Gender Differences in the Correlates of Volunteering and Charitable Giving

Christopher J. Einolf

Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 2011 40: 1092 originally published online 28 September 2010
DOI: 10.1177/0899764010385949

Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly
40(6) 1092–1112

DOI: 10.1177/0899764010385949
http://nvsq.sagepub.com
SAGE

Gender Differences in the Correlates of Volunteering and Charitable Giving

Christopher J. Einolf[1]

Abstract

Psychological research has found that women score higher on most measures of the traits, motivations, and values that predict helping others, and women are more likely to help family and friends. However, sex differences in the institutional helping behaviors of volunteering and charitable giving are small. This article seeks to explain this apparent contradiction with the hypotheses that men have more resources and more social capital than women, which compensates for their lower level of motivation. The article tests these hypotheses using data from the 1995 Midlife in the United States (MIDUS) survey. The data show partial support for these hypotheses, as men score higher on measures of income, education, trust, and secular social networks. However, women have broader social networks through religious participation.

Keywords

volunteering, charitable giving, prosocial behavior, altruism, gender

During the last three decades, researchers in a number of fields have examined sex differences in prosocial or helping behaviors and gender differences in the causes or correlates of those behaviors. Many feminist scholars have argued that women follow "a different voice" in moral thinking (Gilligan, 1982), placing more importance on caring, relationships, and helping than on impersonal reasoning and rule making. Social norms encourage women to take on helping roles within families, and past

[1]DePaul University School of Public Service, Chicago, IL

Corresponding Author:
Christopher J. Einolf, Assistant Professor, DePaul University School of Public Service, 1 E. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Email: ceinolf@depaul.edu

restrictions on labor market participation pushed women into volunteer careers (Daniels, 1989; Kaminer, 1984; Spain, 2001). In experimental research, women are usually more likely to help others although this behavior varies with the conditions of the experiment (Eckel & Grossman, 2008).

Women's greater motivation to help does not, however, seem to translate into much more participation in volunteering and charitable giving. On average, women give more of their time and money to charitable causes than men, but the difference is small and inconsistent across studies. If women have more helpful personalities than men and are much more helpful to friends, family members, and strangers in experimental research, why is there only a slight difference in men's and women's volunteering and charitable giving?

Although there has been much research on volunteering and charitable giving in general, there has been surprisingly little research on how and why participation in these activities varies by gender. Most researchers include sex as a control variable in quantitative analyses, but few have explored sex differences in formal helping behaviors in detail. Given how prominent a role gender plays in discussions of empathy, moral reasoning, caring for children, and helping friends and family members, it is surprising that scholars of formal helping behaviors have paid so little attention to sex and gender. This study seeks to rectify that gap. It uses data from a large, nationally representative survey to examine how gender differences in resources, social capital, and prosocial motivation interact to affect overall levels of volunteering and charitable giving.

Review of the Literature:

This review first discusses research on sex differences in the levels of volunteering and charitable giving, showing that studies find small and inconsistent differences in the total amount of volunteering and charitable giving. It then examines research on how men and women differ in the causes of volunteering and charitable giving. In referring to differences in participation in volunteering and charitable giving, I use the term *sex*, as these differences involve a simple comparison of behaviors as measured by surveys. In referring to differences in the causes or correlates of volunteering and charitable giving, I use the term *gender*, as the factors that lead men and women to engage in these behaviors are socially constructed.

Sex Differences in Volunteering and Charitable Giving

Sex differences vary from survey to survey, depending on the construction of the survey and the country where the survey is administered. Most surveys of residents of the United States find that more women than men engage in volunteering (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009; Independent Sector, 2001; Rooney, Steinberg, & Schervish, 2004; Taniguchi, 2006; Themudo, 2009; Wilson & Musick, 1997). The most recent

of these surveys, by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2009), found that 30.3% of women volunteered during the previous year, as opposed to 23.3% of men. Among those who did volunteer, the median hours spent volunteering was slightly higher for men (52 hr) than women (50 hr).

Analyzing sex differences in charitable giving is difficult because most adults are married, and married couples tend to pool income and make joint decisions about charitable giving. Surveys conducted by Independent Sector find that women are slightly more likely than men to report making a donation to charity (Hodgkinson & Weitzman 1992, 1994, 1996; Kirsh, Hume, & Jalnadoni, 1999). Research on single adults finds that single women give more money to charity than single men, but the results vary from study to study. Andreoni, Brown, and Rischall (2003) found that roughly equal proportions of single women (59.5%) and men (57.9%) donated to charity and that single men gave an average of US$401 per year, compared to single women's average donation of US$316. However, Mesch, Rooney, Steinberg, and Denton (2006) found that 78% of single women were donors, compared to 68% of men and that single women gave an average of US$935 to charity, much more than the male average of US$470. Among married couples, patterns are complex and depend on whether one spouse decides about charitable giving, both spouses decide together, or each spouse decides separately (Andreoni et al., 2003; Burgoyne, Young, & Walker, 2005). Finally, a larger percentage of women leave money to charity through bequests in their wills (Capek, 2005).

While most studies find that women donate more money and time than men, the size of the difference varies from study to study. Much of this variation can be attributed to survey methodology, as women are more likely than men to remember volunteer work and charitable giving without being prompted. Longer surveys, with more questions about volunteering and charitable giving, tend to find a smaller gap between men's and women's participation (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2006; Rooney, Mesch, Chin, & Steinberg, 2005). Sex differences in the amount of volunteering vary from country to country, supporting the view that these differences have a social, not a biological, basis. For example, in Australia, the United Kingdom, Japan (Musick & Wilson, 2008), the Netherlands, and Italy (Dekker & van den Broek, 1998), women are more likely to volunteer than men, but in Canada there are no gender differences and in Sweden men are more likely to volunteer (Musick & Wilson, 2008).

