



## An Investigation into Charitable Giving and Predictive Personality Constructs

Elliott Burke

Supervised by: Katie Dhingra

March 2015

## An Investigation into Charitable Giving and Predictive Personality Constructs

### ABSTRACT

Considering the current overreliance of charities on charitable donations, and the relatively little research on certain personality predictor variables (self-construal) of such charitable behaviours, the present research aimed to clarify the relationship between the personality construct self-construal and charitable giving. Assessing the predictive capacity of the construct whilst controlling for covariates (psychopathy, age, and religion). Additionally the researcher sought to compare levels of psychopathy and self-construals between male and female students and to examine bivariate associations between all variables within the general population ( $N= 134$ ). Via convenience sampling, 43 males and 91 females took part in an online questionnaire comprised of two separate well-established self-report measures, the Singelis self-construal scale and the Self-Report Psychopathy –Short Form. The questionnaire also included a measure for religious affiliation, charitable giving, age and gender. Independent T-tests were used as was Pearson's product moment and logistical multiple regression in order to assess the aforementioned aims. Findings demonstrate gender to be significantly associated with self-construal and psychopathy. Bivariate correlations revealed only self-construal to be significantly associated with charitable giving (specifically charitable donations). However multiple regression found no significant predictors of charitable giving, findings are discussed in terms of previous research and future research implications.

<b>KEY WORDS:</b>	CHARITABLE GIVING	SELF-CONSTRUAL	PSYCHOPATHY	PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOUR
-------------------	----------------------	----------------	-------------	------------------------

## Introduction

Given the current economic climate in the UK, the need for charitable giving has never been as important. A statement presently exemplified in the CAF (2015) report, demonstrating over three quarters of UK charities to have noted an increase in demand for their services over the past year. When considering this statistic in relation to the UK Civil Society Almanac (2014) article, which reported a 23% reduction of government funding to the voluntary sector in 2014, the chilling prospect of charities having to over-rely on charitable giving becomes a reality. With the reduction in government funding predicted to only increase this coming year (Third sector, 2015) it is no surprise that the former Minister for Civil Society, Nick Hurd, has stated a desperate need for an increase in the 'pool of charitable givers' (Ricketts, 2014). In an attempt to aid this quest the following investigation was undertaken, whereby certain personality factors (Self-construal, Psychopathy, Religious affiliation, gender and age) were measured in relation to Charitable Giving (Einolf, 2008) resultantly delineating which personal constructs are more conducive to charitable giving and what type of charitable giving are most associated with each variable.

Whilst Charitable giving is a topic of interest that has stimulated much research with regards to predictor variables of the behaviour, few studies consider the specific constructs discussed in this investigation, and those that do consider the constructs rarely look at the relationship with direct giving behaviours. For example, Skarmeas and Shabbir (2009) investigated self-construal and charitable behaviours, but focused on the relationship between charities and identity rather than actual charitable giving. Similarly, for psychopathic tendencies, research has focused on the emotions typical of a psychopath and its relation to pro-social behaviour (Einolf, 2008) rather than direct giving behaviours. Therefore, the investigation not only addresses a public wide concern but also fills a unique area of research that has largely gone unexplored.

### *Self-construal*

Markus and Kityama (1991) defined self-construal as an aspect of identity that refers to how people see themselves in relation to others. According to Markus and Kityama (1991) differences in self-construal can be conceptualised as defining points for two types of individual, the independent and the interdependent self. Oyserman (1998) adequately demonstrates the differences between the two constructs in his suggestion that the independent self refers to the personal, centralizing the individual, whilst the interdependent self refers to the social, highlighting the context. Consequently, such fundamental differences between the constructs effects an individual's cognitions, emotions and motives. As evidenced in van Horne, Pöhlman, Koeppen, and Hannover (2008) study, whereby independent individuals were shown to be motivated by personal goals, and interdependent individuals motivated by social goals. Thereby characterising the differences between self-construal and evidencing Oyserman (1998) suggestion.

Considering the aforementioned differences between each self-construal, it seems appropriate to suggest that an individual who is governed by social motives is more likely to act pro-socially. A notion supported by research from Cojuharenco, Shteynberg, Gelfand and Schminke, (2012) that demonstrated the interdependent self

to negatively relate to unethical behaviour, whilst the independent self to positively relate. Making self-construal an important predictor of trait morality, which in turn is suggested to be a motivation for prosocial behaviour (Batson, Ahmed, Powell, Stocks 2008). Additionally Moorman and Blakely's (1995) study evidenced the collective self (interdependent self) to take part in more citizenship behaviours (prosocial behaviours) than the independent self. Thereby supporting the position that a collective/interdependent self is more associated with behaviours that are prosocial. This proves to be a significant association for this investigation, as charitable giving can be defined as a prosocial behaviour (Aknin, Dunn, Whillans, Norton 2013), therefore if the interdependent self, out of the two constructs, relates more to prosocial behaviour; this may be represented in the predication of charitable giving.

However, as suggested by Ariely, Bracha and Meier (2009), there are not just social motivations to act pro-socially, but also extrinsic motivations; identified as any benefit associated with giving, motivating an individual to involve themselves with a charity. These sorts of benefits are exemplified in the happiness that is generated from prosocial spending (Dunn, Akin, Norton 2014; Akin, Barrington-Leigh, Dunn, et al, 2013). Subsequently by acting in a prosocial way, one can also act in a self-interested way. Therefore, reevaluating van Horne et al's (2008) results, that demonstrate the independent self to be motivated by personal goals, it may be argued that the independent self, with a personal motivation to be happy, can achieve such happiness through charitable giving and so will act in a prosocial way. Resultantly, challenging the conception that having an interdependent construct will predict charitable giving, as being motivated socially is not necessarily the only motive to act pro-socially. This argument is further evidenced in Sargeant's (1999) model of donor behaviour, and Bekkers and Wiepking (2010) eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. Whereby social motives (e.g. values; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2010) are featured alongside personal (e.g. psychological benefits; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2010) and emotional motives (e.g. empathy; Sargent, 1999).

With reference to emotional motives, for charitable giving, there is some evidence to suggest that a positive correlation exists between these motives and interdependent self-construal. For example, Akin and Eroglu (2013) demonstrate self-compassion to be inherently associated with the interdependent self. Whereby compassion is also associated with empathic concern, an emotion that correlates with donations (Verhaet & Van Poel, 2011). Similarly Wotlin, Yzerbyt and Corneille (2011) have shown, in priming interdependent self-construal, their participants empathic gap resultantly decreased. Thereby associating the interdependent self with a heightened level of empathy and thus more empathic motivation to give. This may be debated however, because as Lee and Bradford (2015) discuss differences in empathy between self-construals is dependent on the empathy-altruism fit effect. Whereby levels of empathy are mediated by the extent, to which the individual in need fits your own self-construal. Resultantly, independent individuals will in fact be more motivated empathically, than interdependent individuals, when the person in need fits their own construct. Thereby, challenging the presupposition that one self-construal is more empathic than the other, resultantly obscuring the preconceived relationship between self-construal and charitable giving. The empathy-altruism fit phenomena has also been evidenced by Lee and Bradford (2013, cited in Lee and Bradford, 2015) to affect what kinds of charitable behaviours are given. For example, it was shown that the interdependent self is more inclined to spend time nurturing relationships and therefore more likely to volunteer, whilst the independent self shows preference to donating

money so that tangible assets can be acquired. Subsequently, it is possible that the two different constructs of self-construal will predict differences in types of charitable behaviours reported.

