

Undergraduate Psychology Research Methods Journal

Volume 1 | Issue 18

Article 10

5-2016

Predicting Factors of Generosity

Carlo Barth
Lindenwood University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/psych_journals



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Barth, Carlo (2016) "Predicting Factors of Generosity," *Undergraduate Psychology Research Methods Journal*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 18 , Article 10.

Available at: https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/psych_journals/vol1/iss18/10

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology, Sociology, and Public Health Department at Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Psychology Research Methods Journal by an authorized editor of Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. For more information, please contact phuffman@lindenwood.edu.

Predicting Factors of Generosity

Carlo Barth⁹

The purpose of this study was to investigate factors (e.g. religiosity, sex, race, income, marital status, and education level) that best predict generosity. The level of a participant's religiosity was measured with a questionnaire examining different self-reported factors, such as attendance of religious events, personal devotion, prayer and community life and scored on a self-devised scale. Generosity was operationally and separately defined as the actions of financial giving and volunteering. Also recorded were participants' reactions to various scenarios, to better understand how helpful they are, as an additional measure of generosity. The scenarios exposed them to situations such as encountering a person begging for money, a homeless person, and a person who might need assistance after an accident. Separate multiple regression analyses were conducted with the two different measures of generosity as the dependent variable and religiosity, gender, race, annual income, marital status and education level as the independent variables. No statistical significance was found for either giving ($r = .357, r^2 = .128$) or volunteering ($r = .314, r^2 = .098$). Moderate correlations between marital status (e.g. being married) and giving ($r = -.257, p = .014$) and volunteering and religiosity ($p = .254, p = .015$) were found.

Keywords: generosity, predicting factors of, giving, volunteering, religiosity, race, multiple regression, pro-social, altruism

Definition of Generosity

Collett and Morrissey (2007) cite from Notre Dame's Center for the Study of Religion in Society's (CSRS) definition and describe generosity as "disposition of freely giving ones' time, talents, and treasures to others." (p. 1) This seems to be a good starting point, but does not

⁹ Carlo Barth, Psychology Department, Lindenwood University. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Carlo Barth, Psychology Department, Lindenwood University, St. Charles, Missouri 63301. E-mail: carlobarth@me.com

distinguish a lot from pro-social behavior or altruism in attitude. While there may be considerable overlap between these three concepts, it is paramount that unique aspects of generosity be identified, as opposed to the two others, especially in action as opposed to attitude. Burwell and Huyser (2014) explicitly state generosity is more than just pro-social behavior; they especially critique the minimization of generosity to an act of monetarily giving. They quote Spencer and his definition of generosity as “the predisposition to love open-handedly” (Burwell and Huyser, 2014). Spencer (2010) also strives to broaden the view of generosity and sees a generous person as someone who, when faced with a need, has an honest desire to help, and within reason proceeds to positively respond to requests. In studying generosity, many researchers looked at different variables, such as religiosity, gender or race, but it is rare for research to focus on numerous different factors that could be helpful in predicting generosity.

Introduction to the Virtue of Generosity

Gray, Ward and Norton (2014) found that generosity or greed received were met and reciprocated alike. This means a person will act generously when having been treated generously, as he or she will act greedily when having been dealt with greedily. When studying these actions more in depth, they found that greed and negative treatment received was reproduced more so than a positively perceived action (Gray et al., 2014). Effectively, people who have been treated greedily or poorly will act upon that more so than people who have been

treated friendly or generously. This highlights the importance of generosity and also the benefit of acting generously, since it is likely to recur, not only directed towards the original author of the action, but to uninvolved parties as well (Gray et al., 2014).

Factors that May Influence Generosity

Will and Cochran (1995) found dramatic differences in generosity, defined as financial giving, between different groups of religiously affiliated people. Income, gender and denomination were other factors used as variables in the analysis, all of which did relate to giving. They also found women to be more generous than men, Non-Caucasian people to be more generous than Caucasian people, and people with lower incomes to give proportionately more than those with higher incomes. In comparison, race made the biggest difference, with Caucasian people giving 25% less than Non-Caucasian people. Religious denominations and subgroups differed up to 16% in their giving, with those classified highly religious Catholics being the most generous, and moderate Protestants being the least generous (Will & Cochran, 1995).