While sex differences in overall charitable giving and volunteering seem to be small, there are differences in the types of organizations to which men and women donate. Some types of volunteering have strong gender norms, with men dominating the staffs of volunteer fire and rescue squads and women making up the majority of hospice volunteers. Differences in other areas are less clear. Some studies find that men are more likely to engage in sports and recreation volunteering, while women are more likely to volunteer for religious, human services, and educational organizations. Men are also more likely to volunteer with groups organized at their place of employment. The differences are not great, however, and different studies have found contradictory results (see Musick & Wilson, 2008, for a review).

Sex differences also exist in the types of organizations to which people donate money. Men tend to concentrate their charitable giving among a few organizations, while women tend to give smaller amounts to a larger number of groups (Andreoni et al., 2003; Brown, 2005; Piper & Schnepf, 2008). Women are more likely to donate to education (Rooney, Brown, & Mesch, 2007) and human services charities (Marx, 2000), whereas men are more likely to donate money to sports and recreational groups (Andreoni et al., 2003). Research is divided on whether women or men give more to religious charities (Brown & Ferris, 2007; Piper & Schnepf, 2008; Regnerus, Smith, & Sikkink, 1998; Yen, 2002).

Gender Differences in the Reasons for Volunteering and Charitable Giving

Following Wilson and Musick (1997), I divide the causes of charitable giving and volunteering into three categories: motivation, resources, and social capital. Motivation includes empathy, religiosity, generative concern, moral obligation, and prosocial role identity; resources include income, wealth, education, and free time; and social capital includes trust and social networks.

Motivation. Scholars have debated the issue of gender differences in moral thinking for decades, beginning with Kohlberg's (1981) work on moral reasoning. Kohlberg found that men scored higher on his scale of sophistication in moral reasoning. Feminist scholars argued that these findings did not show that men were morally superior but that women followed "a different voice" in morality (Gilligan, 1982), placing more value on caring and relationships than on abstract moral principles.

Subsequent research found that women actually score as well as men on Kohlberg's moral reasoning measures and also affirmed Gilligan's claim that women score higher on measures of caring (Skoe, Cumberland, Eisenberf, Hansen, & Perry, 2002). Women score higher than men on measures of empathic concern (Davis, 1994; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998), prosocial role identity (Piliavin & Callero, 1991; Lee, Piliavin, & Call, 1999), moral obligation (Lee et al., 1999; Nock, Kingston, & Holian, 2008; Schwartz, 1977; Schwartz & Flieshman, 1978), and religiosity (Cnaan, Kasternakis, & Wineburg, 1993; Musick & Wilson, 2008). On Clary and Snyder's "Volunteer Functions Inventory," which lists six motivations for volunteering, women score higher on all six scales (Clary et al. 1998; Clary & Snyder, 1991). Although men do not score higher on any measures of motivation to help others, they do score equally high on generative concern (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1998) and helpfulness (Penner & Finkelstein, 1998; Penner, Fritzsche, Craiger, & Freifeld, 1995). Data from he World Values Survey shows that, across cultures, women are more likely to believe that service to others is important, to support the provision of basic human needs and the elimination of income inequalities, and to support a larger government role in reducing poverty (Themudo, 2009).

Scholars agree that women score higher on most psychological measures of caring but differ on the extent to which they attribute this to biological differences (Rhoads,

2004; Udry, Morris, & Kavenock, 1995) or social construction (Chodorow, 1978, 1989; Gilligan, 1982). Others argue that these "nature–nurture" debates set up a false dichotomy and that biology and social influences interact in complex ways to create gender differences (Eagly & Koenig, 2006; Fausto-Sterling, 1985; Rossi, 1985).

Social capital. Social capital, defined as trust and social networks, is an important predictor of volunteering and charitable giving and an area in which men tend to have the advantage. Social capital encourages volunteering and charitable giving in a number of ways (Brown & Ferris, 2007; Musick & Wilson, 2008; Wilson & Musick, 1997). Person-to-person appeals are one of the most common ways that organizations recruit volunteers and donors (Independent Sector, 2001), and people with broad social networks are more likely to be asked to give their money or time. People who have a strong sense of trust feel more solidarity with other people and feel more inclined to help them, and are also less inhibited by concerns about others taking advantage of their generosity (Brown & Ferris, 2007; Wilson, 2000). Participation in religious institutions and service-oriented voluntary associations involve individuals in social networks in which norms of helping are shared among members. Even if members of these networks feel little internal motivation to give money or time to a cause, they are subjected to external pressure and encouragement to do so (Lee et al., 1999).

Norris and Inglehart (2006) have examined gender differences in social capital using international data from the 2001 World Values Survey and U.S. data from the 2000 Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey. They found that men in the United States were slightly more likely to belong to a voluntary association although nearly all men (92%) and women (88%) belonged to at least one. On the other hand, women score slightly higher on measures of social trust. Gender differences in voluntary association participation vary by the type of organization. In the United States, men are more likely to belong to sports and hobby clubs, veterans' groups, professional organizations, labor unions, neighborhood associations, and political groups. Women were more likely to belong to seniors' associations, religious groups, fine arts organizations, parent and educational groups, and charities. Men and women were equally likely to belong to ethnic, nationality, and civil rights organizations, youth organizations, service clubs, fraternities and sororities, and self-help groups.

Resources. On average, men have more of most of the resources that enable people to give of their money and time. Historically, men have had greater access to education than women. As education gives people skills that are useful in volunteer work, men are more likely to be asked to volunteer. Men also earn more money than women, so they have more money to give to charity. Only in regard to free time do women have a potential advantage over men in resources, as women tend to work fewer hours than men. However, women spend more time on housework and child care than men, and more time helping family members and friends, so they have less time available for formal volunteer work than their lower hours worked might indicate (Gerstel, 2000, Hook, 2004). Taniguchi (2006) found that women who work part-time are more likely to volunteer than women who work full-time, while there were no statistically significant differences in volunteering between men employed part-time and men employed

full-time. On the other hand, unemployed men were less likely than employed men to volunteer, but for women, being unemployed made no difference.