### *Psychopathy*

Psychopathy can be defined as a clinical construct that is comprised by a constellation of interpersonal, affective, and behavioural features (Cleckley, 1941/1976; Hare, 2003; Hare and Neumann, 2008) and has been controlled for within this study. This is because central to the conceptualisation of psychopathy is a lack of empathy (Hare, 2002), meaning that motivations such as awareness of needs and altruism simply do not exist in the psychopathic individual (Hare & Vertommen, 2003). Making the variable significant in this investigation as these two motivations have been highlighted as two of the most pivotal driving factors behind prosocial behaviours (Bekkers and Weipking, 2010). Subsequently it is reasonable to believe that testing highly for psychopathic traits will predict lower reported charitable behaviour. This prediction is further supported through Blair's (1995) model of psychopathy, that suggests the main deficit of the condition is within morality; leading him to dub psychopaths as 'morally insane' (Blair, Jones, Clark, Smith, 1995). Additionally, in a non-clinical sample, Seara-Cardoso, Neumann, Rosier, et al (2012) demonstrated using the Self-report Psychopathy Scale 4 Short Form, that testing highly in one of the constructs of psychopathy, related to low empathic concern and less difficulty making moral decisions. Meaning that even within the general populous, psychopathic traits are associated with low empathic concern and less thoughtful moral decision-making. Resultantly supporting the notion that psychopathy will be negatively associated with charitable behaviours and therefore justifying the variables control in this investigation.

However, some research has suggested that, despite psychopathic traits being associated with a lack of empathy and moral concern, psychopathy may predict certain aspects of prosocial behaviours due to social reward. For example, Foulkes McCroy, Neumann and Viding (2014) demonstrated interpersonal psychopathic traits to correlate with fast reaction times to socially rewarding experimental tasks. Resultantly suggesting that acting in a prosocial way may be desirable for individuals with the respective psychopathic traits, as they value the social approval/admiration attributed to such actions. This claim is further supported by White (2014) study, which evidenced the psychopathic trait of affective callousness to be positively associated with public pro-sociality and inversely associated with anonymous and altruistic pro-sociality. Consequently suggesting that certain constructs of the Self-Report Psychopathy-Short Form (used in this investigation) may yield a positive correlation with certain charitable behaviours as they reward the individual for such actions. Thus, further justifying the control for this variable within the present investigation.

### *Demographic Characteristics*

Religious affiliation is a demographic characteristic that the researcher decided to additionally control for in this investigation. For the reason that, as the literature suggests, affiliation with a religion is positively associated with charitable giving and pro-social behaviour. For example, Paxton, Reith and Glanville (2014) found religion to predict volunteering on three dimensions of religiosity, thereby exemplifying the

affect religious affiliation has on charitable behaviours resultantly advocating its control within this investigation. Furthermore, Norenzayan and Shariff (2008) review of religion and pro-sociality revealed that simply by priming religious thought altruistic behaviours (paramount to charitable giving) can be increased. Thus, one only needs to think religiously to be inclined to behave more charitably. It is however suggested that priming religious thought also induces anticipated rewards (Harrell, 2012), therefore it is arguably not enough to consider religious content alone eliciting generosity but also reward cognitions, acting as extrinsic emotions that contribute to charitable giving. Despite this a noticeable effect still remains between religiosity and charitable giving (Gittell & Tebaldi, 2006), and therefore the variable was controlled for.

Age and gender also featured as controls in this study, as they too have been evidenced to affect charitable giving. For example Mesch, Brown, Moore and Hayat (2011) study demonstrated woman to give significantly more than men, and to show a significant amount more empathic concern. This difference in empathic concern is attributed to cause the evidenced differences between genders and charitable giving (Willer, Wimer, Owens, 2015). Resultantly gender is predicted to have an effect on charitable giving and so was controlled for in the present investigation. Age was additionally controlled for, as research has demonstrated a general increase between charitable donations and age, up to 65 (Havens, 2006). Similarly, research from Size, Goodkind and Levenson (2012) suggests that both empathy and pro-sociality increases with age. Therefore, justifying the researchers rationale in controlling for these variables within this investigation.

Interestingly it is also worthy to note that much of the previous research has found a strong association with gender and psychopathy. For example, findings from Nicholls, Ogloff, Brink and Spidel (2005) literature review indicate a significantly lower base rate of psychopathy among women than among men. Furthermore, Cale and Lilienfeld (2002) have suggested similar findings whilst also highlighting the sex differences that exist between neurological variables of psychopathy. Similarly, gender differences have also been found to exist between independent and interdependent constructs. In that, males have been evidenced to be more typically associated with the independent self, whilst women are more associated with relational aspects of the interdependent self (Cross & Madson, 1997; Guimond, Chatard, Martinot et al 2006). Resultantly perpetuating a secondary line of inquest, to investigate the gender differences that exist within psychopathy and between self-construal.

### **Aims/Hypothesis**

Thus, considering the previous research the present study has three aims. The first is to compare levels of psychopathy and self-construals (independent and interdependent) between male and female students. Based on previous findings of a generally higher prevalence of psychopathy among males (Nichols et al, 2005; Cale and Lilienfeld, 2002), it was predicted that male participants would report significantly higher levels of psychopathic traits than female participants. Similarly it was predicted, as according to previous research on gender and self-construal (Cross & Madson 1997; Guimond et al, 2006), that a significantly higher amount of male participants will report having an independent construct of self-construal than female participants. The second aim is to examine bivariate associations between all variables, and the final aim is to clarify the relationship between self-construals and prosocial behaviour (donating blood, giving money to charity, giving time to charity), while controlling for

covariates (four factors of psychopathy, age, and religion). Resultantly leading the researcher to construct the following hypothesis:

H1. Male participants will report a significantly higher level of psychopathic traits than females.

H2. There will be a significantly higher amount of males reported as having an independent construct of self-construal than females.

H3. When controlling for all other variables, self-construal will significantly predict charitable behaviours; namely, interdependent self-construal will be the best predictor of the behaviours.

H4. Reporting high levels of psychopathic traits will significantly predict less reported charitable behaviours.

H5. Female participants will report a significant amount more charitable behaviours than males.

H6. Older participants will report a significant amount more charitable behaviours than younger participants.

H7. Having a religious affiliation will significantly predict more reported charitable behaviours.

## **Method**

### **Design**

An online based, self-report research design was implemented. With the dependent variable being, Einolf's (2008) charitable behaviour measure, assessing formal helping behaviours and the main predictor variable, measuring constructs for, Self-construal (two-subscales). The researcher also controlled for Psychopathy (four-subscales) and the participant variables, age, gender and religious affiliation. All participants completed the same sixty-five item questionnaire (see Appex. 3) containing the same measures (SRP-SF, SCS), and therefore a within subject design was used.

