Religiosity and Generosity of Youth. The Results of a Survey conducted on 8th Grade Students from Bihor County (Romania)

Adela LAZĂR¹,
Adrian HATOS²

¹PhD. student, Doctoral School of Sociology - University of Oradea, Oradea, Romania, adela.lazar11@gmail.com

² Full Professor Ph.D., Habil., Head of the Doctoral School of Sociology - University of Oradea, Oradea, Romania, ahatos@gmail.com

Abstract: The article draws on the results of a survey conducted in schools from Bihor county in 2018-2019. The study analyses the answers of 4,261 8th grade pupils regarding generosity and its predictors. The actual research is an extension of our article from 2016 which analysed similar data collected in 2011. Our first results showed a significant correlation between generosity and socio-economic background and between generosity and gender. Considering the results of our previous research, we conducted the present research using new data and adding new hypotheses such as the influence of religiosity.

As expected, based on the literature, our new results indicate that religiosity explains generosity variation among 8th grade Romanian pupils from Bihor county. It seems that general trust, school results, living environment (rural vs. urban) have no influence, aspect which can be explained, at least partially, by the specificity of the Romanian culture. Religious girls with a better financial position are most generous. Our research also proves a similarity between the generosity level in schools.

We consider that the results of our research can contribute significantly to a better understanding of generosity and its specificity in our country, and be exploited by further studies or programs run by non-profit organizations, fundraising campaigns.

Keywords: *Generosity; prosocial behaviour; helping; altruism; philanthropy.*

How to cite: Lazar, A., & Hatos, A. (2019). Religiosity and Generosity of Youth. The Results of a Survey conducted on 8th Grade Students from Bihor County (Romania). *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 11(3), 93-118. doi:10.18662/rrem/140

1.1. Introduction

The study of prosocial behaviour such as generosity, altruism, helping, cooperation, etc. entered the sphere of scientific preoccupations long ago. However, this concept has not been fully understood, yet.

Why is it that, in the same situation, some individuals help and others do not? Why do people choose to help although this implies consumption of personal resources, making some people sacrifice their own life for that of their fellow humans? What are the factors that influence us to be more or less generous? - these are questions that specialists in the field of sociology, psychology, economy, philosophy or medicine still try to find answers to through various studies.

Given a sociological perspective and starting from the results obtained in a similar previous research (Lazăr & Hatos, 2016), this article is meant to bring improvements to the explanatory model on the generosity of adolescents in Bihor County. Our previous research used data gathered in 2011 and emphasized that gender and parents' socio-economic status were among the factors that explained the appearance and the development of generosity. The group effect (the influence of the group belongingness), represented by school and class, was also present in our research. Recent studies (Bekkers, 2003; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007a, 2011b; Chen, Zhu, & Chen, 2013; Kolm & Ythier, 2006; Sargeant, 1999; Wiepking & Maas, 2009; Wiepking & Bekkers, 2012) have made us introduce religiosity in the current analysis model – a variable that, according to these studies, is strongly associated with generosity. Besides religiosity, we also analysed in the current model the influence of school results, living environment (rural/urban) and generalised trust.

The research presented in this article is based on the methods of quantitative analysis. The self-applied questionnaire was used to collect the replies from more than 4,500 pupils from approximately 150 schools from Bihor County. In order to analyse the individual effect of each variable introduced in the model, we opted for multiple regression. Results indicate a significant improvement in the explanatory model by introducing the variable level of declared religiosity. Contrary to our expectations, the level of generalised trust or school results did not have significant influences which can be partly explained by the specifics of the Romanian society.

1.2. Defining prosocial behaviour

In general terms, prosocial behaviours can be defined as actions that "benefit others" (Stürmer & Snyder, 2009). A mandatory condition of prosocial behaviour is the existence of a benefactor and one or more beneficiaries (Dividio et al., 2006, as cited by Schroeder & Graziano, 2015). At first sight, we could say that usually prosocial behaviours appear as a great appreciation of each other. Still, we could rarely meet just a purely altruistic motivation.