Regnerus, Smith and Sikkink (1998) found religious people to be twice-as-likely to give to the poor than non-religious people. They started with analyzing data from the 1996 Religious Identity and Influence Survey, funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts. In their investigation, the dependent variable was giving, whereas the independent variables were religious location (as

defined by factors such as denominational affiliation and religious activities), political location (e.g., their political beliefs and orientation) and demographics (e.g., race, gender, education, age, income, number of dependents, county population size, southern residence, and marital status).

This study included the most extensive collection of predicting factors I was able to find and some of these factors, such as race, sex, education, income and religiosity, seem to be named in other studies as helpful predictors of generosity.

A recent meta-analysis by Galen (2012) examined a relationship between religiosity and pro-sociality. Galen (2012) worked through a broad array of pro-social experiments, surveys and self-reported measures. In his examination of the literature exploring whether religious belief promotes pro-sociality, Galen (2012) found increased pro-social behavior in planned actions (e.g., giving), but no effect in spontaneous situations (e.g., encountering people asking for money). This why it is particularly interesting to bring both financial giving and spontaneous reactions to different scenarios into one study to investigate reactions of both religious and non-religious participants.

In their study of the relationship between religious over secular giving, Hill and Vaidyanathan (2011) examined both religiously or secularly motivated giving as well as giving to religious and secular causes. They found different demographic factors helpful in predicting people's likelihood to give. Specifically, religiosity was measured by religious

participation and giving and then compared to secular giving. They did find marital status, employment, education and denomination to make for significant differences in giving as well.

Researchers from the Netherlands looked at factors contributing to generosity from a resources perspective. They asked whether generosity was as high as expected when resources were present as opposed to absent (Wiepking, 2009). Influencing factors Wiepking (2009) examined were the impacts of broad groups, such as a social versus a religious network and formal education. Specifically values like church attendance, network size, education, income, age, gender, marital status and other demographics were studied. Findings attested the highest number of donations in any financial manner to church attendance, which the authors explained with the high frequency of requests for donations. Other big predictors for financial generosity were a high number of solicitations (outside of religious institutions), an empathetic concern, and whether the person volunteered in any function (Wiepking, 2009).

Piff, Kraus, Côté, Cheng, and Keltner (2010) hypothesized and found that members of the lower social classes are more generous than members of higher classes. They also stated that religious affiliations could explain higher generosity. Even after controlling for age, religiosity and ethnicity, members of lower socio-economic backgrounds were more generous (Piff et al., 2010). This stands in contrast with Wiepking's (2009) findings in which he claimed that people with higher formal education were more generous because of their greater amount of financial

resources. Wiepking (2009) claims a positive correlation of both higher household incomes and formal education to charitable causes, which could possibly be explained by merely a higher amount of donations in total numbers and not by percent of total income.

Factors that are seldom mentioned in the same sentence as generosity are expectations of reciprocity and that some people might not be selflessly or altruistically generous. Jones, Doughty and Hickson (2006) found in a field experiment that 85% of their participants complied with providing a quarter when given an exchange of equal value in pennies, but only 35% complied when not offered the exchange. While mainly investigating the exchange issue, the second question that was asked concerned the income of the participants. Here it was found that participants earning more than \$60,000 per year were more unlikely than participants who earned less than that to participate in the exchange. Similarly, Cox and Deck (2006) discussed differences in male and female generosity and compared previous studies that concluded either gender to be more giving. One of their findings was that men were looking for reciprocal behavior and their giving was dependent upon that. Since in many cases, there is no direct benefit or reciprocal effect in charitable giving, women are generally seen as more generous (Cox & Deck, 2006). Borch, Thye, Robinson and West (2011) also looked at a form of reciprocity as they examined religious claims on future reward in relation to giving. They found different demographics, such as education and marital status predictive of giving.

