., Koot, H. M., & Meeus, W. H. (2016). Common and unique associations of adolescents' affective and cognitive empathy development with conflict behavior towards parents. *Journal of Adolescence*, *47*, 60–70. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.12.005