

# A Study on Empathy Level and Emotional Intelligence among Performing Arts Students and Non Performing Arts Students

Tanya Tandon

Student, Department of Psychology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

Email - tanyatandon0@gmail.com

**Abstract:** The current study investigated the relationship between Empathy level and Emotional Intelligence among the Performing Arts Students and the Non Performing Arts Students. The sample comprised of 40 college students with 20 performing arts students and 20 non performing arts students all in the age range of 21-24 years. Subjects of Performing Arts were chosen from the Department of Theatre Arts of Panjab University, Chandigarh whereas Subjects for Non performing arts were taken from the various Departments of Panjab University. Purposive Random Sampling method was used for the selection of the sample. Toronto Empathy Questionnaire by Spreng, R. N., McKinnon, M. C., Mar, R. A., & Levine, B. (2009) and The Assessing Emotions Scale by Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J.M., & Bhullar, N. (2009) were used for carrying out the investigation. According to the results obtained, there is no difference in Empathy level of Performing Arts Students as compared to the Empathy level of non Performing Arts students. According to the results obtained, there came out to be a significant difference in Emotional Intelligence in Performing Arts students as compared to Non Performing Arts students. According to the results obtained, there is no significant relationship between empathy level and emotional intelligence in performing arts students and no significant relationship in non performing arts students as well. Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) was calculated in addition to correlation and t ratio for statistical analysis.

**Key Words:** empathy, emotional intelligence, performing arts, non performing arts.

## 1. INTRODUCTION:

The origin of the word empathy dates back to the 1880s, when German psychologist Theodore Lipps coined the term "einfuhlung" (literally, "in-feeling") to describe the emotional appreciation of another's feelings. Empathy has further been described as the process of understanding a person's subjective experience by vicariously sharing that experience while maintaining an observant stance. (Zinn W 1999) It seems that empathy plays an important role in a therapeutic relationship (Wiseman T 1996). Empathy means to recognize others' feelings, the causes of these feelings, and to be able to participate in the emotional experience of an individual without becoming part of it (Keen S 2007). Gagan (1983) indicates that empathy is the ability to perceive one's feelings on one hand, while transmitting them on the other.

Empathy can be expressed in terms of joy, sorrow, excitement, misery, pain and confusion (Le Compte A 2000). It is often described as "the ability to see the world through someone else's eyes", which simply implies developing the ability to imagine what someone else is thinking and feeling in a given situation. This is an attempt to understand one another, to live and feel things in the same way.

## 2. DEFINITIONS AND MODELS OF EMPATHY:

"Empathy...is the experience of foreign consciousness in general" - **Edith Stein, 1917/1989**

"Altruism itself depends on a recognition of the reality of other persons, and on the equivalent capacity to regard oneself as merely one individual among many." - **Thomas Nagel, 1970/1978**

## 3. TWO INFLUENTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS:

The two clinical psychologists Carl Rogers and Heinz Kohut have been considered pioneers in the study of the phenomenon of empathy (Bohart & Greenberg, 1997). After World War II, a great interest in empathy research developed in the psychology field. This mostly involved attempts to test Rogers' hypothesis that three therapeutical conditions – unconditional positive regard, empathy, and genuineness – were necessary and sufficient for therapeutic change. In addition, after years in the background, empathy became a central concept within psychoanalysis with Kohut's self psychology.

**Rogers' contribution:** During the decades after World War II, the American psychologist and therapist Carl Rogers introduced a new perspective on personality change and therapy of which empathy was a core component (cf. Rogers, 1957). Many psychologists had participated in the war, and were now ready to apply their knowledge in society at

large. It was in this climate that Rogers' idea of empathy was born (Wispé, 1987). In fact, much of empathy's popularity today within psychology can in some way be traced back to Rogers.

Rogers developed his therapy from his own experiences of meeting clients and from some specific philosophical ideas about the human nature. He had in essence a very positive view of human nature and believed that people have a basically positive direction in their lives. One of Rogers' most basic philosophical assumptions was that people have a capacity for self-actualization, and that under the right circumstances will find their own way to develop and grow, unless these potentials are hindered. More generally put, Rogers argued that human nature was good rather than evil. Also, he assumed that when a person experiences empathy, genuineness and unconditional positive regard from another individual (e.g. a therapist), this constructive actualizing force is promoted (Rogers, 1959).