The forms of prosocial behaviour include: generosity, altruism, co-operation, reciprocity, etc. (Collett & Morrissey, 2007; Lindenberg, Fetchenhauer, Flache, & Buunk, 2006; Molm, 2010; Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005)

1.2.1. *Generosity*

Generosity is a recurring form of prosocial behaviour (Wiepking & Maas, 2009) defined as a deliberate act by which you do good to another person or contribute to the good of society (Komter, 2010). The mandatory and enough condition for conduct to be considered as prosocial is that somebody will benefit from it. More specifically, generosity as a form of prosocial behaviour, in addition to the existence of a beneficiary, also implies the free intention of helping others, the mandatory condition being the desire to increase the welfare of the other by offering exactly what he needs (Herzog & Price, 2016; Rojas, 2014). The term "generosity" is very often associated with the concept of "charity", being used to describe the acts of charity, donations, the help of the poor, philanthropy, etc. (Kolm & Ythier, 2006; Komter, 2010; Science of Generosity, 2009;). Specific to generosity is that it is a behaviour that is most likely to happen consistently in the life of an individual, it is like a habit, it is based on stable characteristics of the individual, acquired over time in interactions and not on situational explanations of prosocial behaviour (Finkelstein, Penner, & Brannick, 2005; Herzog & Price, 2016; Science of Generosity, 2009)

From a sociological point of view, generosity is defined by the emphasis on role and social identity in understanding generous actions, that is by emphasizing that the group and institutions play a key role in the transmission of values and the rules that are the basis of the formation of prosocial behaviours (Science of Generosity, 2009).

1.2.2. Forms of Generosity

The book “American Generosity: Who Gives and why” (Herzog & Price, 2016) discusses the existence of nine forms of generosity emphasizing three of them, “the Big 3” as the authors call them: giving money, donating time, giving action. Besides the three basic forms, which are practically the most common in human relations, there are six other forms not less important: blood donation, organ donation, property/goods donation, borrowing of possessions, sustainability – engaging in environmental protection activities and resource care, including offering attention (Herzog & Price, 2016).

The most common form of generosity is providing sums of money to those in need. Many researchers have paid attention to the generosity manifested through donations in money by trying to identify the factors that influence people to get money from their own pockets for the good of others (Alesina & Dollar, 2000; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007a; Bielefeld, Rooney, & Steinberg, 2005; Einolf, 2011; Finkelstein et al., 2005; Haley & Fessler, 2005; Herzog & Price, 2016; Sargeant, 1999; Science of Generosity, 2009).

1.3. Predictors of generosity

A detailed analysis of the most common predictors in terms of philanthropy and, implicitly of generosity, was carried out in three articles (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a, 2011b; Wiepking & Bekkers, 2012). The authors of the articles reviewed over 500 studies on philanthropy and generosity. The three articles speak of the following most important predictors: education, age, gender, marital status, income and wealth, religion (involvement, belonging, principles-vision), socialization. Also, they mentioned rural residence as a predictor of frequency of donation - the probability to donate increases when living in the village, but not necessarily the value donated. Moreover, they describe eight mechanisms that define helping behaviour: reputation, psychological benefits, values, costs and benefits involved, solicitation, altruism, awareness of the need (idem). Uslaner (2002a) believes that trust is essential when it comes to generosity because generosity implies helping people who are out of our control without having always full information on how our money or other donated resources will be used. “Indeed, the relationship between interpersonal trust and membership in voluntary associations is a persistent research finding in Sociology” (Anheier & Kendall, 2002: 344).

All these predictors mentioned above are individual predictors, highlighted in research that analysed individual helping behaviour. In terms of group influence, it is generally acknowledged that peer effect has an influence on generosity and charitable giving, but it is still not entirely clear how and why (Duch & Rueda, 2014; Smith, Windmeijer, & Wright, 2015).

Our article “Generosity and prosocial behaviour in Middle school. The results of a survey in Bihor County Schools” (Lazăr & Hatos, 2016) analysed some of these predictions, namely: gender differences and the effect of the socio-economic status, plus the group influence. Due to the characteristics of our population, other predictors highlighted in the literature (like marital status) could not be analysed.