Examples of Generosity in Different Contexts

A contrast to the voluntary contributions in the scope of this work, Islamic societies practice mandatory giving called zakat (Singer, 2013). The set sum that Muslims have to contribute is measured by their income. They can, however, participate in another form of alms that is not forced onto them. Unfortunately, Singer (2013) does not have specific numbers that allow comparing giving to other circumstances, such as the ones in the U.S.

The system of welfare states in many European countries can be seen as practical manifestation of generosity. Koster (2008) explores the relationship of the sustainability of this generosity practiced in these social expenditures and the globalization of markets. He finds that the effects of globalization that include social and political openness might have a negative impact on generosity as practiced in welfare states. Kenworthy (2009) deepens this research with his study on the effect of public opinion on social policy generosity. The work lacks to find empirical evidence that the disposition of the public has a definite influence on generous social policy, while several authors he cites still infer that a more generous public desires and leads to a more generous social system. His thesis correlates with that, assuming the more generous the people, the more generous the system. This leads to the question of the system that underlies these assumptions. A meritocratic system compensates on the basis of their individual ability, position, and merit, whereas an egalitarian system compensates people in an equal fashion. In a

social system, people who earn significantly less than the population mean are supported by the state, as are people who are unemployed and people who are unable to work. Riyanto and Zhang (2014) find interesting results in their study of the benefit of both systems. Low-income families that receive additional income by redistribution are significantly more generous, and contrary to expectation, high-income earners are not less generous than before the income redistribution. It seems like there is a factor in which generosity positively (or at least not negatively) impacts all sides in this deal. This whole discussion seems to move away from the study of the original, simplistic value of generosity but the further study of it as a virtue can lead to further reaching implications than previously thought.

What Impacts Does Generosity Have and How Can it be Promoted?

As far as the impact of generosity is concerned, different studies report different, but thoroughly positive findings. Research on the topic is done in the hope of leading to more than just concrete results; not only is it paramount to have empirical descriptions of findings, but to also productively think about their applications. Study and therein-gained understanding should help inspire people to lead a group, a community, or culture into desirable behavior.

Beneficiaries of generosity are often motivated to be generous themselves.

Vo (2014) studied what results from gratitude to perceived generosity. Among others, she recounts her experience with the Peace Corps, during which she received warm generosity and

humbling hospitality from her poor neighbors. Even though she was there to “develop” the towns, she learned more through the generosity of the people and was changed and inspired to more generosity on her own part by what she received.

Several scholars report the impact of practicing generosity in marriage to factors such as marital quality and the success of marriages. Dew and Wilcox (2013) found generosity as they defined it was positively correlated with marital satisfaction and negatively correlated with marital conflict and perceived likelihood of divorce. These findings are in line with Einof and Philbrick’s (2014) findings, that state that marriage in general encouraged greater financial giving, but also that health and happiness were positively correlated with these actions.

One very interesting study explained how, when people see themselves as small in an attitude of awe, directed towards the vastness of the world, the greatness of the stars, or generally perceive themselves as little pieces in a big puzzle, their generosity is positively affected by that (Piff et al., 2015). They made a connection to religiosity, alleging that people who believe in the presence of a god perceive themselves as smaller and less significant and tend to be more generous (Piff et al., 2015). Kradin (1999) reports of therapeutic benefits of generosity, as the counselor teaches the counselee by exemplifying generosity and leading to minimization of super-ego and narcissistic tendencies.

Hypotheses

All of these different findings lead to the rationale for this proposed study, which combines many aspects of different previous studies into one big survey. The purpose of the study at hand is to predict which demographic has the biggest impact on generosity. Among the many demographic factors I propose to include (e.g., religiosity, marital status, income, gender, race, and educational level), I predict that religiosity would be the strongest predictor of generous behavior. I propose to examine both planned as well as spontaneous giving in one study, thereby conducting possibly the first comprehensive study linking different demographic factors to generosity in different contexts.