### **Participants**

With the aim of obtaining a heterogeneous sample, participants were recruited using a convenience sampling technique, via a URL posted on social media sites. Through this method a sample of 134 participants completed the questionnaire, of which 43 were male and 91 were female, with an age range of 18 to 62. The majority of the sample stated themselves as Christian (68) with a secondary majority stating themselves as having no religion (62), whilst a small minority stated they were Muslim (3) and Buddhist (1)

### **Materials**

For this online survey, participants were provided with an information sheet (see Appex. 1). This informed the participant what was required from them and what the aim of the study was, this sheet also assured anonymity, the right to withdraw and provided the participant with relevant contact information if they wished to email the

researcher. Before completing the two scales (Psychopathy and self-construal), the participants were asked to provide their Age, Gender, Religious affiliation and at the end of the survey answered three multiple choice questions assessing charitable giving (Ever gave blood, ever donated money to charity, ever volunteered). After completion participants were provided with a debrief (see Appex. 2), thanking them for their participation, and providing the researchers email address once more. The two scales assessed the constructs of Psychopathy and Self-construal along four subscales (Psychopathy) and two subscales (Self-construal). The survey was sixty-five items in total, and was presented online using qualtrics, and analysed using SPSS- 19.0 (IBM Corp, 2010).

*Self-construal scale (see Appex. 4)*

The construct self-construal was assessed using the Singelis and Brown (1995) scale (SCS). Whereby, participants answered on a five point Likert scale how much they felt each statement applied to them, concerning their behaviours and feelings in different situations. The SCS (1995) consists of thirty-items, with, fifteen items relating to the independent sub-scale and fifteen relating to the interdependent sub-scale. The scales are scored as follows: Independent construal (#s 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 18, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27 and 29), Interdependent construal (#s 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 26, 28 and 30). Responses on each of these subscales are averaged to give two separate independent and interdependent scores that may range from 1 to 7, with the higher score indicating the self-construal for that individual.

Although the internal reliabilities have only been evidenced as adequate, ranging from high .60's to middle 70's (Singelis & Brown, 1995; Singelis & Sharkey, 1995; Kwan, Bond, Singelis 1997; Yamada & Singelis, 1999) (in this investigation; Independent  $\alpha = .80$ , Interdependent  $\alpha .60$ ) the scale is the most commonly used measure of self-construal (Cross, 2011). For the reason that, the independent self and interdependent self are considered two, separate constructs (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, and Gelfand 1995). Therefore, any attempt to increase internal consistency would reduce the validity of the measure. As Singelis et al (1995) explains in terms of Chronbachs (1990) notion of bandwidth and fidelity, the broader the construct the lower the fidelity, so in this sense, because self-construal is so broad the internal consistency is naturally lower.

*Psychopathy Scale (see Appex. 5)*

For the psychopathology measure the Self-Report Psychopathy –Short Form is used. The Self-Report Psychopathy-Short Form (SRP-SF) is a 29-item questionnaire assessing psychopathic traits (Paulhus, Neumann, Hare, in press). Participants were asked to respond on the extent to which they agree with each statement using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = disagree strongly, 5 = agree strongly) (see Appex 5). The SRP-SF yields a total psychopathy score and also scores for the four dimensions of psychopathy: Interpersonal (items 7,9,10,15,19,23,26), Affective (3,8,13,16,18,24,28), Lifestyle (1,4,11,14,17,21,27), and Antisocial (2,5,6,12,22,25,29). Which resultantly gives a score for each of the individual subscales and an overall psychopathy score, in total the participant receives five scores relating to psychopathy.

The SRP-SF has been shown to have good construct validity as it strongly correlates with the most commonly used clinical psychopathy assessments. Those being the PCL-R (Lilienfeld and Fowler 2006; Paulhus et al. in press), the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; e.g. Andershed, Gustafson, Kerr, Stattin, 2002) and a psychopathy self-report measure based on the five-factor model of personality



(Lynam, Gaughan, Miller, et al. 2011). Additionally Cronbach's alphas were all found to be acceptable: .90 for the full scale; .77 for Interpersonal Manipulation; .71 for Callous Affect; .82 for Erratic Lifestyle; and .65 for Antisocial Behaviour. Thereby supporting the scales internal consistency.

*Religious Affiliation and Charitable Giving. (see Appex. 3)*

When measuring the participants religious affiliations, the researcher followed guidelines set out by the Office for National Statistics (no date) for measuring religion in England. The guidelines seek to enable consistency and comparability of data across the UK and therefore the researcher deemed this the best way to measure religious affiliation. Charitable Behaviours were measured at the end of the questionnaire whereby participants were asked to indicate if they had ever; donated blood, gave money to a charity or volunteered for a charity. This measure was decided upon as Einolf (2008) classified these behaviours as formal helping behaviour, and as the researchers broad aim was to delineate the relationship between formal charitable giving and the predictor variables, the measure was seen as most applicable.

## **Procedure**

Once the scales utilized in the study were decided upon, and ethical approval had been granted by Manchester Metropolitan University (see Appex. 6), questionnaire construction and data collection could begin. The questionnaire was created as an online survey, using the computer program qualtrics, and was presented to the public via a URL on a social media website on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2014. The survey was online for a total of three months whereby the URL was reposted on the social media website three times each month, in order to advertise the study to an appropriate amount of potential participants. The survey finished recruiting participants on the 19<sup>th</sup> February 2015 and on this date; the survey info was downloaded from qualtrics into SPSS- 19.0 (IBM Corp, 2010).

## **Analyses**

Upon downloading the data from qualtrics into SPSS- 19.0 (IBM Corp, 2010) analysis was completed. Descriptive statistics were computed for all variables including the demographic characteristics of age (but not gender) and frequencies were calculated for religious affiliation and charitable behaviours. In addition to this independent T-tests were used to investigate between-group differences in the four factors of psychopathy and the two factors of self-construal between males and females. In order to assess bivariate correlations between all variables, Pearson's product moment was used. Lastly, a logistical multiple regression was used to ascertain to what extent the personal variables predict charitable behaviours as well as showing the strongest predictor whilst controlling for all other variables.

## **Ethics**

The present research was completed according to the British Psychological Society's (2009) code of conducts and ethics. No vulnerable individuals were used in the investigation and risk to both researcher and participants was minimal. Participants were comprehensively informed and debriefed, so no level of deception was implemented. Relevant contact information was provided, to be used if the participant wished; to withdraw, have accesses to the results or wanted to speak to someone about anything concerning the study. Confidentiality was of particular concern to the researcher as the research was conducted online and many feel that the online world

is a public domain rather than a private one (Elgsem, 2002; Capurro and Pingel 2002). Therefore, to safeguard the participants the computer program qualtrics was used meaning only the researcher had access to the information that was password locked. Additionally no written consent was required from the participant as they were a self-selected sample; consequently, by completing the questionnaire consent was implied. All the scales used are established and therefore have been ethically approved for other research, however the participants were reminded that if they did not want to complete a question they were not required to.

## Results

### 3.1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Descriptive statistics, including means (M) and standard deviations (SD) for all continuous measures are presented in Table 1.