In summary, the existing research shows that women are more motivated than men to help others, but engage in only slightly more charitable giving and volunteering than men. Gender differences in resources and social networks may explain why male and female participation in volunteering and charitable giving is nearly equal. This article tests this hypothesis on nationally representative survey data, combining measures of motivations, social capital, and resources in a single study.

Theory and Hypotheses

From the existing literature, one can theorize that women are more motivated to help others than men, but that men may have more social and human capital, which compensates for their lower motivation. This article tests this theory through three hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Women will score higher than men on measures of the psychological traits, motivations, and values that predict charitable giving and volunteering.
Hypothesis 2: Men will score higher than women on the measures of social capital that predict charitable giving and volunteering.
Hypothesis 3: Men will score higher than women on the measures of resources that predict charitable giving and volunteering.

This article will also explore the possibility that some predictors are more important for one gender than the other. As there has been no previous work on this issue, this work is exploratory, and no specific hypotheses are advanced.

Data and Method

Sample

This study analyzes data from the 1995 Midlife in the United States (MIDUS) survey, which was given to a nationally representative random sample of noninstitutionalized, English-speaking adults aged 25 to 74 in 1995. Both telephone and written survey questionnaires were used, and the estimated overall response rate was 60.8%. The MIDUS dataset contains weights to adjust for the biases related to the characteristics of nonresponders, and these weights were used in the analysis. There were 3,032 respondents to the main sample of the MIDUS survey. More complete information about the MIDUS sample and response rate is contained in the MIDUS codebook, available from the MIDUS web site at midmac.med.harvard.edu/research.html.

Although the MIDUS survey data are now 15 years old, the MIDUS data are still the best currently available to answer the question of this article, as no survey since 1995 has contained equally good measures of volunteering, charitable giving, motivations, resources, and social capital. For example, the recent Center on Philanthropy Panel

Study of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics has excellent measures of volunteering and charitable giving but few measures of motivations and social capital. There is a 2005 wave of the MIDUS panel study, but unfortunately the attrition rate between 1995 and 2005 is 50%. As agreeing to participate in the second wave of a panel study is a prosocial behavior similar to volunteering and charitable giving, there is good reason to believe that the high attrition rate would skew the results.

Dependent Variables

This study examines three dependent variables: volunteering, religious giving, and secular charitable giving. The MIDUS survey asked respondents to write in how many hours they spend volunteering each month, with separate categories for educational and youth volunteering, health and medical volunteering, and other (excluding political) volunteering. I combined these into a single category. MIDUS asked respondents how much money they or their family members donate to religious institutions and charities in a typical month, and how much they donate to secular charities. Preliminary analysis showed that the causes of these two behaviors were distinct, so I kept them as two separate dependent variables. Table 1 shows means and standard deviations for volunteering for the entire sample, of whom 1,713 are women and 1,318 are men. Table 1 shows means and standard deviations for charitable giving for the 966 unmarried respondents in the sample, of whom 621 are women and 345 are men.

I excluded married respondents in the analyses of charitable giving because MIDUS asks respondents to report their household charitable giving. This makes it impossible to separate donations made by wives and husbands, so to compare sex differences one must only examine unmarried individuals. This raises additional complications as the unmarried women in the sample are older (45.6 years), on average, than the unmarried men (41.6 years). The different mean ages of these groups reflects the fact that women live longer and marry younger, and are therefore more likely to become single through widowhood: 21.4% of the unmarried women in the sample are 60 or older, compared to only 13.6% of the unmarried men. I included a variable for age in the regression equations to account for this, and I also divided the sample into 10-year age cohorts to test whether gender differences varied by age.

Independent Variables

I follow Wilson and Musick (1997) in dividing the causes of helping behaviors into motivation, resources, and social capital. The MIDUS survey has five measures of motivation: agreeableness, moral obligation, prosocial role identity, generative concern, and subjective religiosity. It has six measures of resources: education, income, hours spent working, hours spent in informal helping, hours spent on household chores , and the presence of children in the household. MIDUS has three measures of social capital, attendance at meetings of voluntary associations, attendance at religious services, and trust in one's local community. Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations for these variables.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Range	*M* or % yes	*SD*
Volunteering (*N* = 3032)			
All volunteering (% yes)	0-1	36.8	n/a
All volunteering (hr/month)	0-80	5.0	11.4
Donations (unmarried respondents only, *N* = 966)			
Religious giving (% yes)	0-1	29.2	n/a
Religious giving (US$/month)	0-1,000	22.54	81.75
Secular giving (% yes)	0-1	33.5	n/a
Secular giving (US$/month)	0-1,000	8.25	36.74
Independent variables (total sample, *N* = 3,032)			
Motivations			
Agreeableness	1-4	3.5	0.5
Moral obligation	0-10	5.7	2.4
Prosocial role identity	0-10	6.6	2.2
Generative concern	1-4	2.8	0.6
Subjective religiosity	1-4	2.8	0.7
Resources			
Education (ordinal scale)	1-12	6.2	2.4
Household income (in thousands)	0-250	62.3	50.9
Employed full-time	0-1	60.7%	n/a
Employed part-time	0-1	13.5%	n/a
Hours/week household chores	0-100	14.2	13.1
Hours/month informal helping	0-100	20.4	28.0
Hours/week working	0-80	31.9	22.6
Minor children in household	0-1	44.4%	n/a
Children 0-6 in household	0-1	19.4%	n/a
Children 7-13 in household	0-1	25.6%	n/a
Children 14-17 in household	0-1	18.2%	n/a
Trust and social networks			
Attendance at voluntary association meetings (times/month)	0-15	2.1	3.5
Religious services attendance (times/month)	0-15	2.3	3.1
Neighborhood trust	1-4	3.4	0.6

Motivations. Personality traits that motivate volunteering include empathic concern, moral obligation, prosocial role identity, generative concern, and religiosity. While MIDUS does not have a measure of empathic concern, it does measure the "big five" personality trait of "agreeableness" (John, 1990), which is conceptually and theoretically linked to empathy (Bekkers, 2005; Rossi, 2001) and correlates with empathic concern (Ashton, Paunonen, Helmes, & Jackson, 1998; Del Barrio, Aluja, & Garcia, 2004; Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997; Penner, 2002; Van Der Zee, Thijs, & Shakel, 2002).