**Kohut's contribution:** The Austrian-American psychoanalyst Heinz Kohut is best known for his self-psychology, of which empathy is an essential component. Selfpsychology held that empathic failures in childhood lead to deficits in the self-structuralization process in the client. Empathic responsiveness from a therapist creates an environment in which transference feelings toward the therapist related to empathic failures in the client's past could develop. Occasional empathic failures on the part of the therapist offered opportunities for clients to learn and to strengthen defects in their selfstructures (Kohut, 1959).

#### **Contemporary research on empathy:**

**Stotland (1969)** defined empathy in only affective term. More recent contemporary theorists have also tended to define empathy only in affective terms, but unlike Stotland have restricted the term to reactions congruent with those of the other. Since the middle of the 1980's, a trend of conceptualizing empathy in solely affective terms has developed. These researchers usually also restricted the term empathy to refer to affective reactions similar to those of the target (for a review, see Eisenberg & Strayer, 1987). Hoffman (1987) saw empathy as an affective response more appropriate to another's situation than one's own. Similarly, **Barnett and his colleagues (1987)** conceptualized empathy as feeling a vicarious emotion that is congruent with but not necessarily identical to the emotion of another. Batson (e.g., Batson, 1991) restricted the term empathy to refer not only to other-oriented feelings in general but to certain feelings such as compassion, warmth, concern, and the like. He defined empathy as feeling a vicarious emotion that is congruent with but not necessarily identical to the emotion of another (Batson, 1991).

#### **4. EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE:**

**Mayer and Salovey (1970)** had defined EI as "a global capacity to reason about emotions and of emotions to enhance thinking. It includes the ability to accurately perceive others emotions, to assess and generates emotions to assist thoughts, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge and to promote intellectual growth.

Emotional intelligence was described formally by **Salovey and Mayer (1990)**. They defined it as 'the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions' (p. 189). They also provided an initial empirical demonstration of how an aspect of emotional intelligence could be measured as a mental ability (Mayer, DiPaolo, & Salovey, 1990).. Historically, 'emotion' and 'intelligence' were viewed as being in opposition to one another (Lloyd, 1979). How could one be intelligent about the emotional aspects of life when emotions derail individuals from achieving their goals (e.g., Young, 1943)? The theory of emotional intelligence suggested the opposite: emotions make cognitive processes adaptive and individuals can think rationally about emotions.

Emotional intelligence is an outgrowth of two areas of psychological research that emerged over forty years ago. The first area, cognition and affect, involved how cognitive and emotional processes interact to enhance thinking (Bower, 1981; Isen, Shalke, Clark, & Karp, 1978; Zajonc, 1980). Emotions like anger, happiness, and fear, as well as mood states, preferences, and bodily states, influence how people think, make decisions, and perform different tasks (Forgas & Moylan, 1987; Mayer & Bremer, 1985; Salovey & Birnbaum, 1989). The second was an evolution in models of intelligence itself. Rather than viewing intelligence strictly as how well one engaged in analytic tasks associated with memory, reasoning, judgment, and abstract thought, theorists and investigators began considering intelligence as a broader array of mental abilities (e.g., Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1987; Gardner, 1983/1993; Sternberg, 1985). Sternberg (1985), for example, urged educators and scientists to place an emphasis on creative abilities and practical knowledge that could be acquired through careful navigation of one's everyday environment. Gardner's (1983) 'personal intelligences,' including the capacities involved in accessing one's own feeling life (intrapersonal intelligence) and the ability to monitor others' emotions and mood (interpersonal intelligence), provided a compatible backdrop for considering emotional intelligence as a viable construct.