Figure 1 summarises our theoretical model regarding the individual predictors of generosity based on the consulted literature:

Fig. 1: Individual predictors of generosity

The following section briefly presents some of the studies that have helped us in formulating assumptions about the factors that influence generosity at individual and group level.

Gender differences

According to our 2016 research (Lazăr & Hatos, 2016), in most cultures, women are expected to behave differently in terms of prosocial behaviour and most studies show that women are perceived to be more generous (Aguilar, Brañas-Garza, Cobo-Reyes, Jimenez, & Miller, 2009; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007b; Einolf, 2010; Flanagan, Bowes, Jonsson,

Csapo, & Sheblanova, 1998; Mesch & Pactor, 2016; Wiepking & Bekkers, 2012; Willer, Wimer, & Owens, 2015). On the other hand, in the literature we find enough research that shows that there are no differences between men and women, or that the differences are in favour of men (Bekkers, 2006; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007b; Einolf, 2010; Mesch & Pactor, 2016; Wiepking & Bekkers, 2012). For example, 91% of the 7,000 people awarded by the Carnegie Hero Foundation Commission for risking their lives helping others were male (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 2007). Wiepking and Bekkers (2012) believe that, as more demographic variables are taken into account, the differences between women and men tend to decline.

Influence of the socio-economic status

Most studies underline an association between belonging to a lower social class (to a lower socio-economic status) and few resources, as well as lower self-control (Kraus, Piff, Mendoza-Denton, Rheinschmidt, & Keltner, 2012). Given the presence of these correlations, we expect generosity to be more frequent among those from upper social classes compared to those from lower social classes. This was also highlighted by the findings of our previous research from 2016. According to another study conducted in Romania by Safra et al, (2016), children aged 6-7 also showed these differences in prosocial behaviours. Using the dictator's game method, research results showed that children from richer districts behaved more prosocial than children from poorer neighbourhoods (Safra et al., 2016). Similar results are encountered in adult research as well (Korndörfer, Egloff, & Schmukle, 2015).

However, there are studies that prove otherwise (Piff, Kraus, Côté, Cheng, & Keltner, 2010). The in-depth analysis of mediators and moderators has led to the conclusion that individuals belonging to the lower social class have acted more prosocial because of a greater commitment to equality values and feelings of compassion. Also, high economic inequality seems to be the explanatory factor of the lower generosity among the rich (Côté, House, & Willer, 2015). Nevertheless, this hypothesis has been recently invalidated by others (Schmukle, Korndörfer, & Egloff, 2019). According to the research conducted by Musick, Wilson, and Bynum (2000), the socio-economic status is a predictor of generosity among the communities of white people, an aspect which is no longer valid among Afro-Americans.

Group homogeneity

We already know from the previous research (Lazăr & Hatos, 2016) that in Bihor county pupils from the same school have similar levels of

generosity - we called it the peer effect, since we attributed it, at least partially, to peer influence. Individuals belonging to the same group tend to have the same principles, so they react similarly to generosity. On the other hand, according to Manski (1993), individuals with similar principles in terms of generosity and charity tend to choose the same groups. A different approach emphasizes that individuals tend to help group members and form a certain group homogeneity on the grounds that they feel useful when contributing to the well-being of their group members, which is not the case for non-members of the group (Duch & Rueda, 2014). Scientists suggest that the preference for altruism seems to differ between groups: whites are more involved in volunteering than black people (Musick, Wilson, & Bynum, 2000), girls are more generous than boys (Einolf, 2010), American communities strongly differ from one another regarding generosity (Wolpert, 1995).

Living Environment differences

A study on a group of adolescents from the rural and urban areas of the Maya community in Guatemala that used the method of photographing showed that pupils from urban areas had more altruistic behaviours than those from rural areas (Gibbons, 2013). On the contrary, Ma, Pei, and Jin (2015) show that individuals raised in the countryside are more generous than those raised in the city. This feature is preserved even after moving to the city. These results may be regarded as an effect of the specificity of the Chinese culture with a traditional rural environment that is still based on cooperation, strong emphasis on family and strong interpersonal relationships.