For conducting a multiple regression analysis, I came up with five hypotheses to cover five different areas or demographics. Religiosity was expected to be the strongest predictor for generosity, for the other four (marital status, sex, income, race, and education) there was no prediction made, except the hypotheses listed below. The first one states that religiosity will be the biggest factor in predicting all measures of generosity; as Regnerus et al. (1998) stated, they found a twofold likelihood for religious people to give as compared to non-religious people. Secondly I expect women to be more generous than men; Cox and Deck (2006) find men to be looking for reciprocal giving, so I hypothesize that women will be more generous than men. Thirdly, non-Caucasian people are expected to be more generous than Caucasian people; non-white ethnicities gave 25% more than their white counterpart (Will & Cochran, 1995). The

fourth hypothesis states that people who earn more give proportionately less than people who earn less income; which is what Piff et al. (2010) suggested and I expect to find the same. Lastly, there will be a negative correlation between education level and generosity. Research suggested different conclusions about the formal educational achievement of an individual and their giving. Wiepking (2009) claims that more resources equal more giving, while Piff et al. (2010) disagree and argue for the empathy and communal orientation of the lower socio-economic classes being indicative of generosity. This latter one seems to outweigh the former in terms of percent given of the actual income.

Method

Participants

Participants for the study at hand were being recruited out of the Lindenwood Participant Pool (LPP), which is an ethical way of recruiting participants who in turn earn extra-credit for some General Education classes (e.g., Intro to Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, Criminology, Athletic Training and Exercise Science), over the PI's email address book, and through the PsiChi's Internet presence.

Many of the participants were college students, since a significant part of the recruitment took place through the LPP, which engages mostly traditional college-aged students. The age range of participants spanned from 18 to 75, 29 of which identified as male and 67 as female.

From the standpoint of diversity, people identified as members of the following races, native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander: 2, Asian: 6, African American/ black: 3, Latin American: 5, White: 70, Multiracial: 4, and other: 5. Income ranged from 0 to \$300,000. The highest educational level was at the doctoral level, and there were some participants who did not attain a high school degree. Twenty subjects were married or widowed and 76 participants were single (e.g., never married, divorced, or separated).

Materials and Procedure

Several recruitment scripts that were appropriate for the different outlets were used. There was one script that was used for PsiChi (see Appendix B), one for emails (Appendix C), and a third one for Lindenwood University's Participant Pool (Appendix D). The different scripts attempted to explain as much as needed, while trying to prevent participants from guessing the purpose of the study or leading them a certain way in answering the survey.

Information and the informed consent processes were handled on the first couple of pages of the SuveryGizmo questionnaire, where the study was hosted. The online nature of the study helped make access convenient for people from diverse backgrounds and also helped protect the respondent's identity. The questionnaire included 36 steps, which included the informed consent process and all conditional questions. It had three different tools that tested religiosity, generosity (which included role-play scenarios) and lastly collected demographic information, which was

the main source of predicting factors for generosity. Several generosity questions were evaluated on a Likert scale to assess dispositions, with a few items with yes/ no decisions. In the survey, a number of questions were included that were conditional, meaning they would only be asked in case the participant answered a preceding question with a specific answer or in a specific way. Some questions that were conditional were for example whether people volunteered or donated money; if those questions were answered “yes,” several follow up questions were asked to specify in detail how much people donated or where they volunteered. After the completion of the survey, the participant was transferred to a debriefing page that explained the purpose of the survey and encouraged the participant to reach the PI in case of questions or concerns.

Measures

To measure generosity (as dependent variables), both financial giving as well as volunteering were measured. For both of these a numerical value was recorded, which made analysis easier. The independent variables were religiosity (see section below), sex, income, education, race, and marital status. All of these were quantified for analysis. For most of them, a number was assigned to each category, such as one for married and two for not married, enabling statistical analysis of predictability in the multiple regression analysis and further correlational analyses. The same was possible for ordinal categories, such as education, where a higher number meant a higher formal achievement.

Religiosity Scale

In order to quantify religiosity for further tests, a scoring system was devised. It ranked participants activities in four areas and assigned a score from zero to four to them in each of them. This enabled a score from 0 to 16, the higher the more religious. So for example, praying daily would result in a score of four, praying several times a week would be three, once a week would be two, a couple times a month would be one and less than that would result in a score of zero. Similar scales were applied to church attendance, the frequency with which religious texts were studied and participation in community groups.