Alternative models of emotional intelligence. Today, there are two scientific approaches to emotional intelligence. They can be characterized as the ability model and mixed models (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2000). The ability model views emotional intelligence as a standard intelligence and argues that the construct meets traditional criteria for an intelligence (Mayer, Roberts, & Barsade, 2008b; Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2008a). Proponents of the ability model measure emotional intelligence as a mental ability with performance assessments that have a criterion of correctness (i.e., there are better and worse answers, which are determined using complex scoring algorithms). Mixed models are so called because they mix the ability conception with personality

traits and competencies such as optimism, self-esteem, and emotional self-efficacy (see Cherniss, 2010, for a review). Proponents of this approach use self-report instruments as opposed to performance assessments to measure emotional intelligence (i.e., instead of asking people to demonstrate how they perceive an emotional expression accurately, self-report measures ask people to judge and report how good they are at perceiving others' emotions accurately).

**The Mayer and Salovey Model of Emotional Intelligence:** The Mayer and Salovey (1997) model of emotional intelligence defines four discrete mental abilities (also referred to as 'branches') that comprise emotional intelligence: (i) perception of emotion, (ii) use of emotion to facilitate thought, (iii) understanding of emotion, and (iv) management of emotion. These four inter-related abilities are arranged hierarchically such that more basic psychological processes (i.e., perceiving emotions) are at the base or foundation of the model and more advanced psychological processes (i.e., conscious, reflective regulation of emotion) are at the top. Empirical demonstrations of whether the higher-level abilities are dependent, to some extent, upon the lower-level abilities, have yet to be conducted.

The first branch, '*Perception of emotion*,' includes the ability to identify and differentiate emotions in the self and others.

The second branch, '*Use of emotion to facilitate thinking*,' refers to harnessing emotions to facilitate cognitive activities such as reasoning, problem solving, and interpersonal communication.

The third branch, '*Understanding and analyzing emotions*,' includes comprehension of the language and meaning of emotions and an understanding of the antecedents of emotions

**The following includes a brief overview of the 5 main components (as stated by Daniel Goleman) of Emotional Intelligence.:**

**Self-awareness:** Recognize and understand your own moods and motivations and their effect on others. To achieve this state, you must be able to monitor your own emotional state and identify your own emotions.

**Self-Regulation:** Controlling your impulses—instead of being quick to react rashly, you can reign in your emotions and think before responding. You express yourself **appropriately**.

**Internal Motivation:** Internal motivation is marked by an interest in learning. It is also self-improvement vs. a pursuit of wealth and status (as a pursuit of wealth and status is an external motivator).

**Empathy:** The ability to understand another person's emotional reaction. This is only possible when one has achieved self-awareness—as one cannot understand others until they understand themselves.

**Social Skills:** Identifying social cues to establish common ground, manage relationships and build networks.

**Howard Gardner** in his book "Intelligence Reframed: Multiple Intelligences for the 21st Century" (Gardner H 1999) argues that Human intelligence does not have a single format, while recognizing eight forms of human intelligence:

- Linguistic, as the ability to efficiently use words, manipulate languages and express meanings through written words, debate, humour etc.
- Logical-Mathematical, as the ability to use numbers and effectively analyze scientific thought, productive and deductive reasoning
- Visual and spatial perception, as the ability to perceive sites and to form mental images as creating maps, plastic arts etc.
- Physical-Kinetic to use body to express feelings and ideas such as dance, body language and sport
- Music recognition, production and conversion of musical forms
- Interpersonal perception of moods, feelings and motivation of others, cooperation and communication in a group with others
- Personal ability to self-knowledge, understanding of moods, feelings and motivation and our ability to act based on our knowledge
- Naturalistic ability to distinguish between natural phenomena of the world and their assessment.

## 5. REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

According to the Review of Literature:

In 2002, the Performing Arts Research Coalition (PARC) conducted surveys in 10 major metropolitan areas on the empathy level of Performing Artists. They discovered that at least 90 percent of respondents from each metropolitan area agreed or strongly agreed that the performing artists have shown increase in the empathy level More than 60 percent of respondents in each location who had children aged 13 and older strongly agreed that the performing arts leads to increase in empathy level and love.

According to Catterall, J., R. Chappleau, et al. (1999). Involvement in the arts and human development: General involvement and intensive involvement in music and theatre arts. National Educational Longitudinal Survey (NELS:88), a panel study that followed more than 25,000 students in middle and high schools for ten years. The first phase of the study examines involvement in the arts across all disciplines. The second phase examines the potential importance of sustained involvement in a single discipline, here using instrumental music and the theatre arts.