The MIDUS survey gave respondents a list of words describing personality traits and asked them how much a list of words describes them, on a 4-point scale ranging from *not at all* to *a lot*. Five words on the list measure the respondent's score on the agreeableness personality scale, "helpful," "warm," "caring," "softhearted," and "sympathetic." Respondents' scores on these five variables were averaged to create a single agreeableness index, with a Cronbach's alpha measurement of reliability of .805.

MIDUS measured moral obligation through a set of questions that asked respondents to rate how obligated they would be to help in a hypothetical situation, on a scale of 0 to 10. One question asked how obligated the respondent would feel "to volunteer time or money to social causes you support" and another asked how obligated the respondent would feel "to collect contributions for heart or cancer research if asked to do so." These questions correlated at $r = .53$, and I averaged them to create a single measure of moral obligation to engage in charitable giving and volunteer work.

MIDUS measured prosocial role identity through a single question, "How would you rate your contribution to the welfare and well-being of other people these days? Take into account all that you do, in terms of time, money, or concern, on your job, and for your family, friends, and the community." Response categories for this question range from 0, *the least possible contribution*, to 10, *the greatest possible contribution*. The average response was 6.6, and the standard deviation was 2.2.

Generative concern, a concept derived from Erikson's (1980) life stage theory, is "the concern for and commitment to promoting the next generation, through parenting, teaching, mentoring, and generating products and outcomes that aim to benefit youth and foster the development and well-being of individuals and social systems that will outlive the self" (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1998, p. 9). MIDUS incorporated a six-item reduction of the Loyola Generativity Scale (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992), a commonly used measure of generative concern, which asked respondents to what degree a set of statements described them, on a scale of 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*a lot*). The statements were "Others would say that you have made unique contributions to society," "You have important skills you can pass along to others," "Many people come to you for advice," "You feel that other people need you," "You have had a good influence on the lives of many people," and "You like to teach things to people." The Cronbach's alpha measure of reliability for this scale was .84.

I created an index of subjective strength and intensity of religious feeling by averaging together four questions measured on a 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*a lot*) scale. The questions asked respondents how religious they were, how spiritual they were, how important religion was to them, and how important spirituality was to them. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .87.

Resources. Education and free time are resources for volunteering, and wealth and income are resources for charitable giving. MIDUS measures education using a 12-point ordinal scale, ranging from a primary school education to a doctorate or equivalent. I measured free time through three variables: hours spent working, hours spent helping friends and family, and hours spent on housework. Unfortunately MIDUS does not have a question about hours spent on child care, so it is impossible to estimate whether

men or women in the MIDUS sample have more free time overall. However, MIDUS does record the presence of minor children in the household and also breaks down this measure into age groups, with dummy variables for the presence of children aged newborn to 6 years, 7 to 13, and 14 to 17. Out of the entire sample, 44.4% respondents had minor children in their household, and 34.2% of unmarried women and 30.1% of unmarried men had children living with them at least part of the time.

Social capital. The MIDUS survey does not directly measure the strength and size of respondents' social networks, but it does have questions about respondents' attendance at religious services and the meetings of voluntary associations. As participation in these activities brings individuals into contact with the kinds of social networks that promote charitable giving and volunteering, these variables form a good proxy measure of social networks. The MIDUS survey asked respondents to write in how many meetings they attend each month in three types of voluntary associations: labor unions and professional associations, sports and recreation groups, and all other groups. The variables were added together to make a single measure of participation in voluntary associations, and this measure was truncated at the 97th percentile, or 15 meetings per month, to prevent outliers from biasing the regression analysis. MIDUS measured religious attendance through a single question that asked respondents how many religious services they attended in a typical month, which I truncated at the 99% level (15 services per month).

The MIDUS survey does not have a question that measures trust in society or other people in general, but it uses a four-item measure of trust and integration into one's community derived from Keyes (1998). Questions on this measure ask respondents to what extent they trust their neighbors, feel safe in their neighborhoods, and feel that they can call on their neighbors for help if needed. This scale has a Cronbach's alpha of .68.

Method of Analysis

I first used regression analysis to determine whether the independent variables used in this study actually predicted volunteering and charitable giving. I then used *t* tests to determine whether men and women differed in their levels of volunteering and charitable giving, and whether they differed in their scores on the predictors of volunteering and charitable giving. Finally, I used interaction terms in regression analysis to determine whether there gender differences in how the predictor variables correlated with charitable giving and volunteering.

As volunteering and charitable giving are left-censored data, with most respondents contributing no money or time to charity, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression is not suitable. Instead, I used Tobit regression (Breen, 1995) on the volunteering and giving variables, truncated at 99th percentile to prevent outliers from biasing the coefficients. All respondents who volunteered more than 80 hr per month were recoded as 80, and all donors who gave more than US$1,000 were recoded as US$1,000. I also recoded the variables as binary (0 = *no volunteering or giving* and 1 = *any volunteering or giving*) for use in logistic regression.

The logistic and Tobit regressions returned similar results for statistical significance, and I report the slope coefficients from Tobit regression and the Nagelkerke pseudo-R squared values from logistic regression (Nagelkerke, 1991) To test for gender differences in the slope coefficients of the independent variables, I ran a series of Tobit regressions with each independent variable, a dummy variable for gender, and an interaction term of each independent variable and gender.

Findings

Table 2 shows differences in the quantity and the correlates of volunteering and charitable giving for both the total sample and for the unmarried respondents. The results are similar for both groups, but some of the differences in the unmarried sample are less statistically significant or nonsignificant due to the smaller sample size.

Sex Differences in Helping Behaviors

Women volunteered at a higher rate and for more hours than men. A greater proportion of women (41.6%) than men (34.5%) volunteered, and this difference was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Among those who did volunteer, women volunteered an average of 14.0 hr per month, more than the male average of 12.9 hr although this difference was not statistically significant. There were no statistically significant differences between the percentage of unmarried men and women who gave money to charity. Among those who did give to charity, men gave significantly ($p = .002$) more to religious charities (US$100.20) than women (US$65.23), but there was no difference between unmarried men and women in the amount donated to secular charities (Table 2).