Results

Out of 104 total participants, there were 73 respondents that contributed data that was complete enough for analysis. A multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to determine which of the predetermined factors (e.g. religiosity, race, sex, income, education, and marital status) best predict generosity as defined as financial giving and volunteering (individually). The regression for predictors in financial giving was statistically non-significant ($r = .357$, $r^2 = .128$); predictors in the second regression for volunteering were even weaker ($r = .314$, $r^2 = .098$). Out of the sample of 73 resulted the following values: The average giving was \$860.07 ($SD = \2637.601), ranging from \$0 to \$15,000 (0-100% of a person's income). Volunteering ranged from 0 to 700 hr, with a mean of 47.19 hr ($SD = 100.454$). Religiosity,

which was scored as explained above, where higher church attendance, participation in prayer and religious study materials resulted in a higher number, ranged from 0 to 15 on a scale from 0 to 16, averaging at 4.6 ($SD = 4.561$). Even though correlations, as shown in Table 1, were mostly statistically non-significant, two showed moderate relationships. First, married people were more likely to give, as they were the lower value in the correlation, $-.257$ ($p = .014$). Second, religious people were more likely to volunteer, $.254$ ($p = .015$).

Discussion

Findings suggest that first there was no direct and reliable predictor in the given sample. Secondly, correlations were mostly weak or insignificant. Taking into consideration the previous research done, either strong correlations or significant predictability in the multiple regression analysis had been predicted and expected. Since none has been found, there needs to be a different explanation. Again considering previous research findings, it seems that the amount of such would merit an assumption that the sample at hand is not representative of the population. It is to determine what factors might have had an impact on the findings and what made them different from previous insights.

Two of the correlations showed statistical significance, hence some focus should be given as to why that might be. Married couples showed a moderate correlation to giving. A possible explanation could be that these couples have more financial means than other non-married

individuals, resulting in higher giving. Secondly, there was a moderate correlation between religiosity and volunteering. For this, it seems possible that college students (since the sample consisted mostly of students) may be able to donate time when they lack the financial means for other donations. This is a finding that is in line with previous research.

One limitation and certainly possible reason for the weakness of the findings are the demographics of the sample, containing a high number of college students, many of them being full-time students. The financial strain of getting an education might have a strong influence on donations and giving, as might the time commitment of many who work and study on volunteering. There were also a fairly high number of participants who were not born in the U.S., this could mean different cultural or religious practices, and also if they do not live in the U.S. maybe different standards. In many cultures volunteering is a given and would not be recorded, or even recognized as such, but just acted out.

Several weaknesses in the research design were found when scoring results. The high number of college students might have obscured data, as many of them work and earn money, but have to pay for cost of living and education, which does not go into giving, even if they would feel compelled to give. Weaknesses on the level of the survey were two lacking questions. First, there should have been a question as to whether a participant had retired; second, there should have been a question to record whether the participant was a U.S. resident. Both questions

would have served the purpose of describing the sample better, and understanding how representative it was of different populations. There needs to be some way to more appropriately explain questions for a cross-cultural sample such as this, since international participants and American participants might read or understand questions differently, based upon language and societal or cultural norms.

For future research, there would need to be more recruiting from diverse places, in order to ensure the diversity of the sample concerning professional background and also to study a sample of people who are not college students. The findings of this study only showed that for this sample of mostly college students there were no reliable predictors for generosity in forms of giving or volunteering. Neither were there factors that correlated strongly with either of these, except for religiosity, which correlated moderately with volunteering, $r = .254$, $p = .015$, and marital status which correlated negatively with giving, $r = -.257$, $p = .014$, meaning that participants who are married were more likely to give. This seems to suggest that, given the high number of college students, if they indeed are inhibited from giving financially, they could still give in time, but this is speculation at best.

References

Arber, A., & Gallagher, A. (2009). Generosity and the moral imagination in the practice of teamwork. *Nursing Ethics*, 16(6), 775-785.