**Findings reveal:** Theatre arts and human development: Sustained student involvement in theatre arts (acting in plays and musicals, participating in drama clubs, and taking acting lessons) associates with a variety of developments for

youth: gains in reading proficiency, gains in self-concept and motivation, and higher levels of empathy and tolerance for others.

According to study on 'The Relationship between Fine Arts Participation and the Emotional Intelligence of Fifth-Grade Elementary Students' by Susan Jean Clark(1999): Participants were 645 fifth-grade students from the 12 AWFK pilot schools with specialists in one of four art disciplines in the Davis, Salt Lake, Granite, and Uintah school districts of Utah and three schools with no specialist (i.e. the non-arts group). Representative pilot schools in each area included: Oakridge Elementary (Music), Highland Park Elementary (Dance), Hillsdale Elementary (Theatre), Lapoint Elementary (Visual Art), and Antelope Elementary (non-arts). This sample constituted a purposive sampling of the population.

**Findings reveal:** predicted that the students in the drama emphasis would outperform the other students on the level of Emotional Intelligence. One reason for this prediction was that the largest portion (46 percent) of the related primary studies reviewed in the literature review suggested the emotional ability outcomes of drama participation (Baum & Owen, 1997; Burton, Horowitz, & Abeles, 2000; Gourgey, Bosseau, & Delgado, 1985; Hortacsu & Ekinci, 1992; Jackson, 1992; Milner, 1982).

## 6. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

The current study attempts to investigate the relationship between Empathy level and Emotional Intelligence among the Performing Arts Students and the Non Performing Arts Students.

## 7. HYPOTHESES:

Based on the review of literature, following hypotheses have been proposed:

- It is expected that there is a relationship between the empathy level and the emotional intelligence of the performing arts students.
- It is expected that there is a relationship between empathy level and the emotional intelligence of the non performing arts students.
- It is expected that empathy level and emotional intelligence is different in performing arts students and non performing arts students.

## 8. METHOD:

### *Sample:*

The sample comprised of 40 college students with 20 performing arts students and 20 non performing arts students all in the age range of 21-24 years. Subjects of Performing Arts were chosen from the Department of Theatre Arts of Panjab University, Chandigarh whereas Subjects for Non performing arts were taken from the various Departments of Panjab University. Purposive Random Sampling method was used for the selection of the sample.

### **Procedure**

### *Tests and Tools Used:*

The following standardised tests and tools were used:

Toronto Empathy Questionnaire by Spreng, R. N., McKinnon, M. C., Mar, R. A., & Levine, B. (2009)

This questionnaire consists of 16 questions, each rated on a five point scale from 'never' to 'often'. It was developed by reviewing other available empathy instruments, determining what these instruments had in common, and deriving a single factor that became the basis of the Toronto Empathy Questionnaire (TEQ).

Assessing Emotions Scale by Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J.M., & Bhullar, N. (2009)

The Assessing Emotions Scale is a 33-item self-report inventory focusing on typical emotional intelligence. Respondents rate themselves on the items using a five-point scale. Respondents require on average five minutes to complete the scale. Table 1 shows the items comprising the measures and instructions to respondents. Total scale scores are calculated by reverse coding items 5, 28 and 33, and then summing all items. Scores can range from 33 to 165, with higher scores indicating more characteristic emotional intelligence.

### *Time Taken*

It took a day to carry out the investigation. Subjects took 15 mins each to fill up the questionnaire

### *Instructions:*

The following instructions were given to the subjects:



- A. For Toronto Empathy Questionnaire: “Below is a list of statements. Please read each statement carefully and rate how frequently you feel or act in the manner described. Circle your answer on the response form. There are no right or wrong answers or trick questions. Please answer each question as honestly as you can.”
- B. For The Assessing Emotions Scale: “Each of the following items asks you about your emotions or reactions associated with emotions. After deciding whether a statement is generally true for you, use the 5-point scale to respond to the statement. Please circle the “1” if you strongly disagree that this is like you, the “2” if you somewhat disagree that this is like you, “3” if you neither agree nor disagree that this is like you, the “4” if you somewhat agree that this is like you, and the “5” if you strongly agree that this is like you.”