Gender Differences in the Causes of Behaviors

Hypothesis 1, that women would score higher than men on measures of prosocial traits, motivations, and values, was strongly supported by the data. Women scored significantly higher than men on agreeableness, subjective religiosity, prosocial role identity, and sense of moral obligation. Although there was no statistically significant gender difference in generative concern, men did not score higher on any of these measures.

Hypothesis 2, that men possess more resources for volunteering and charitable giving, was partially supported. Men had significantly more education than women, giving them more of the skills needed for volunteering, and men had higher incomes, giving them more money to contribute to charity. Gender differences in free time are impossible to determine from the MIDUS data. Men worked significantly more hours than women, but women spend more time on housework and helping friends and family. When these three variables are added together, men spent more time on work, helping, and housework (53.4 hr per week) than women did (49.9 hr per week). MIDUS does not measure time spent caring for children, and if these hours were added to the total, women would probably have fewer free hours than men.

Table 2. Sex and Gender Differences in Independent and Dependent Variables

Variable	Range	*M* or % yes (all men)	*M* or % yes (all women)	*M* or % yes (unmarried men)	*M* or % yes (unmarried women)
Volunteering ($N = 3,032$)					
All volunteering (% yes)	0-1	34.5	41.6**	27.0	33.0*
All volunteering (hours/month)[a]	0-80	12.9	14.0	13.9	14.9
Donations (unmarried respondents only, $N = 966$)					
Religious giving (% yes)	0-1	—	—	29.8	28.0
Religious giving (US$/month)[a]	0-1,000	—	—	100.20***	65.23
Secular giving (% yes)	0-1	—	—	32.0	34.3
Secular giving (US$/month)[a]	0-1,000	—	—	25.37	24.21
Independent variables (total sample, $N = 3,032$)					
Personality traits and values					
Agreeableness	1-4	3.4	3.6****	3.4	3.6****
Moral obligation	0-10	5.4	6.0****	5.6	6.5****
Prosocial role identity	0-10	6.3	6.9****	6.1	6.7****
Generative concern	1-4	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8
Subjective religiosity	1-4	2.7	3.0****	2.6	2.9****
Resources					
Education (ordinal scale)	1-12	6.4****	6.1	6.5****	6.0
Household income (in thousands)	0-250	69.9****	56.6	52.1****	34.7
Employed full-time	0-1	75.2****	49.5	74.0****	56.8
Employed part-time	0-1	7.7	17.9****	28.1	34.1**
Hours/week household chores	0-100	8.9	18.8****	7.0	12.8***
Hours/month informal helping	0-100	18.1	22.2****	17.2	24.0****
Hours/week working for pay	0-80	39.5****	26.1	38.8****	28.5
Minor children in household	0-1	45.9%	43.2%	30.1%	34.2%
Children 0-6 in household	0-1	20.3%	18.7%	10.9%	11.4%
Children 7-13 in household	0-1	27.5%**	24.2%	17.0%	20.5%
Children 14-17 in household	0-1	18.6%	18.0%	10.4%	16.9%***
Trust and social networks					
Attendance at voluntary association meetings (times/month)	0-15	2.5**	2.0	2.3*	1.9
Religious services attendance (times/month)	0-15	2.0	2.6****	1.4	2.1****
Neighborhood trust	1-4	3.4****	3.3	3.3	3.2

Note: Statistical significance of gender differences measured with *t* tests.
[a]Mean calculated only for those respondents who volunteer or give (respondents who do 0 are excluded).
*$p \leq .10$. **$p \leq .05$. ***$p \leq .01$. ****$p \leq .001$.

Although the presence of children might reduce volunteering through the demands they place on their parents' time, the data show that the presence of children in the household actually correlates positively with volunteering. The strongest correlation is for children aged 7 to 13, followed by children aged 14 to 17. Children this age are involved in many activities through school, places of worship, and other institutions, and these institutions encourage parents to volunteer. The positive effect of this institutional participation seems to be stronger than the negative effect of children's demands on parents' time. Having children 6 and under has no significant relationship with volunteering, presumably because the positive effects of institutional involvement are fully balanced out by the negative effects of the additional demands that young children place on parents' time. Separate analyses for married fathers and married mothers show that these results held for both genders. For single parents, however, only mothers of school-aged children were more likely to volunteer. For single fathers, the presence of children of any age had no statistically significant relationship with volunteering.

Hypothesis 3, that men have more social capital than women, also received partial support. Men scored significantly higher on the MIDUS measure of local trust, and men participated more in secular voluntary associations. Women, however, attended religious services more often and therefore were likely to have broader social networks through religious institutions.

Relationship Between Independent Variables and Prosocial Behaviors

Table 3 shows the slope coefficients and significance levels from bivariate and multivariate Tobit regressions of each of the three dependent variables. The first column shows the slope coefficients and significance levels for each variable in a bivariate regression, and the second column shows the slope coefficients and significance levels for a multivariate equation containing all the independent variables.

Most of the independent variables were statistically significant predictors of all three outcomes at the bivariate level. Exceptions included the religiosity variables, which predicted volunteering and religious giving but not secular giving. As one would expect, variables measuring the resource of free time (employment, chores, and informal helping) correlated with volunteering but not with charitable giving. Surprisingly, the findings did not support the perspective that time is a scarce resource that individuals allocate to volunteering, household chores, and helping friends and family. The contrary was true: informal helping, household chores, and the presence of children in the household all correlated positively with volunteering, indicating that people who do more of this type of helping do more volunteering also.