- Borch, C., Thye, S. R., Robinson, C., & West, M. R. (2011). What predicts religious participation and giving? Implications for religion in the United States. *Sociological Spectrum, 31*(1), 86-113. doi:10.1080/02732173.2011.525697
- Burwell, R., & Huyser, M. (2014). The virtue of generosity. *Social Work & Christianity, 41*(2/3), 193-205.
- Collett, J. L. & Morrissey, C. A. (2007). The social psychology of generosity: The state of current interdisciplinary research. *The Center for the Study of Religion and Society*, University of Notre Dame.
- Cox, J. C., & Deck, C. A. (2006). When are women more generous than men? *Economic Inquiry, 44*(4), 587-598. doi:10.1093/ei/cbj042
- Dew, J., & Bradford Wilcox, W. (2013). Generosity and the maintenance of marital quality. *Journal of Marriage & Family, 75*(5), 1218-1228. doi:10.1111/jomf.12066
- Einolf, C. J., & Philbrick, D. (2014). Generous or greedy marriage? A longitudinal study of volunteering and charitable giving. *Journal of Marriage & Family, 76*(3), 573-586. doi:10.1111/jomf
- Galen, L. W. (2012). Does religious belief promote prosociality? A critical examination. *Psychological Bulletin, 138*(5), 876-906. doi:10.1037/a0028251

- Gray, K., Ward, A. F., & Norton, M. I. (2014). Paying it forward: Generalized reciprocity and the limits of generosity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *143*(1), 247-254.
doi:10.1037/a0031047
- Hill, J. P., & Vaidyanathan, B. (2011). Substitution or symbiosis? Assessing the relationship between religious and secular giving. *Social Forces*, *90*(1), 157-180.
- Jones, K., Doughty, A., & Hickson III, M. (2006). The effects of age, gender, and economic status on generosity in the presence of exchange: A pilot study. *Communication Quarterly*, *54*(2), 257-264. doi:10.1080/01463370600650969
- Kenworthy, L. (2009). The effect of public opinion on social policy generosity. *Socio-Economic Review*, *7*(4), 727-740. doi:10.1093/ser/mwp014
- Koster, F. (2008). The effects of social and political openness on the welfare state in 18 OECD countries. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, *17*(4), 291-300. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2397.2008.00552.x
- Kradin, R. (1999). Generosity: A psychological and interpersonal motivational factor of therapeutic relevance. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, *44*(2), 221-236.
- Piff, P. K., Feinberg, M., Dietze, P., Stancato, D. M., & Keltner, D. (2015). Awe, the small self, and prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *108*(6), 883-899.
doi:10.1037/pspi0000018

- Piff, P. K., Kraus, M. W., Côté, S., Cheng, B. H., & Keltner, D. (2010). Having less, giving more: The influence of social class on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*(5), 771-784. doi:10.1037/a0020092
- 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*(3), 481-493.
- Riyanto, Y. E., & Zhang, J. (2014). An egalitarian system breeds generosity: The impact of redistribution procedures on pro-social behavior. *Economic Inquiry, 52*(3), 1027-1039. doi:10.1111/ecin.12090
- Singer, A. (2013). Giving practices in Islamic societies. *Social Research, 80*(2), 341-358.
- Spencer, G. (2010). *Awakening the quieter virtues*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Vo, C. S. (2014). Gratitude: duty, virtue, and practice. *Social Work & Christianity, 41*(2/3), 175-191. doi:10.12115
- Wiepking, P. (2009). Resources that make you generous: Effects of social and human resources on charitable giving. *Social Forces, 87*(4), 1973-1995
- Will, J. A., & Cochran, J. K. (1995). God helps those who help themselves?: The effects of religious affiliation, religiosity, and deservedness on generosity toward the poor. *Sociology of Religion, 56*(3), 327-338.