Influence of religion and religiosity

Most religions preach helping, sacrificing for the other. They urge us to follow the example of the Good Samaritan and help those in need no matter who they are and where we meet them. Religion is often seen as a source of morality. One would be tempted to say that the more religious people, the ones who go to church, follow much more the example of the Good Samaritan, and most of the studies carried out in this respect confirm this assumption (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011b; Eckel & Grossman, 2003; Graham & Haidt, 2010; Herzog & Price, 2016; Lim & MacGregor, 2012; McCullough, Hoyt, Larson, Koenig, & Thoresen, 2000; Musick et al., 2000; Preston, Ritter, & Ivan Hernandez, 2010; Regnerus, Smith, & Sikkink, 1998; Ruiter & De Graaf, 2006; Wiepking, Bekkers, & Osili, 2014; Will & Cochran, 1995). A study carried out on the American adult population

(more than 2,500 interviewed) shows that religiosity influences in a positive way the help of the poor, the Catholics and the Liberal Protestants being the first places in this regard (Regnerus et al., 1998). There are positive correlations between the level of participation, involvement in the church and the level of involvement in volunteering activities; we emphasize that the individuals' involvement in the church, not the fact that they are members of a religion, is the variable that shapes volunteering (Ruiter & De Graaf, 2006). It is also shown that religious affiliation, namely going to church, encourages not only donations to the church and to the church group, but also paradoxically to other organizations, associations – secular help (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011b; Eckel & Grossman, 2003; Wiepking et al., 2014). Not only the religion of the individual, but also the religious context in which he lives (we refer to the religious characteristics of the area, the country) positively influences volunteering and donations (Lim & MacGregor, 2012; Ruiter & De Graaf, 2006; Wiepking et al., 2014). Analysing data from 53 countries, Ruiter and De Graaf (2006) conclude that a national religious context has positive influences on volunteering, and in such countries differences between religious and secular individuals are lower compared to secular countries.

However, certain studies also discuss the boundaries of this religious-generosity correlation. Thus, the meta-analysis carried out by Preston, Ritter, and Ivan Hernandez (2010) shows that religious principles can lead to an increase in prosocial behaviours in certain contexts, but, at the same time, they can influence and increase the rate of occurrence of antisocial behaviours in other contexts. Johnson, Rowatt, and LaBouff (2010) demonstrated, for example, that subliminal exposure to certain religious words can determine an increase in the level of discrimination, so we are talking about influence at the level of antisocial behaviours. The paradox of the bivalent influence of religiosity was explained by the fact that religion is more than just a belief system; it is a group of belongingness that unites individuals through common principles, traditions, celebrations, etc. Religious principles lead to greater moral concern for one's own group, for the survival and perpetuation of the group members, virtually, similar to what is happening within any group (Preston et al., 2010).

Influence of generalised trust

According to the European Values Survey, 28 of the 32 analysed countries show a positive correlation between volunteering and the level of trust, namely volunteers have a higher level of generalised trust than those who are not part of volunteer associations (Anheier & Kendall, 2002).