Table 1.

*Descriptive statistics for the four factors of psychopathy, age, and two self-construal factors*

Factor	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Interpersonal Manipulation	12.95	4.71	7	27
Callous Affect	11.91	4.14	0	23
Erratic Lifestyle	15.31	5.39	7	29
Antisocial Behaviour	11.43	3.64	8	27
Interdependent	47.69	4.95	34	60
Independent	51.74	5.19	35	67
Age	30.19	12.89	18	62

Table 2 presents the rates of endorsement for the three prosocial behaviours (having donated blood, having donated money to charity, and having volunteered time for a charity), as well as the number (and percentage) of participants that identified as being religious.

Table 2.

*Frequencies of endorsement for all categorical variables*

Variable	Frequency	%
----------	-----------	---

Donated Blood		
No (0)	124	91.9
Yes (1)	11	8.1
Donated to Charity		
No (0)	15	11.1
Yes (1)	120	88.9
Volunteered for Charity		
No (0)	79	58.5
Yes (1)	56	41.5
Religious?		
No (0)	62	45.9
Yes (1)	73	54.1

Independent samples *t*-tests were employed to explore potential between-group differences in the four factors of psychopathy (IPM, CA, ELS, and ASB) scores, and the two self-construal constructs between males and females. Results in Table 3 indicate that males scored significantly higher than females on each of the four psychopathy factors. Additionally, it is shown that males also scored significantly higher on the independent construct of self-construal.

Table 3.

*Descriptive statistics and group differences (gender) for the four factors of psychopathy*

Factor	Gender	N	M	SD	t-value	Cohen's d
Interpersonal Manipulation	Males	43	16.19	4.27	6.12***	1.27
Callous Affect	Females	91	11.45	4.14		
Erratic Lifestyle	Males	34	15.35	3.68	7.98***	1.44
Antisocial Behaviour	Females	91	10.30	3.30		
Independent	Males	43	19.40	4.80	6.70***	1.28
	Females	91	13.40	4.56		
Interdependent	Males	43	14.00	4.24	5.35***	1.07
	Females	91	10.25	2.57		
	Males	43	53.30	5.31	2.35*	0.45
	Females	91	51.00	5.02		
	Males	43	47.15	5.21	-0.81	--
	Females	91	47.93	4.86		

Note: \* $p < .05$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

### 3.2 Psychopathy, self-construals and charitable giving

Bivariate correlations among all variables were investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (Table 4). Results indicate small but significant relationships between having donated to charity (PB2) and Independent self-construals ( $r = .19$ ) and Interdependent self-construals ( $r = .19$ ). None of the other variables were found to be significantly related with having donated to charity, or the other prosocial behaviours (having donated blood and having volunteered time for a charity). However, results also indicate small but significant relationships between self-construal and certain psychopathy factors. Independent self-construal was shown to significantly relate to Interpersonal manipulation ( $r = .20$ ), whilst Interdependent self-construal was found to significantly negatively relate to Callous affect ( $r = -.30$ ) and Erratic lifestyle ( $r = -.20$ ).

Table 4.

*Correlations between Age, self-constuals and the four factors of Psychopathy*

	Age	Gender	Religion	IM	CA	ELS	ASB	SC1	SC2	PB1	PB2	PB3
Age	1											
Gender	.29**	1										
Religion	.39***	.23**	1									
IM	-.23*	-.47***	-.07	1								
CA	-.37***	-.57***	-.16	.58***	1							
ELS	-.39***	-.52***	-.18*	.56***	.62***	1						
ASB	-.24**	-.48***	-.16	.44***	.54***	.47***	1					
SC1	-.10	-.21*	.01	.20*	.12	.16	-.01	1				
SC2	.02	.07	.13	-.10	-.30**	-.20*	-.08	.35***	1			
PB1	-.08	.03	.01	-.07	-.04	.09	.04	-.04	-.03	1		
PB2	.10	.06	.15	.05	-.11	-.06	.01	.19*	.19*	-.07	1	
PB3	-.05	.13	.11	-.07	-.06	-.11	-.09	.12	.01	-.03	.25**	1

Note: IM = Interpersonal Manipulation, CA = Callous Affect, ELS = Erratic Lifestyle, ASB = Antisocial Behaviour, SC1 = Independent, SC2 = Interdependent, PB1 = Donated Blood, PB2 = Donated to Charity, PB3 = Volunteered for a Charity, \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

### 3.3 Binary Logistic Regression.

Direct binary logistic regression was used to assess the impact of the two self-construal constructs (Independent and Interdependent), the four psychopathy subscales (interpersonal manipulation, callous affect, erratic lifestyle and antisocial behaviour), gender, age and religion, on charitable giving; donating blood (Table 5), donating money (Table 6), donating time (Table 7). Results indicate that none of the independent variables significantly predicts any of the dependent variables (donating blood, donating money, or donating time).

Table 5.

*Logistic regression model of the predictors of blood donation*

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	OR (95% CI)
Age	-.03	.03	.98 (.91/1.04)
Gender	-.57	.96	.56 (.09/3.70)
Religious	.53	.75	1.70 (.39/7.42)
Interpersonal Manipulation	-.15	.11	.86 (.70/1.07)
Callous Affect	-.11	.17	.90 (.71/1.12)
Erratic Lifestyle	-.15	.09	1.16 (1.00/1.40)
Antisocial behaviour	-.14	.12	1.15 (.90/1.46)
Independent	.00	.07	1.00 (.87/1.12)
Interdependent	.61	.09	.96 (.81/1.14)

*Note:* OR = Odds Ratio. SE = Standard Error. 95% CI = Confidence Interval.

Table 6.

*Logistic regression model of the predictors of charity donation*

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	OR (95% CI)
Age	.11	.10	1.12 (.92/1.36)
Gender	-.45	1.10	.64 (.08/5.38)
Religious	1.55	1.25	4.71 (.41/54.30)

Interpersonal Manipulation	.07	.14	1.70 (.81/1.41)
Callous Affect	-.02	.17	.98 (.70/1.38)
Erratic Lifestyle	-.01	.10	.99 (.81/1.20)
Antisocial behaviour	.05	.17	1.10 (.76/1.48)
Independent	.20	.12	1.20 (.97/.96)
Interdependent	.12	.13	1.13 (.87/.88)

*Note:* OR = Odds Ratio. SE = Standard Error. 95% CI = Confidence Interval.

Table 6.

*Logistic regression model of the predictors of charity volunteering*

<b>Variable</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE</b>	<b>OR (95% CI)</b>
Age	-.02	.02	1.00 (.95/1.02)
Gender	-.63	.55	.53 (.18/1.57)
Religious	.50	.46	1.65(.67/4.05)
Interpersonal Manipulation	-.05	.06	.95 (.85/1.20)
Callous Affect	.04	.07	1.04 (.90/1.2)
Erratic Lifestyle	-.02	.05	.98 (.88/1.08)

Antisocial behaviour	.03	.08	1.02 (.89/1.19)
Independent	.07	.04	1.07 (.99/1.17)
Interdependent	-.05	.49	.95 (.87/1.05)

*Note:* OR = Odds Ratio. SE = Standard Error. 95% CI = Confidence Interval.