Appendix A

Table 1

Correlations for Demographic Factors and Dependent Variables

Pearson Correlation	Religiosity	Sex	Income	Race	Education	Marital Status
Giving	.171	.014	.191	-.127	.017	-.257
Sig. (1-tailed)	.074	.453	.053	.143	.442	.014
Volunteering	.254	-.005	-.031	-.140	.107	-.175
Sig. (1-tailed)	.015	.484	.398	.118	.183	.069

Appendix B

Psi Chi:

<u>Study Title</u>	<u>Study Area</u>	<u>Study Description</u>	<u>Study URL</u>
Predicting Factors of Generosity	Social/ Behavioral	How do you spend your time and money? What influence do your gender, race, income and religious belief have on your generosity?	Submission Link

Appendix C

Email script:

Dear friend, professor, colleague, or classmate!

As part of wrapping up my BA in psychology at Lindenwold University I am conducting research for a Senior Thesis. I hereby invite you to help me finish strong in my last semester by partaking in this study.

The topic being studied are different factors that might influence generosity and I am also exploring how free-time and spending habits play into this.

The questionnaire will take about 15 minutes to complete and no personal data will be recorded.

Your participation will be completely anonymous. If you are not interested in this, please disregard this message and I apologize for the inconvenience.

Thank you and here is the link! <https://www.surveymzmo.com/s3/2010620/Spending-habits>

Carlo Barth

Appendix D

Lindenwood University Participant Pool script:

Dear Participant, This survey about the possible relationships between spending habits and religious activities is part of a study conducted by Carlo Barth in the department of Psychology at Lindenwood University. This survey contains questions pertaining to both these areas and will help to set the bar for further investigations in the direction of decision-making and persistence in how these beliefs are acted upon. The two different components are basic variables for how you tend to spend your money, and how involved you are in different religious activities or communities. This survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Your participation may not result in direct benefits to you; it is anticipated however, that your awareness about spending habits and your religious habits and preferences could be increased. Also, information from this study may help provide additional insight into spending habits in a broad sense and religious activities as they relate to spending.

Appendix D

Spending habits

Page One

Dear Participant,

This survey about the possible relationships between spending habits and religious activities is part of a study conducted by Carlo Barth in the department of Psychology at Lindenwood University. This survey contains questions pertaining to both these areas and will help to set the bar for further investigations in the direction of decision-making and persistence in how these beliefs are acted upon.

The two different components are basic variables for how you tend to spend your money, and how involved you are in different religious activities or communities.

This survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Your participation may not result in direct benefits to you; it is anticipated however, that your awareness about spending habits and your religious habits and preferences could be increased. Also, information from this study may help provide additional insight into spending habits in a broad sense and religious activities as they relate to spending.

Your responses will be anonymous. No information that identifies you personally will be collected, not even your IP address. The primary investigator will not be able to identify your answers as belonging to you; data will be examined at the group level only.

Your participation is completely voluntary. You may discontinue taking the survey at any time. If you choose not to participate or stop participating before the end of the survey, you will not be penalized in any way; LPP participants will still receive extra credit.

The results of this survey will be used for scholarly purposes only. If you have any questions or concerns about the survey and the background of the study it is used in itself, please do not hesitate to contact the primary investigator, Carlo Barth at 636-634-1042 or at cb705@lionmail.lindenwood.edu

Some of the questions on the survey may make some respondents feel uncomfortable. Please feel free to skip any questions that you are uncomfortable answering. If you are feeling significant discomfort, please contact the researcher using the contact information provided above, or contact my supervisor, Dr. Michiko Nohara-LeClair at mnohara-leclair@lindenwood.edu or 636-949-4371.

ELECTRONIC CONSENT: Please select your choice below. Checking "Yes" below indicates that:

- You have read the above information.

- You voluntarily agree to participate.
- You are at least 18 years of age or you are part of the LPP and have a parental consent form filed with the LPP Office.

Please make sure you also uncheck the "No" field.

If you do not wish to participate in the research study, or are not at least 18 years old, please decline participation by selecting "No". *

Yes

No

1) Are you a student?

Yes

No

MONETARY CLUSTER

2) Do you give or donate in any form? (This includes both money and other goods you give away)

Yes

No

*3) In your best estimate, how much do you give or donate per year? **

\$/year: _____

4) In case you give differently than monetarily, please explain what you give!