## 9. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

### *Statistical Analysis Applied*

Mean and Standard Deviation(SD) was calculated in addition to correlation and t ratio.

Table 1: Represents descriptive statistics viz. Means and Standard Deviation and t ratio of the study variables.(n=40)

**Table 1: Showing Means and S.D and t ratio of Performing Arts Students and Non Performing Arts. (N=40)**

Variables	Performing Arts Students(n=20)		Non Performing Arts Students(n=20)		t ratio
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1. Empathy	41.9	4.54	37.35	7.51	1.876
2. Emotional Intelligence	134.25	10.38	132.95	13.29	6.28**

\*t ratio significant at 0.05 level= 2.086

\*\*t ratio significant at 0.01 level= 2.845

Table 2: Shows the inter correlation matrix between Empathy and Emotional Intelligence among Performing Arts students. (n=20)

**Table 2: Showing correlation between Empathy and Emotional Intelligence among Performing Arts Students. (n=20)**

Empathy	Emotional Intelligence
	-0.21

\*correlation value significant at 0.05= .423

\*\*correlation value significant at 0.01= .537

Table 3: Shows the inter correlation matrix between Empathy and Emotional Intelligence among Non Performing Arts students. (n=20)

**Table 3: Showing correlation between Empathy and Emotional Intelligence among Non Performing Arts Students. (n=20)**

Empathy	Emotional Intelligence
	0.2599

\*correlation value significant at 0.05=.423

\*\*correlation value significant at 0.01=.537

Table 3: Shows the inter correlation matrix between Empathy and Emotional Intelligence among the total sample. (n=40)

**Table 3: Showing correlation between Empathy and Emotional Intelligence among the Total Sample . (n=40)**

<b>Empathy</b>	<b>Emotional Intelligence</b>
	<b>0.124</b>

\*correlation value significant at 0.05= .304

\*\*correlation value significant at 0.01= .393

## Discussion

The current investigation was designed to investigate the relationship between Empathy level and Emotional Intelligence among the Performing Arts Students and the Non Performing Arts Students.

According to the result obtained, there is no difference in Empathy level of Performing Arts Students as compared to the Empathy level of non Performing Arts students. The t ratio value came out to be **1.876** which is not significant at both the levels.( $p < 0.05$ )

Acting requires an actor to understand the character's mental world and the experience of the character's feelings. Acting thus involves what is referred to in psychological terms as theory of mind (the ability to understand and interpret other individuals' mental and emotional states) and empathy (the ability to experience the feelings of others). This exploratory study compared the ToM and empathy of 20 theatre and performance students with different levels of acting training. The ToM measures used were Movie for the Assessment of Social Cognition (MASC) and Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (RMET). The empathy measures used were the Interpersonal Reactivity Index and the Empathy Quotient (EQ). No significant differences were found between the levels of ToM and empathy of the novice and experienced group.

According to the results obtained, there came out to be a significant difference in Emotional Intelligence in Performing Arts students as compared to Non Performing Arts students. The t ratio value came out to be **6.28** which is significant at 0.01 level ( $p > 0.01$ ). This shows there is a significant difference in emotional intelligence of both the groups.

Actor training requires students to learn and practice creative skills that overlap with abilities necessary for high emotional intelligence (EI). In this study, the researcher looked at three groups studying actor training: Sanford Meisner actor training, non-Meisner, and those interested in actor training who had not studied it before to determine if skills of EI are impacted through having participants take the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT v2.0) before and after actor training. Results from the between-subjects analysis indicated that significant difference existed in the average of two test scores between groups (Meisner, non-Meisner, and acting interest).

According to the results obtained, there is no significant relationship between empathy level and emotional intelligence in performing arts students. The Pearson's coefficient came out to be **-.21**. This shows that there is no significant relationship between the two variables in performing arts students ( $p < 0.05$ ).