## Discussion

The present study set out to assess three aims, the first being an evaluation of the levels of psychopathy and self-construals (independent and interdependent) between male and female students, in order to add to the pre-existing literature. The second being to examine the bivariate associations between all variables prior to multiple regression analysis, and the final aim was to accurately delineate the relationship between prosocial behaviour (donating blood, giving money to charity, giving time to charity) and self-construal, whilst controlling for covariates (four factors of psychopathy, age and religion).

Consistent with the first hypothesis, independent T-tests demonstrated males to score significantly higher on all four of the psychopathy subscales. This is coherent with the current literature that suggests psychopathic traits to be more frequently present within males than in females (Nicholls et al, 2005; Cale and Lilienfeld, 2002; Forth et al, 1996). Subsequently the results in the present study can be used as support for such findings, and may be utilised in the explanation of research that suggests women give a significant amount more and behave typically more altruistic than men (Mesch et al, 2011, Andreoni & Vesterlund, 2001). This is because psychopathic traits are related to problems in resonating with others emotions (Lockwood 2013), empathic concern. Furthermore, empathic concern is a driving



motive for altruistic and prosocial behaviours (FeldmanHall, Dalgleish, Evans, Mobbs, 2015). Consequently as psychopathic traits relate to a decrease in empathic responsiveness (Marsh, Finger, Adalio, 2013) it is reasonable to suggest that lack of empathy in males, as evidenced by Einolf (2011), may be due to presence of psychopathic traits. Resultantly, explaining the previous research findings that demonstrate females to give more and behave typically more altruistic than males (Mesch et al, 2011, Andreoni & Vesterlund, 2001), as a relationship may exist between empathic motivation and psychopathic traits specific to males. Subsequently effecting male charitable giving habits, although additional research is needed to investigate and clarify this propositioned relationship.

The independent T-tests also revealed gender differences to exist between self-construals. Supporting the researchers second hypothesis that a significant amount more males than females will be found to hold the independent construct of self-construal. This offers evidence to support a great body of pre-existing literature that suggest similar gender differences within self-construal (Cross & Madson, 1997; Guimond et al, 2006). Moreover, gender differences between the two constructs are noted as so fundamental that they are used to explain all other gender differences in emotion, cognition, motivation and social behaviour (Guimond & Chatard, 2014). Therefore, the results may be applied in an attempt to aid an understanding of the differences that exist between male and female prosocial motivations. For example considering Kottasz's (2004) findings, that males tend to be more egotistical with their donations, in relation to the previously discussed personal goals that motivate the independent self (van Horne et al, 2008) a tenuous link can be inferred. That being, because males more typically hold the independent construct of self-construal the same motives that govern this construct may dictate pro-social motives. Mellstrom and Johannesson (2010) further this argument as they evidence males to be more incentivised by a monetary reward for giving blood than females, consequently further demonstrating the pervasive motivation for personal goals present in males, arguably relatable to the gender typical independent construct. However, additional research within this area is needed, in order to clarify whether self-construal causes gender differences within prosocial motivation.

The results from the bivariate correlations (Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients) interestingly found weak but significant correlations between self-construal and psychopathy. This manifested as a weak but significant negative correlation between two psychopathic traits (Callous effect and Erratic lifestyle) and interdependent self-construal, and a weak but significant positive correlation between independent self-construal and Inter-personal manipulation. This result can be considered rather novel, and the researcher did not account for such a finding within the aims or hypothesis, as there is relatively little research on the relationship between psychopathy and self-construal. Yet the results can be explained when considering Ma-Kellams and Blascovich (2012) research, as they evidence the interdependent self to be associated with a heightened level of empathic inferences compared to the independent self. Therefore, it may tenuously be inferred that as psychopathic traits are related to a decrease in empathy (Marsh, et al 2013) a comparison with the heightened level of empathy found within the interdependent self (Ma-Kellams and Blascovich, 2012) explains the negative association between the constructs. However, conversely Obhi Hogeveen, Pascual-Leone (2011) has demonstrated in priming interdependent self-construal an increase activity in the mirror systems within the brain is observed, this is related to a hyper-responsiveness to other peoples pain and is

associated with high levels of psychopathy (Fecteau, Pscual-Leone, Theoret, 2008). Leading Obhi et al (2011) to suggest that independent self-construal priming could even be used in remedial programs for psychopathic individuals. Thus, a future research avenue has presented itself in the need to clarify the relationship between psychopathy and self-construal.

Bivariate correlations also showed a weak but significant positive correlation between both self-construal constructs (independent, interdependent) and charitable donations. Which is explained by Sargeant's (1999) model of donor behaviour, and Bekkers and Wiepking (2010) eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. As both models suggest a range of motivations exist that prompt charitable behaviours, including motivations coherent to both independent and interdependent constructs, personal/social (van Horne et al, 2008). However, no other significant correlations were found between the predictor variables and charitable giving (giving money, giving time, giving blood). Similarly, whilst controlling for all other variables, logistical regression revealed no significant predictors of any of the charitable giving measures, forcing the researcher to reject the predicted hypotheses (H4, H5, H6, 57).

The present finding that self-construal is not a significant predictor variable of charitable giving may be explained by Eckstein (2001) results, as she revealed in her study on volunteerism, that conventional conceptualizations of formal charitable behaviours are not typical of the interdependent construct of self-construal. This is because the interdependent individual is noted as taking part in community based charitable behaviours. Represented in Eckstein's (2001) example of collectivist based volunteerism. Subsequently, the measure used in the present study may not have accurately recorded the full propensity of the interdependent self's charitable giving. Additionally the researcher notes, what communal charitable behaviours were recorded by the measure, may have been nullified by the evidenced in-group out-group effect that occurs within the interdependent self-construal construct (Duclos & Barasch, 2014). The in-group out-group effect is suggested to impede on motivations for prosocial behaviour, as the interdependent individual is less likely to be charitable to out-group members (Duclos & Barasch, 2012). Contrary to Lee and Bradford (2013, cited in Lee and Bradford, 2015) who suggest a similar effect is observable in both constructs, it has been evidenced that this effect is stronger within the interdependent self (Duclos & Barasch, 2014; Duclos & Barasch, 2012). Resultantly it is positioned that the reason for insignificant results in the present investigation is due to an absent measurement for all charitable behaviours. Thus, the interdependent self may be found as a significant predictor of charitable behaviours when additionally measuring for informal and communal charitable acts; however, more research is needed to test this hypothesis.

The finding that psychopathy did not significantly relate to charitable behaviours can be explained with reference to White (2014) results. This is because his results indicate a positive relationship between public pro-social behaviours and psychopathy whilst also indicating a negative relationship between psychopathy and anonymous pro-sociality. This has been explained through the motives behind such behaviours, whereby public prosocial behaviours are egoistically motivated and are associated with less empathic motivation (Eisenberg, Eggum, Di Gunta, 2010; McGinley & Carlo, 2007). Therefore, concerning the present investigation it may be argued that participants testing highly for psychopathic traits potentially reported more charitable behaviours in an attempt to seek social approval/admiration (Foulkes et al, 2014)

whereas others may have reported less; as they viewed it as anonymous pro-sociality (White 2014), resultantly producing an insignificant relation between the two variables. It may also be appropriate to discuss Gao and Raine's (2010) report on the 'successful psychopath,' which concludes the difference between 'successful' and 'unsuccessful' psychopathy is success in mainstream society despite affective, interpersonal and behavioural deficits. Thus, the researcher positions that an ability to act or report pro-social behaviour may be an attribute of the successful psychopath; however, further research is needed to come to such a conclusion.