There was a relationship between employment hours and volunteering, but this relationship was not linear. Adding a quadratic term (work hours squared) also failed to find significant results, but using dummy variables for part-time (1 to 34 hr) and full-time (35+ hr) employment did produce significant results. Part-time employees

Table 3. Tobit regression

	Volunteering (full sample)		Religious giving (nonmarried only)		Secular giving (nonmarried only)	
Variable	Bivariate	Full model	Bivariate	Full model	Bivariate	Full model
Personality						
Agreeableness	4.30****	−2.55**	41.69***	−26.06*	*ns*	*ns*
Moral obligation	3.04****	1.91****	14.18****	*ns*	6.25****	4.73****
Prosocial role identity	3.00****	1.43****	19.31****	*ns*	6.47****	*ns*
Generative concern	9.55****	3.84****	52.55****	*ns*	24.56****	*ns*
Subjective religiosity	4.42****	*ns*	112.22****	78.04****	*ns*	*ns*
Resources						
Education	2.03****	0.80****	15.73****	4.74*	9.23****	3.05****
Household income	0.04****	*ns*	0.73****	0.81****	0.54****	0.28****
Employed full-time	−3.46****	−3.03**	*ns*	38.70**	19.07***	*ns*
Employed part-time	5.64****	4.83****	*ns*	*ns*	*ns*	*ns*
Household chores	0.20****	0.12***	*ns*	*ns*	*ns*	*ns*
Informal helping	0.07****	*ns*	0.51**	*ns*	*ns*	*ns*
Children at home	6.02****	6.24****	*ns*	*ns*	*ns*	*ns*
Children 0-6		—		—		—
Children 7-13		—		—		—
Children 14-17		—		—		—
Social capital						
Meeting attendance	1.96****	1.44****	8.69****	*ns*	4.67****	2.11****
Services attendance	1.90****	1.24****	31.64****	21.15****	*ns*	*ns*
Neighborhood trust	6.18****	1.87**	41.32***	*ns*	23.07****	*ns*
Controls						
Age	−.08**	*ns*	*ns*	*ns*	*ns*	0.50****
African American	4.63***	*ns*	48.18***	*ns*	*ns*	*ns*
Hispanic	−5.87*	−5.63*	*ns*	65.83*	*ns*	*ns*
Asian American	*ns*	*ns*	*ns*	*ns*	*ns*	−71.54*

Note: *ns* = not statistically significant.
*$p \leq .10$. **$p \leq .05$.***$p \leq .01$.****$p \leq .001$.

were significantly more likely to volunteer than either full-time employees or people who do not work. It seems that the social networks that come with paid employment, combined with the free time that part-time employees have, predict the highest levels of volunteering.

Most of the independent variables remained statistically significant in the full models. Exceptions for volunteering were subjective religiosity, income, and informal helping. For religious giving, subjective religiosity and religious attendance were such

strong predictors that moral obligation, prosocial role identity, generative concern, informal helping, attendance at voluntary association meetings, and trust became nonsignificant predictors of religious giving in the full model. For secular giving, generative concern, full-time employment, and trust became nonsignificant in the full model. Agreeableness remained significant in the full model for volunteering and religious giving but changed signs.

The Nagelkerke pseudo-*R* squared statistic from logistic regression (Nagelkerke, 1991) allows one to estimate the total predictive power of all the independent variables and to compare the predictive power of the variables that favor men and those that favor women. When combined into a single logistic regression equation, the independent and control variables best predicted religious giving (Nagelkerke pseudo-*R* squared = .505), followed by volunteering (pseudo-*R* squared = .359) and secular giving (pseudo-*R* squared = .163). The Nagelkerke pseudo-*R* squared values for a regression equation containing only the variables in which women have an advantage (agreeableness, moral obligation, role identity, subjective religiosity, religious services attendance, and household chores, informal helping, and employment status for volunteering) were .188 for volunteering, .416 for religious giving, and .029 for secular giving. Nagelkerke pseudo-*R* squared values for the variables in which men have an advantage (education, income, attendance at voluntary association meetings, neighborhood trust, and employment status for charitable giving), were .187 for volunteering, .060 for religious giving, and .142 for secular giving.

Gender Differences in the Importance of Predictors

There were only a few statistically significant interactions between the independent variables and gender but nearly all of them indicated that the causal variable had a stronger effect on men's behavior. Religious attendance was a stronger predictor of religious giving for men (slope = 14.32, $p < .001$), and local trust was a stronger predictor of volunteering (slope = 3.00, $p = .071$) for men. Moral obligation was a stronger predictor of both volunteering (slope = 0.09, $p = .038$) and religious giving (slope = 16.74, $p = .006$) for men. Part time employment was a stronger predictor of volunteering (slope = 8.07, $p = .005$) and religious giving (slope = 52.00, $p = .003$) for men. For women, full time employment was a stronger predictor (slope = 30.22, $p = .041$) of secular charitable giving.

Variation in Gender Differences by Age

As a larger proportion of the single women in the sample were 60 or older, part of the difference in charitable giving among single men and women in the sample might have actually been a spurious function of age. To test this possibility, I excluded all respondents aged 60 and older from the sample of single adults and examined gender differences in charitable giving on this new sample. There was still no statistically significant difference between men and women in the percentage who gave to religious and secular charities, and no difference in the amount given.

Discussion

The main innovation of this study is the hypothesis that men's advantages in resources and social capital cancel out women's advantage in motivations. The data supported the second half of this hypothesis, that women are more motivated to help others. Women scored significantly higher on measures of agreeableness, religiosity, moral obligation, and prosocial role identity.

However, the data only partially supported the new hypotheses of the study, that men's advantages in resources and social capital balance out women's advantages in motivations. In regard to resources, men have more income and therefore more money to donate to charity. They also have more education, which makes them more skilled and desirable volunteers. However, women are more likely to work part-time, which is associated with more volunteering. Furthermore, women's greater involvement in informal helping and housework does not seem to prevent them from volunteering, as these activities correlate positively with volunteering. Although the data contained no direct measure of hours spent on child care, the presence of school-aged children correlated positively with volunteering among married mothers and fathers and among single mothers. Men also only have a partial advantage in social capital. Men have broader secular social networks and more local trust, but women have more access to the social networks that come with religious participation.