According to Stanislavski (1937) an actor only portrays a character truthfully if he actually experiences the feelings specific to a scene. In order to do so, actors analyze a script to find the specific emotions of each moment (Goldstein & Winner, 2010). Actors then create specific cues that will help them to generate the emotions (they might use specific objects or memories that remind them of the emotion in order to recall it when they need it). This technique ensures that actors are in the same affective state as their characters. Acting training thus teaches actors not only to be sensitive to emotions, but also to regulate emotions by being able to recall a specific emotion when needed (emotional intelligence). Decety & Jackson (2004) have proposed that the self-regulation of emotion is a vital component of emotional intelligence.. The skills taught to actors to be able to regulate and experience a character's feelings thus appear to simulate empathy. Limited research have however been done on the possible correlation between acting emotional intelligence and empathy.

According to the results obtained, the Pearson's coefficient came out to be **.2599** which is insignificant at both the levels. ( $p < 0.05$ ). This means there is no relationship between the empathy level and emotional intelligence in non performing arts students.

Goldstein et al. (2009-2010) found that actors do not differ significantly from non-actors in terms of empathy. This might be as a result of the shift that actors have to make from their characters back to real life. Actors might stop their emotional experience when they choose to do so by means of a perfectly crafted set of techniques (Walsh-Bowers, 2006). They might therefore not display a raised sense of empathy in reality. There is a gap in the literature with regards to whether acting training and its focus on the ability to experience a character's emotions might lead to the development of empathy.

According to the results, the Pearson's coefficient came out to be **.124** which shows insignificant relationship between the empathy level and emotional intelligence in performing arts students and non performing arts students. ( $p < 0.05$ ).

Decety and Jackson (2004) have mentioned that empathy is impossible without self-awareness and emotion-regulation, two skills taught to actors during their training without which acting is impossible. Actors have to hide their own emotions on stage and portray that of the character, thus feeling what the character, another "person" is feeling. They might therefore be practicing the psychological construct known as empathy. Verducci (2000) thus argues that acting can provide a means via which empathic feelings might be developed. As the above evidence suggest, the possibility that acting training might teach or develop ToM and empathy is there. But there occurs no relationship among actors and no actors on empathy and EQ.

## **10. CONCLUSION:**

**The following conclusions can be drawn from the above investigation:**

### ***Limitations and Future Directions***

The only major limitation of this study was the small sample. This was due to the time frame within which the study had to be completed in addition to the limited number of theatre and performance students. Future investigations might thus benefit from a larger sample which would positively impact upon statistical power. There are however a number of concerns as a result of which the findings should be interpreted with caution.

### ***Implications of the study***

Why I have investigated the phenomenon of acting in more depth because acting is largely a psychological process, involving actors simulating human beings with all their accompanying emotions and mental states.

### **Empathy and Emotional Intelligence helps actors to develop empathy skills and emotional regulation:**

Acting may provide a powerful lens through which to understand how we understand our own and others' minds. In this dissertation, I review research on theory of mind, empathy, and emotion regulation, show how these three skills are related to acting theory and acting training, and discuss studies I have previously completed demonstrating correlations between skill in acting and skill in theory of mind, empathy, and positive emotion regulation. I then completed four studies. Study 1 was a longitudinal study comparing children (ages 8-10) receiving acting vs. visual arts training over the course of one academic year testing the hypothesis that acting training in childhood is causally related to development of advanced theory of mind, positive emotion regulation, and empathy. Study 1 found that children in acting classes gain in empathy and expression of emotion over a year above children involved in other art forms. Study 2 was a qualitative study designed to determine the kinds of habits of mind taught, explicitly and implicitly, in acting classes for children (ages 8-10). The purpose of Study 2 was to determine the extent to which acting teachers strive to teach theory of mind, empathy, and adaptive emotion regulation in their acting classes. Study 2 found that children in acting classes at this age are taught about physicality and motivation, with no emphasis on empathy or emotion regulation and only a slight emphasis on theory of mind. Study 3 was parallel to Study 1, but with young adolescents, aged 13-15. Study 3 found that adolescents involved in acting classes gain in their empathy, theory of mind acuity, and expressive emotion regulation over the course of a year over and above adolescents involved in other art forms. Study 4 was parallel to Study 2, with acting classes for adolescents. Study 4 found that adolescent acting classes focus on theory of mind and motivation, without any emphasis on empathy or emotion regulation. I conclude by considering the potential impact of this research on our understanding of typical development in theory of mind, empathy, emotion regulation, and on our understanding of individuals deficient in these skills.