Contrary to previous research, religious affiliation was found as a non-significant predictor of charitable behaviours. This inconsistency may be perceived as unexplainable, however it has been noted that a consistent link exists between social desirability and religiosity (Sedikides & Gebauer, 2010). Therefore, religion may only be reported as being highly associated with pro-sociality in previous research because of conformity to social standards. Moreover, the idea that religious people are prosocial has been evidenced as an intrinsic stereotype of religious people's behaviour (Lewis, 2001; Harper 2007). Thus contributing to the line of argument that religion and pro-sociality are related because of societies expectation of the relation, rather than because of actual differences between atheist and religious people. This has prompted a critique on the existing literature of religion and pro-sociality by Galen (2012). For Galen (2012) the relationship between pro-sociality and religiosity is not only confounded by social desirability and stereotype's, but also by differences between religious and secular religious individuals. Considering that this research did not control for secular aspects of religiosity (lack of church attendance, etc.) the sample may have been comprised of a majority of non-secular religious individuals. Subsequently, the converse findings may be explained as a result of differences between secular and non-secular religious people. However, an inclusion of a secular measure would cement this presumption, and therefore is advised in future research.

In addition to the aforementioned inconsistent findings, it was also found that neither age nor gender significantly predicted any charitable behaviours. Concerning age, research has typically found as age increases so does charitable and prosocial behaviours (Havens, 2006; Size et al, 2012). This finding however was not replicated in the present investigation, which is explained by the researcher as a result of the sample size and composition. This is because the sample consisted of a broad majority of students, ageing between twenty and twenty-five, therefore a general increase in age amongst participants and its relation to charitable giving could not accurately be observed. In explanation of the unobserved differences in gender and charitable giving Einolf's (2011) results may be used. As Einolf (2011) found that men have typically more resources and social capital than women do, giving men the amenities to give more despite the lack of charitable/prosocial motivation (Christov-Moore, 2014). Resultantly due to men's abundance of resources this may have affected the present investigations findings that gender is not a significant predictor of charitable giving, subsequently the inclusion of a measure for informal and communal charitable behaviour is further recommended, as this would measure charitable giving that does not require a plethora of resources.

In discussing the findings of the present investigation, certain limitations of the study have presented themselves. Firstly, as this study is a cross-sectional investigation, causality may not be implied. This is additionally true for the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, whereby results are only correlational and

therefore causality may not be assumed. Additionally, as previously discussed, the sample may also be considered a limitation of the study because, although a heterogeneous sample was aimed for, the sample obtained was dominated by students; resultantly acting as a possible confound variable within the research, and making the results difficult to generalise. Moreover, it is suggested a cross cultural sample may have benefited the research due to self-construal being conceptualised as a cultural construct (Gudykunst, Matsumoto, Ting-Toomey, 1996), meaning that arguably to obtain a truly interdependent participant, they must be obtained from a culture consistent with eastern values. The self-report measures can also be criticised due to the social desirability associated with pro-social behaviours. For example, Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) found that in comparison of actual amount recorded for charitable donations and the amount reported by participants, amount reported by participants is significantly higher than that, which was recorded. Resultantly exemplifying the issue of social desirability within this research area for the self-report design, thus future research may consider experimental methods. Furthermore, following Gallen (2012) advice it may be appropriate to include a secular measure when measuring religiosity, whilst in addition to this the inclusion of a measure for informal and communal helping behaviours could potentially reveal differences in self-construal pro-sociality and gender pro-sociality.

Despite the noted limitations of the present investigation there are also some strengths associated with this study. Firstly as well as adding to pre-existing evidenced findings such as the relationship between self-construal and gender, and psychopathy and gender, the present study provides new, novel results in the correlation found between self-construal and psychopathy. As self-construal has been linked to eastern and western cultures (Chen, Wagner, Kelley, Heatherton, 2015), the result may be used as evidence to support the position that psychopathy is a socialized disorder (Cooke, Michie, Hart, Clark, 2005) and with further research may be applied to treatment/remedial programs (Obhi et al, 2011).

In conclusion whilst the present investigation principally sought to clarify the relationship between self-construal and charitable behaviours, whereby the results favoured rejection of the research hypothesis (neither self-construal was found to significantly predict charitable giving), the study's findings have provided supplementary novel research directions to be explored by further investigation. More research in this field may provide potential applications that would benefit individuals and society, thus making this line of inquest an important area concerning future research. The researcher therefore advises the outlined study to be used as a springboard for further investigation whilst following the suggestions made in the report for subsequent research.

## References.

- Akin, A., Eroglu, Y. (2013). 'Self-Compassion and Relational-Interdependent Self-Construal.' *Studia Psychologica*, 55(2) pp. 111-121.
- Aknin, L., Barrington-Leigh, C., Dunn, E., Helliwell, J., Burns, J., Birswas-Diener, R., Kemeza, I., Nyende, P., Ashton-James, C., Norton, M., (2013). 'Prosocial spending

and well-being: Cross-cultural evidence for a psychological universal.' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(4) pp. 635-652.

Aknin, L. Dunn, E. Whillans, A. Grant, A. Norton, M. (2013) 'Making a difference matters: Impact unlocks the emotional benefits of prosocial spending.' *Journal of Economic Behaviour & Organization*, 88, April, pp. 90-95. [issue number missing]

Andershed, H., Gustafson, S. B., Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2002). 'The usefulness of self-reported psychopathy-like traits in the study of antisocial behaviour among non-referred adolescents.' *European Journal of Personality*, 16(5) pp. 383-402.

Andreoni, J. Vesterlund, L. (2001) 'Which is the Fair Sex? Gender Differences in Altruism.' *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(1) pp. 293-312.

Ariely, D. Bracha, A. Meier, S. (2009) 'Doing Good or Doing Well? Image and Monetary Incentives in Behaving Prosocially.' *American Economic Review*, 99(1) pp. 544-555.

Batson, D. Ahmed, N. Powell, A. Stocks, E. (2008) 'Prosocial Motivation.' In Shah, J. Gardner (eds.) *Handbook of Motivation Science*, New York: Guilford Press, pp. 135-150.

Bekkers, R. Wiepking, P. (2010) 'A literature Review of Empirical Studies of Philanthropy: Eight Mechanisms That Drive Charitable Giving.' *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5) pp. 924-973

Bekkers, R. Wiepking, P. (2011) 'Accuracy of self-reports on donations to charitable organizations.' *Quality & Quantity*, 45(6) pp.1369-1383.

Blair, R. (1995) 'A cognitive developmental approach to morality: investigating the psychopath.' *Cognition*, 57(1) pp. 1-29.