Nearly all of the interaction terms favored men: religious attendance, local trust, moral obligation, and part-time employment were better predictors of men's prosocial behavior than women's. As one of the anonymous reviewers pointed out, this finding supports the theoretical proposition of this article, as it shows that women are "more inclined to help," but men "need specific hooks to draw them in." Since men are less inclined to help to begin with, the "specific hooks" have a stronger pull on men than on women.

Overall, men possess only a slight advantage in resources and social capital, whereas women possess a large advantage in prosocial motivation. One would expect, therefore, for women to do significantly more formal helping work than men. This is true for volunteering but not religious or charitable giving. The lack of difference in secular giving makes sense because the motivational factors upon which women have an advantage have a weak or nonsignificant relationship with secular giving, while the factors upon which men have an advantage (income, education, and participation in voluntary associations) have a strong and significant relationship with secular giving. Accordingly, men's advantage in resources and social capital balance out women's advantage in motivations, so men's and women's contributions to charitable giving are similar.

With religious giving, the reasons for gender differences are still unclear. Women possess an advantage in the most important predictors of religious giving, subjective religiosity and attendance at religious services, yet roughly equal proportions of men and women donate to religious institutions, and male donors gave significantly more money. Men's advantage in income seems to explain why male donors gave more

money, but it is not clear why men and women were equally likely to donate. Further research is needed to explain this part of the puzzle.

This study has a number of features that limit the applicability of its findings. The MIDUS study takes individuals as the unit of analysis, when in fact many people make decisions about charitable giving and volunteering as households. For charitable giving, this article attempted to compensate for the fact that couples make decisions about charitable giving together by examining only unmarried respondents, but there may be gender-specific correlates of being unmarried that bias the results. The MIDUS sample, while large and nationally representative, is cross-sectional, with only a moderate (60.8%) estimated overall response rate. Changes in society between 1995 and the present may limit the applicability of these findings to current conditions, and the findings can only be generalized to residents of the United States.

While this article advances the state of knowledge on gender differences in volunteering and giving, many unanswered questions remain. First, it is not clear why men, who are less religious than women, are about equally likely to give money to religious institutions. Second, the independent variables examined in this study explain a good deal of the variation in volunteering and religious giving, but relatively little of the variation in secular giving. More knowledge about the predictors of secular giving is needed as well as how the effects of these predictors vary by gender.

The findings of this research pose an interesting set of questions about the future of volunteering and charitable giving. As women's education, income, and labor force participation increase, will women greatly outpace men in their level of volunteering and charitable giving? Or will cultural changes in gender norms affect men as well, causing them to become more motivated to engage in prosocial actions? In an attempt to answer this question, I analyzed gender differences in prosocial motivations by age cohort, dividing the MIDUS sample into people in their 20s, their 30s, and so on. I found that there was just as large a distance in prosocial motivation between the youngest men and women as the oldest group. On the other hand, men in their 20s and 30s in 1995 did not participate more in voluntary associations and were not significantly better educated than women. This indicates that the gap between men and women's volunteering and giving may widen as these generations grow older, not narrow. However, the youngest people in the MIDUS sample were born in 1970, which may be too long ago for cultural changes in the way children are raised to have any effect on male prosocial motivations. It is possible that a study of people born after 1970 might find that gender differences in prosocial motivation have narrowed somewhat.

In conclusion, this article found strong differences in the variables that cause volunteering and charitable giving but only modest differences in the behaviors themselves. The hypothesis of this paper, that men's advantages in resources and social capital would cancel out women's advantages in prosocial motivation, was supported in the case of volunteering and secular giving, but fails to explain the lack of difference in religious giving. Future research should examine the causes of male religious giving, and the causes of secular giving among both men and women. Future research should

also examine whether gender differences in prosocial motivations and behavior are changing among more recent generations.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

References

Andreoni, J., Brown, E., & Rischall, I. (2003). Charitable giving by married couples: Who decides and why does it matter? *Journal of Human Resources, 38*, 111-133.

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

Bekkers, R. (2005). Participation in voluntary associations: Relations with resources, personality, and political values. *Political Psychology, 26*, 439-454.

Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. 2007. *Generosity and philanthropy: A literature review*. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://papers.ssrn.com/s013/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1015507

Breen, R. (1996). *Regression models: Censored, sample selected, or truncated data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brown, E. (2005). Married couples' charitable giving: Who and why. *New Directions in Philanthropic Fundraising, 50*, 69-80.

Brown, E., & Ferris, J. M. (2007). Social capital and philanthropy: An analysis of the impact of social capital on individual giving and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 36*, 85-99.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2009). *Volunteering in the United States, a supplement to the September 2009 Current Population Survey*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Labor. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/volun.pdf

Burgoyne, C. B., Young, B., & Walker, C. M. (2005). Deciding to give to charity: A focus group study in the context of the household economy. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 15*, 383-405.

Capek, M. E. S. (2005). Documenting women's giving: Biases, barriers, and benefits. In E. Clift (Ed.), *Women, philanthropy, and social change: Visions for a just society* (pp. 29-60). Medford, MA: Tufts University Press.

Chodorow, N. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering. Berkeley*: University of California Press.

Chodorow, N. (1989). *Feminism and psychoanalytic theory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Clary, G., & Snyder, M. (1991). A functional analysis of altruism and prosocial behavior: The case of volunteerism. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 12*, 119-148.

Clary, G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., et al. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 1516-1530.

Cnaan, R. A., Kasternakis, A., & Wineburg, R. J. (1993). Religious people, religious congregations, and volunteerism in human services: Is there a link? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 22*, 33-51.

Daniels, A. K. (1988). *Invisible careers: Women civic leaders from the volunteer world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Davis, M. H. 1994. *Empathy: A social psychological approach*. Madison, WI: WCB Brown and Benchmark.

Dekker, P., & van den Broek, A. (1998). Civil society in comparative perspective: Involvement in voluntary associations in North America and Western Europe. *Voluntas, 9*, 11-38.