### **The study might help in making them the performing artists aware of their emotions and controlling their emotions:**

Having an ensemble of acting talent all paying homicidal maniacs could very well take its mental toll on the cast, which is why director hires a "life coach" to make sure nobody falls too deep into the darkness. According to an actor: "We have a therapist on board if you fall off the wagon and really are villainous."

### **Helps in development of Theory of Mind:**

We have a sense of empathy with works of art. If we see gestures in a portrait, we actually almost simulate those gestures in our mind. We often implicitly act as if we are moving our arms in response empathically to what we see in the painting.

We also respond empathically to what we think the sitter is experiencing in their head. So we have what is called "a theory of mind" in which when I look at you, I have a sense of where you're going and you have a sense of

where I'm going. We have an enormous capability by just looking at the person we are interacting with, and particularly if we're having a conversation, to predict certain aspects of future events simply by looking at them.

### **Emotional Intelligence helps actors in making Active choices on stage:**

Some people actively participate in life. Others talk about it. The stage is a dynamic medium, and the most-interesting things we see there occur when emotions heighten and create a change in the actors' moods, behavior, or understanding of themselves or their lives. Improve actors learn to "Play it, don't say it!"

### **It might help in Drama Therapy:**

Drama therapy is a type of therapy that allows you to explore emotional difficulties through the medium of drama. This could involve a variety of activities including writing and learning scripts, improvisation exercises, or activities using puppets and masks.

Drama therapy is often used within a group environment, however it can be used in one to one sessions too. A drama therapist will use different techniques and may help you create a fictional story to portray. Creating this space between yourself and the emotional concerns being explored can offer clarity and a sense of relief or catharsis.

### **REFERENCES:**

1. Bachelor, A. (1988). How clients perceive therapist empathy: A content analysis of "received" empathy. *Psychotherapy*, 25, 227-240.
2. Barnett, M. A. (1984). Similarity of experience and empathy in preschoolers. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 145, 241-250.
3. Barnett, M. A. (1987). Empathy and related responses in children. In N. Eisenberg & J. Strayer (Eds.), *Empathy and its development* (pp. 146- 162). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Barnett, M. A., & McCoy, S. J. (1989). The relation of distressful childhood experiences and empathy in college undergraduates. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 150, 417-426.
5. Barnett, M. A., Tetreault, P. A., Esper, J. A., & Bristow, A. R. (1986). Similarity and empathy: The experience of rape. *Journal of social psychology*, 126, 47-49.
6. Barnett, M. A., Tetreault, P. A., & Masbad, I. (1987). Empathy with a rape victim: The role of similarity of experience. *Violence and Victims*, 2, 255-262.
7. Barrett-Lennard, G. T. (1981). The empathy cycle: Refinement of a nuclear concept. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28, 91-100.
8. Barrett-Lennard, G. T. (1997). The recovery of empathy-Towards other and self. In A. C. Bohart & L. S. Greenberg (Eds.), *Empathy reconsidered: New directions in psychotherapy* (pp. 103-121). Baltimore: United Book Press.
9. Batson, C. D. (1991). *The altruism question: Toward a social- psychological answer*. Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
10. Batson, C. D. (1994). Why act for the public good? Four answers.
11. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. Special Issue: The self and the collective, 20, 603-610.
12. Batson, C. D. (1997). Self-other merging and the empathy-altruism hypothesis: Reply to Neuberg et al. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 517-522.
13. Batson, C. D., Batson, J. G. Todd R. M, Brummett, B. H., Shaw, L. L., & Aldeguer, C. M. R. (1995). Empathy and the collective good: Caring for one of the others in a social dilemma. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 619-631.
14. Batson, C. D., Bolen, M. H., Cross, J. A., & Neuringer-Benefiel, H. E. (1986). Where is the altruism in the altruistic personality? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 212-222.
15. Batson, C. D., Eidelman, S. H., Higley, S. L., & Russell, S. A. (2001). "And who is my neighbor?" II: Quest religion as a source of universal compassion. *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion*, 40, 39-50.
16. Batson, C. D., Klein, T. R., Highberger, L., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). Immorality from empathy-induced altruism: When compassion and justice conflict. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 1042-1054.
17. Batson, C. D., & Moran, T. (1999). Empathy induced altruism in a prisoner's dilemma. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 909- 924.
18. Batson, C. D., Sager, K., Garts, E., Kang, M., Rubchinsky, K., & Dawson, K. (1997). Is empathy-induced helping due to self-other merging? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 495-509.
19. Batson, C. D., Sympon, S. C., Hindman, J. L., Decruz, P., Todd, R. M., Weeks, J. L. Jennings, G., & Burris, C. T. (1996). "I've been there too": Effect on empathy of prior experience with a need. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 474-482.
20. Bentham, J. (1876). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (Original work published 1789)
21. Berger, D. M. (1987). *Clinical empathy*. Northvale: Jason Aronson, Inc. Bohart, A. C., & Greenberg, L. S. (1997). *Empathy reconsidered: New directions in psychotherapy*. Baltimore: United Book Press.