5) What kinds of organizations, charities or ministries do you donate to? (Select appropriate fields)

Organization type

Ministries (Faith based organizations)

Charities (Goodwill, homeless shelters)

Other

If other, please specify.

SERVICE CLUSTER

*6) Do you volunteer?**

Yes

No

7) How many hours do you estimate you volunteer per year?*

8) Where do you volunteer? (Please mark all that apply)

Church, ministry, faith-based or religiously-affiliated charity

Non-profits

Charity

Other

WHAT WOULD YOU DO?

9) How would you respond to a stranger who approached you asking for money? What would you be likely to do?

10) Imagine the following situation: You are downtown in the middle of the winter, and the temperatures are around zero degrees. On the side of the road, you see a person who appears to be homeless and cold. How would you react to this person?

11) Imagine you have just witnessed someone you do not know trip and fall. How likely is it that you help him/ her or ask whether he or she is okay?

Very Unlikely Unlikely Likely Very Likely

12) Imagine the following situation. You are driving home from work (or school). At a small intersection close to your house you see a car crash. You cannot tell how bad it is at this point, only that the cars look very damaged. The way home for you is not blocked, and you could pass without anyone noticing. How likely is it that you would get out of your car and check on the people involved in the accident?

- Very Unlikely Unlikely Likely Very Likely

RELIGIOUS ACTIVITY

*13) In the last 12 months, have you attended religious services of any kind?**

- Yes
 No
 I wish not to say

14) How often do you attend such services?

- Daily
 Multiple times a week
 Twice a week
 Once a week
 Twice a month
 Once a month
 A couple times a year
 Other

15) How often do you pray or meditate in private?

- Multiple times a day
- Daily
- Multiple times a week
- Once or twice a week
- A couple times a month
- Less than the afore mentioned

16) Do you privately study religious materials or scriptures of your religion or belief system?

- Yes
- No

17) How often do you study your religion's or belief system's scriptures?

- Daily
- Multiple times a week
- Once or twice a week
- A couple times a month
- Once or twice a month
- Less than that

18) How many minutes do you study your religion's or belief system's scriptures when you study them?

Minutes: _____

19) Do you take part in any study or community groups? Community groups are Bible studies or other scripture studies, prayer or meditation groups, or any other form of service group that regularly meets and originates out of a religious community.

Yes

No

20) Do you participate in any secular community or service groups?

Yes

No

21) How often do you meet for these groups and or studies?

Once a month

Twice a month

Once a week

Twice a week

Other

22) Since you selected "other" please specify.

23) Are you partaking in any form of religious activity outside of the aforementioned?

Yes

No

24) Please specify.

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

These data does not necessarily have to do with the subject under investigation, the information you provide is still important to describe the participants of this research accurately. Please answer as accurately as possible. Since this survey is completely anonymous, you do not need to be afraid of your data being misused.

*25) How old are you?**

Age in years: _____

26) What is your sex? (If would like to skip this question, please do so)

Female

Male

27) What is your annual income?

\$/year: _____

28) How would you describe your racial/ethnic identity?

American Indian/Alaska Native

Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander

- Asian or Asian American
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- White or Caucasian
- Multiracial/Multiethnic
- Other

29) *Are you born in the U.S.?*

- Yes
- No

30) *How would you describe your religious affiliation, if any?*

- Buddhist
- Catholic
- Hindu
- Jewish
- Mormon
- Muslim
- Protestant
- Other
- Unaffiliated

31) Is there any denomination or group you claim affiliation to within your religion or belief system?

32) What is your highest level of educational attainment?

- Some high school, no diploma
- High school diploma or equivalent (GED)
- Some college, no degree
- Associate's (2 year) degree
- Bachelor's (4 year) degree
- Master's degree
- Doctoral or professional degree

33) What is your marital status?

- Married or in a domestic partnership
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Separated
- Never Married

34) Are you currently employed?

- Yes
- No

35) Are you a full-time college student?

- Yes
- No

36) How many hours do you work every week?

THANK YOU!