Blair, R. Jones, L. Clark, F. Smith, M. (1995) 'Is the Psychopath 'morally insane'?' *Personality and Individual Differences*, 19(5) pp. 741-752.

British Psychological Society. (2009) Code of Ethics and Conduct Guidance. [Online] [Accessed on 14th April 2015]

[http://www.bps.org.uk/system/files/Public%20files/bps\\_code\\_of\\_ethics\\_2009.pdf](http://www.bps.org.uk/system/files/Public%20files/bps_code_of_ethics_2009.pdf)

Cale, E. Lilienfeld, S. (2002) 'Sex differences in psychopathy and antisocial personality disorder: A review and integration.' *Clinical Psychology Review*, 22(8) pp. 1179-1207.

Capurro, R. Pingel, C. (2002) 'Ethical issues of online communication research.' *Ethics and Information Technology*, 4(3) pp 189-194.

Charities Aid Foundation (2015) *Social Landscape: the state of charities and social enterprises in 2015*. [Online] [Accessed on 28<sup>th</sup> March 2015]

<https://www.cafonline.org/pdf/CAF%20Social%20Landscape%20Report%20-%20WEB.pdf>

Chen, P. Wagner, D. Kelley, W. Heatherton, T. (2015) 'Activity in cortical midline structures is modulated by self-construal changes during acculturation.' *Culture and Brain*, 3(1) pp. 39-52.

- Christov-Moore, L. Simpson, E. Coude, G. Grigaityte, K. Lacoboni, M. Ferrari, P. (2014) 'Empathy: Gender effects in brain and behaviour.' *Neuroscience & Biobehavioural Reviews*, 46(4) pp 604-627.
- Chronbach, L. (1990) *Essentials of psychological testing* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- Cleckley, H. (1941/1976), *The mask of sanity*, St Louis: Mosby.
- Cojuharencu, I. Shteynberg, G. Gelfand, M. Schminke, M. (2012) 'Self-Construal and Unethical behaviour.' *Journal of Business Ethics*, 109(4) pp. 447-461.
- Cooke, D. Michie, C. Hart, S. Clark, D. (2005) 'Searching for the pan-cultural core of psychopathic personality disorder.' *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39(2) pp. 283-295.
- Cross, S. Madson, L. (1997) 'Models of the self: Self-construals and gender.' *Psychological Bulletin*, 122(1), pp 5-7.
- Duclos, R. Barasch, A. (2012) 'In the Aftermath of an Earthquake: Interactive Effects of Self-construal and Victim Group-Status on Charitable Behaviour.' *Consumer Research*, 40(1) pp. 640-641.
- Duclos, R. Barasch, A. (2014) 'Prosocial Behaviour in Intergroup Relations: How Donor Self-Construal and Recipient Group-Membership Shape Generosity.' *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41(1) pp. 93-108.
- Dunn, E. Aknin, L. Norton, M. (2014) 'Prosocial Spending and Happiness: Using Money to Benefit Others Pays Off,' *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(1) pp.41-47.
- Eckstein, S. (2001) 'Community as Gift-Giving: Collectivistic Roots of Volunteerism.' *American Sociological Review*, 66(6) pp. 829-851.
- Einolf, C. (2008) 'Empathic concern and prosocial behaviours: A test of experimental results using survey data.' *Social Science Research*, 37(4) pp. 1267-1279.
- Einolf, C. (2011) 'Gender Differences in Correlates of Volunteering and Charitable Giving.' *Nonprofit Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(6) pp. 1092-1112.
- Eisenberg, N. Eggum, N. Di Gunta, L. (2010) 'Empathy related responding: Associations with prosocial behaviour, aggression, and intergroup relations.' *Social issues and Policy Review*, 4(1) pp. 143-180.
- Elgesem, D. (2002) 'What is special about the ethical issues in online research.' *Ethics and Information Technology*, 4(3) pp. 195-203.
- Fecteau, S. Pascual-Leone, A. Theoret, H. (2008) 'Psychopathy and mirror neuron system: preliminary findings from a non-psychiatric sample.' *Psychiatry research*, 160(2) pp.137-144.
- FeldmanHall, O. Dalgleish, T. Evans, D. Mobbs, D. (2015) 'Empathic concern drives costly altruism.' *NeuroImage*, 105, January, pp. 347-356. [issue number missing]

- Forth, A. Brown, S. Hart, S. Hare, R. (1996) 'The assessment of psychopathy in male and female noncriminals: Reliability and validity.' *Personality and Individual Differences*, 20(5) pp. 531-543.
- Foulkes, L. McCroy, E. Neumann, C. Viding, E. (2014) 'Inverted Social Reward: Associations between Psychopathic Traits and Self-Report and Experimental Measures of Social Reward.' *PloS one*, 9(8)
- Galen, L. (2012) 'Does religious belief promote prosociality? A critical examination.' *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(5) pp. 876-906.
- Gao, Y. Raine, A. (2010) 'Successful and unsuccessful psychopaths: A neurobiological model.' *Behavioural Sciences & the Law*, 28(2) pp. 194-210.
- Gittell, R. Tebaldi, E. 'Charitable Giving: Factors Influencing Giving in U.S. States.' *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector*, 35(4) pp.721-736.
- Gudykunst, W. Matsumoto, Y. Ting-Toomey, S. Nishida, T. Kim, K. Heyman, S. (1996) 'The Influence of Cultural Individualism-Collectivism, Self Construals, and Individual Values on Communication Styles Across Cultures.' *Human Communication Research*, 22(4) pp. 510-543.
- Guimond, S. Chatard, A. (2014) 'Basic principles of social comparison: Does gender matter?' In Krizan, Z. Gibbons, F. (eds.) *Communal Functions of Social Comparison*, Cambridge University Press; New York.
- Guimond, S. Chatard, A. Martinot, D. Creisp, R. Redersdorff, S. (2006) 'Social comarrison, self-stereotyping, and gender differences in self-construals.' *Journal of Personalit and Social Psychology*, 90(2) pp. 221-242.
- Hare, R. (2002) The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised: PLC-R. MHS, Multi-Health Systems.
- Hare, R. D., & Vertommen, H. (2003). The Hare psychopathy checklist-revised. Multi-Health Systems, Incorporated
- Hare, R. Neumann, C. (2008) "Violent and aggressive behaviour by criminal psychopaths." *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 7(1) pp. 35-50.
- Harper, M. (2007) 'The stereotyping of nonreligious people by religious students: Contents and subtypes.' *Journal for The scientific study of Religion*, 46(4) pp. 539-552.
- Harrel, A. (2012) 'Do Religious cognitions promote prosociality?' *Rationality and Society*, 24(4) pp. 463-482.
- Havens, J. O'herlihy, M. Schervish, P. (2006) 'Charitable giving: How much, By Whom, to what, and How?' *Powell, W. Steinberg, R. The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*. 2., New York: Yale University, 542-564.\*
- IBM Corp. (2010) IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 19.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

Kottasz, R. (2004) 'Differences in the Donor Behaviour Characteristics of Young Affluent Males and Females: Empirical Evidence from Britain.' *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 15(2) pp.181-203.