Del Barrio, V., Aluja, A., & Garcia, L. F. (2004). Relationship between empathy and the big five personality traits in a sample of Spanish adolescents. *Social Behavior and Personality, 32*, 677-682.

Eagly, A. H., & Koenig, A. M. (2006). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: Implication for prosocial behavior. In K. Dindia & D. J. Canary (Eds.), *Sex differences and similarities in communication* (pp. 161-178). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (2008). Differences in the economics decisions of men and women: Experimental evidence. In C. R. Plott & V. L. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of experimental economics results, Volume 1* (pp. 1061-1076). Linacre House, UK: North-Holland.

Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1998). Prosocial development. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Volume 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed., pp. 779-862). New York: Wiley.

Erikson, E. (1980). *Identity and the life cycle*. New York: Norton.

Fausto-Sterling, A. (1985). *Myths of gender: Biological theories about women and men*. New York: Basic Books.

Gerstel, N. (2000). The third shift: Gender and care work outside the home. *Qualitative Sociology, 23*, 467-483.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Graziano, W., & Eisenberg, N. (1997). Agreeableness: A dimension of personality. In R. Hogan, J. W. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 795-825). New York: Academic Press.

Hook, J. L. (2004). Reconsidering the division of household labor: Incorporating volunteer work and informal support. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 66*, 101-117.

Independent Sector. (2001). *Giving and volunteering in the United States: Findings from a national survey*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

John, O. P. 1990. The "big five" factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 66-100). New York: Guilford.

Kaminer, W. (1984). *Women volunteering: The pleasure, pain, and politics of unpaid work from 1830 to the present*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press.

Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 61*, 121-137.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Lee, L., Piliavin, J. A., & Call, V. R. A. (1999). Giving time, blood, and money: Differences and similarities. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 62*, 276-290.

Marx, J. D. (2000). Women and human services giving. *Social Work, 45*, 27-38.

McAdams, D. P., & de St. Aubin, E. (1992). A theory of generativity and its assessment through self-report, behavioral acts, and narrative themes in autobiography. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 1003-1015.

McAdams, D. P., & de St. Aubin, E. (1998). *Generativity and adult development: How and why we care for the next generation*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Mesch, D. J., Rooney, P. M., Steinberg, K. S., & Denton, B. (2006). The effects of race, gender, and marital status on giving and volunteering in Indiana. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 35*, 565-587.

Musick, M. A., & Wilson, J. (2008). *Volunteers: A social profile*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Nagelkerke, N. J. D. (1991). A note on a general definition of the coefficient of determination. *Biometrika, 78*, 691-692.

Nock, S. L., Kingston, P. W., & Holian, L. M. (2008). The distribution of obligations. In A. Booth, A. C. Crouter, S. Bianchi, & J. A. Seltzer (Eds.), *Intergenerational caregiving* (pp. 333-340). Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2006). Gendering social capital: Bowling in women's leagues? In B. O'Neill & E. Gidengil (Eds.), *Gender and social capital* (pp. 73-98). New York: Routledge.

Penner, L. A. (2002). Dispositional and organizational influences on sustained volunteerism: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*, 447-467.

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

Penner, L. A., Fritzsche, B. A., Craiger, J. P., & Freifeld, T. (1995). Measuring the prosocial personality. In J. N. Butcher & C. D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Advances in personality assessment*, Vol. 10 (pp. 147-163). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Piliavin, J. A., & Callero, P. (1991). *Giving blood: The development of an altruistic identity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Piper, G., & Schnepf, S. V. (2008). Gender differences in charitable giving in Great Britain. *Voluntas, 19*, 103-124.

Regnerus, M. D., Smith, C., & Sikkink, D. (1998). Who gives to the poor? The influence of religious tradition and political location on the personal generosity of Americans toward the poor. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 37*, 481-493.

Rhoads, S. E. (2004). *Taking sex differences seriously*. San Francisco: Encounter Books.

Rooney, P., Steinberg, K. S., & Schervish, P. G. (2004). Methodology is destiny: The effect of survey prompts on reported levels of giving and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 33*, 628-654.

Rooney, P. M., Mesch, D. J., Chin, W., & Steinberg, K. S. (2005). The effects of race, gender, and survey methodologies on giving in the US. *Economics Letters, 86*, 173-180.

Rooney, P., Brown, E., & Mesch, D. (2007). Who decides in giving to education? A study of charitable giving by married couples. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 7*, 229-242.

Rossi, A. (Ed.). (1985). *Gender and the life course*. New York: Aldine.

Rossi, A. S. (Ed.). (2001). *Caring and doing for others: Social responsibility in the domains of work, family, and community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schwartz, S. H. (1977). Normative influences on altruism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 10*, 221-279.

Schwartz, S. H., & Fleishman, J. A. (1978). Personal norms and the mediation of legitimacy effects on helping. *Social Psychology, 41*, 306-315.

Skoe, E. E. A., Cumberland, A., Eisenberf, N., Hansen, K., & Perry, J. (2002). The influences of sex and gender-role identity on moral cognition and prosocial personality traits. *Sex Roles, 46*, 295-309.

Spain, D. (2001). *How women saved the city*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Taniguchi, H. (2006). Men's and women's volunteering: Gender differences in the effects of employment and family characteristics. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 35*, 83-101.

Udry, J. R., Morris, N. M., & Kavenock, J. (1995). Androgen effects on women's gendered behavior. *Journal of Biosocial Science, 27*, 359-368.

Van Der Zee, K., Thijs, M., & Schakel, L. (2002). The relationship of emotional intelligence with academic intelligence and the big five. *European Journal of Personality, 16*, 103-125.

Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 215-240.

Wilson, J., & Musick, M. (1997). Who cares? Towards an integrated theory of volunteer work. *American Sociological Review, 62*, 694-713.

Yen, S. T. (2002). An econometric analysis of household donations in the USA. *Applied Economics Letters, 9*, 837-841.

Bio

Christopher J. Einolf is a sociologist who studies altruism, volunteering, and charitable giving. He teaches at the School of Public Service at DePaul University.