- Borg, G. (1992). A "fixed star" for interprocess comparisons. In G. Borg & G. Neely (Eds.) *Fechner day 92, Proceedings of the Eight Annual Meeting of the International Society for Psychophysics* (pp 41-45). Stockholm: Department of Psychology, Stockholm University.
22. Bozarth, J. D. (1997). Empathy from the framework of client-centered theory and the Rogerian hypothesis. In A. C. Bohart & L. S. Greenberg (Eds.), *Empathy reconsidered: New directions in psychotherapy* (pp. 81-102). Baltimore: United Book Press.
  23. Campbell, R. J., Kagan, N., & Krathwohl, D. (1971). The development and validation of a scale to measure affective sensitivity (empathy). *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 18, 407-412
  24. Chalmers, D. J. (1998). *The Conscious Mind: In search for a fundamental theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  25. Cialdini, R. B., Brown, S. L., Lewis, B. P., Luce, C., & Neuberg, S. L. (1997). Reinterpreting the empathy-altruism relationship: When one into one equals oneness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 481-494.
  26. Coke, J. S., Batson, C. D., & McDavis, K. (1978). Empathic mediation of helping: A two-stage model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 752-766.
  27. Damasio, A. R. (1999). *The feeling of what happens: Body and emotion in the making of consciousness*. Orlando: Harcourt, Inc.
  28. Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 113-126.
  29. Davis, M. H. (1996). *Empathy: A social psychological approach*. Boulder: Westview Press.
  30. Davis, M. H., Conklin, L., Smith, A., & Luce, C. (1996). Effect of perspective taking on the cognitive representation of persons: A merging of self and other. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 713-726.
  31. Davis, M. H., Hull, J. G., Young, R. D., & Warren G. G. (1987). Emotional reactions to dramatic film stimuli: The influence of cognitive and emotional empathy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 126-133.
  32. Davis, M. H., Luce, C., & Kraus, S. J. (1994). The heritability of characteristics associated with dispositional empathy. *Journal of Personality*, 62, 369-391.
  33. Deigh, J. (1995). Empathy and universalizability. *Ethics*, 105, 743-763.
  34. Duan, C. (2000). Being empathic: The role of motivation to empathize and the nature of target emotions. *Motivation and Emotion*, 24, 29-49.
  35. Duan, C., & Hill, C. E. (1996). The current state of empathy research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 43, 261-274.
  36. Dymond, R. F. (1949). A scale for the measurement of empathic ability. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 13, 127-133.
  37. Eisenberg, N. (2000). Emotion, regulation, and moral development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 665-697.
  38. National Dance Institute: *Inspiring Children Through the Arts*. National Dance Institute, 2006. Web. 22 Oct. 2009.
  39. Neville, Helen, et al. "Effects of Music Training on Brain and Cognitive Development in Under-Privileged 3- to 5-Year-Olds." *Brain and Brain Research Information*. The Dana Foundation, 2011. Web. 20 July 2011.
  40. "Theory of Multiple Intelligences." Wikipedia, 2011. Web. 12 September 2011.
  41. Von-Rossberg-Gempton, Irene Elizabeth, John Dickinson, and Gary Poole. "Creative: Dance: Potentiality for Enhancing Social Functioning in Frail Seniors and Young Children." *The Arts in Psychotherapy*. 26.5 (1999): 313 – 327.