Kwan, V. Bond, M. Singelis, T. (1997). 'Pancultural explanations for life satisfaction: Adding relationship harmony to self-esteem.' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(5) pp. 1038-1051.

Lee, A. Bradford, T. (2015) 'The Effects of Self-Construal Fit on Motivation, Attitudes, and Charitable Giving.' In Ng, S. Lee, A. (ed.) *Handbook of Culture and Consumer Behaviour*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 135-150.

Lewis, C. (2001) 'Cultural stereotype of the effects of religion on mental health.' *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 74(3) pp. 359-367.

Lilienfeld, S. O., Fowler, K. A., & Patrick, C. (2006) 'The self-report assessment of psychopathy'. *Handbook of psychopathy*, pp. 107-132.

Lockwood, P. Bird, G. Bridge, M. Viding, E. (2013) 'Dissecting empathy: high levels of psychopathic and autistic traits are characterized by difficulties in different social information processing domains.' *Frontier in Human Neuroscience*, 7(760) pp. 1-6.

Lynam, D. R., Gaughan, E. T., Miller, J. D., Miller, D. J., Mullins-Sweatt, S., & Widiger, T. A. (2011). 'Assessing the basic traits associated with psychopathy: Development and validation of the Elemental Psychopathy Assessment.' *Psychological Assessment*, 23(1) pp. 108.

Ma-kellams, C. Blascovich, J. (2012) 'Inferring the Emotions of Friends Versus Strangers: The Role of Culture and Self-Construal.' *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(7) 933-945.

Markus, H. Kitayama, S. (1991) 'Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation.' *Psychological Review*, 98 (2) pp. 224-253

Marsh, A. Finger, E. Fowler, K. Adalio, C. Jurkowitz, I. Schechter, J. Pine, D. Decety, J. Blair, R. (2013) 'Empathic responsiveness in amygdala and anterior cingulate cortex in youths with psychopathic traits.' *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 54(8) pp. 900-910.

McGinley, M. Carlo, G (2007) 'Two sides of the same coin? The relations between prosocial and physically aggressive behaviours,' *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36 (3) pp. 337-349.

Mellstrom, C. Johannesson, M. (2010) 'Crowding out in Blood Donation: was Titmuss Right?' *Journal of European Economic Association*, 6(4) pp. 845-863.

Mesch, D. Brown, M. Moore, Z. Hayat, A. (2011) 'Gender differences in charitable giving.' *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 16(4) pp. 342-355.

Moorman, R. Blakely, G. (1995) 'Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour.' *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 16(2) pp. 127-142.

NCVO UK Civil Society Almanac (2014) *How have government spending cuts affected voluntary sector income*. [Online] [Accessed on 28<sup>th</sup> March 2015]



<http://data.ncvo.org.uk/a/almanac14/how-have-government-spending-cuts-affected-voluntary-sector-income/>

Nicholls, T. Ogloff, J. Brink, J. Spidel, A. (2005) 'Psychopathy in women: a review of its clinical usefulness for assessing risk for aggression and criminality.' *Behavioural Sciences & the law*, 23(6) pp. 779-802.

Norenzayan, A. Shariff, A. (2008) 'The Origin and Evolution of Religious Prosociality.' *Science*, 322(5898) pp. 58-62

Obhi, S. Hogeveen, J. Pascual-Leone, A. (2011) 'Resonating with Others: The Effects of Self-Construal Type on Motor Cortical Output.' *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 31(4) pp. 14531-14535.

Oyserman, D. Izumi, S. Armand, L. (1998) 'Culture Accommodation: Hybridity and the Framing of Social Obligation.' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6) pp. 1606-1618.

Paulhus, D. L., Neumann, C. F., & Hare, R. D. (in press). Manual for the Self-Report Psychopathy (SRP) scale. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

Paxton, P. Reith, N. Glanville, J. (2014) 'Volunteering and the Dimensions of Religiosity: A Cross-National Analysis.' *Review of Religious Research*, 56(4) pp. 597-625.

Rickets, A. (2014) *We must grow the pool of charitable givers, says Nick Hurd*. Third Sector.[Online] [Accessed on 28<sup>th</sup> May 2015]

<http://www.thirdsector.co.uk/grow-pool-charitable-givers-says-nick-hurd/policy-and-politics/article/1298082>

Sargeant, A. 'Charitable Giving:Towards a Model of donor behaviour.' *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15(4) pp. 215-238.

Sedikides, C. Gebauer, J. (2010) 'Religiosity as self-enhancement: A met-analysis of the relation between socially desirable responding and religiosity.' *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 14(1) pp17-36.

Sera-Cardoso, A. Neumann, C. Rosier, J. McCroy, E. Viding, E. (2012) 'Investigating associations between empathy, morality and psychopathic personality traits in the general population.' *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(1) pp. 67-71.

Singelis, T. Brown, W. (1995) 'Culture, self, and collectivist communication: Linking culture to individual behaviour.' *Human Communication Research*, 21(3) pp. 354-389.

Singelis, T. Sharkey, W. (1995) 'Culture, self-construal, and embarrassability.' *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26 (6) pp. 622-644.

Singelis, T. Triandis, H. Bhawuk, D. Gelfand, M. (1995) 'Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement.' *Cross-Cultural Research*, 29 (3) pp. 240-275.

Size, J. Gyurak, A. Goodkind, M. Levenson, R. (2012) 'Greater emotional empathy and prosocial behaviour in late life.' *Emotion*, 12(5) PP.1129-1140.

Skarmeas, D. Shabir, H. (2009) 'Relationship quality and giving behaviour in the UK fundraising sector: Exploring the antecedent roles of religiosity and self- construal.' *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(5) pp. 720-738.

Third Sector (2015) *Hang on to your hats: 2015 will be a year of uncertainty for charities*. Third Sector. [Online] [Accessed on 28<sup>th</sup> May 2015]

<http://www.thirdsector.co.uk/hang-hats-2015-will-year-uncertainty-charities/policy-and-politics/article/1326545>

Van Horen, F. Pöhlman, C. Koeppen, K. Hannover, B. (2008) 'Importance of Personal Goals in People with Independent Versus Interdependent Selves.' *Social Psychology*, 39(4) pp. 213-221.

Verheart, G. van den Poel, D. (2011) 'Empathy as added value in predicting donation behaviour.' *Journal of Buisness Research*, 64(12) pp. 1288-1295.

White, B. (2014) 'Who cares when nobody is watching? Psychopathic traits and empathy in prosocial behaviours.' *Personality and Individual Differences*, 56, January, pp. 116-121.

Willer, R. Wimer, C. Owens, L. (2015) 'What drives the gender gap in charitable giving? Lower empathy leads men to give less to poverty relief.' *Social Science Research*, 52, July, pp. 83-98. [issue number missing]

Wolfin, K. Yzerbyt, V. Corneille, O. (2011) 'On reducing an empathy gap: The impact of self0construal and order of judgement.' *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(3) pp. 553-562.

Yamada, A-M., & Singelis, T. M. (1999) 'Biculturalism and self-construal.' *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23(5) pp. 697-709.