Generalised trust increases the rate of citizens' involvement in charitable acts (Bekkers, 2003). A recent study which involved the analysis of seven Gallup World Poll surveys (2005 – 2012) and over 130 countries shows that migrants adapt their level of trust to the specifics of the new countries, but still there is a certain footprint of their homeland - about one-third of the level of trust (Helliwell, Wang, & Xu, 2016). The authors conclude that both trust and generosity are two social norms adaptable to the new conditions of the country in which migrants currently reside, but adaptation is not 100% since significant influences of the social norms acquired from their native culture and environment are observed (idem). There is a positive correlation between the level of generalised trust and education, namely between education and generosity (Bekkers & De Graaf, 2006; Musick & Wilson, 2007; Putnam, 2000). It is noted that there is a strong correlation between trust and generosity and that generalised trust favours reciprocity - we are tempted to help someone we trust that will return us, at some point, the favour (Glanville, Paxton, & Wang, 2016; Musick & Wilson, 2007). On the other hand, researchers signal that we must be cautious when we generalise the correlation between the level of trust and generosity and that we need to take into account various situational variables or individual predispositions (De Cremer, Snyder, & Dewitte, 2001). For example, Uslaner (2002b) notes in his comparative study that, people from the English speaking provinces of Canada, respectively of Quebec, who have a higher level of trust tend to be less involved in volunteering, while in the United States he notes the opposite. A possible explanation would be the presence of a link between trust and the individualist society, as is the case of the United States (Musick & Wilson, 2007). Most of the studies show a correlation between the level of general trust and generosity (Anheier & Kendall, 2002; Bekkers, 2003; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011b; De Cremer et al., 2001; Dekker, 2004; Glanville et al., 2016; Helliwell et al., 2016; Musick & Wilson, 2007; Putnam, 2000; Uslaner, 2002a).

Education

Most studies prove that education and the level of intelligence positively influence generosity, charity (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007b; Lyons & Nivison-Smith, 2006; Millet & Dewitte, 2007; Wiepking & Handy, 2016; Wilhelm, 2006). In a study that included the analysis of over 5,000 households in the USA, Yen (2002) underlines the positive influence of education when it comes to donations, regardless of the cause they are headed for, be it donations to religious organizations, charities or other

organizations. “People who do well in school are more likely to volunteer”, said Musick and Wilson (2007: 8) in a book on the volunteer's social profile.

Intellectual skills are associated with social skills, intelligent people generally have broader social networks (Lin, Cook, & Burt, 2001), have a better ability to know more people and keep relationships, therefore the chances of being asked to donate or help in various forms are higher (Glanville et al., 2016). The memory capacity is also related to the size of the social networks of an individual (Stiller & Dunbar, 2007) and therefore with a higher frequency of the aid request. People with high intellectual skills and high levels of education have a better ability to understand the situation and demand from the needy. Also usually people with high levels of education come from richer families (Hatos, 2010) so they have more material resources and they are more likely to be more often involved in voluntary activities or make charitable gestures (Bekkers & De Graaf, 2006). The correlation between education and generosity can also be explained by the fact that the more years the individual benefits from schooling, the more a degree of civic and political involvement he develops (Hillygus, 2005).

Also, school and education develop social skills, help individuals develop their communication skills, but also their empathy (Wiepking & Maas, 2009). Intelligent people are more altruistic (Millet & Dewitte, 2007), altruism being a mechanism that models helping behaviour (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011a). Individuals with high levels of schooling generally have a higher level of confidence, i.e. a lower response time facilitating greater probability of solving problems (Deary, Der, & Ford, 2001; Son & Wilson, 2017).

When formulating the hypotheses of the present research, we took into account the results presented in the specialised literature, respectively kept under control the variables tested in the first article (Lazăr & Hatos, 2016). These hypotheses are presented below.

Our main objective was to identify the predictors of generosity among 8th grade students from Bihor county. Based on the literature review and on our previous research, the hypotheses are:

HS1: Group effect: Generosity shows significant intergroup variance.

Furthermore, at the level of individual effect, we expect the following covariations if we control the influences of gender, social background and social status:

HS2: The influence of religiosity: Generally, religious children are more generous.

HS3: The effect of school results: The better school results children have, the more generous they are.

HS4: The influence of environment (rural/urban): Children from urban areas are more generous than their rural counterparts.

HS5: The trust effect: Children's generosity significantly differs in relation to their level of generalised trust.

2. Data and Methods

2.1. Variables

Table 1. Variables involved

Types of Variables	Variable Names	Operationalization
Dependent variable	<i>Generosity</i>	As a factor score of Generosity Scale (Alpha Cronbach=0.83)
Control variables	<i>Gender</i>	
	<i>Social status</i>	We used a proxy variable: maternal level of education - dummy for the inferior education level and the <i>until high school</i> education level (reference variable: <i>university graduate and up to</i>)
	<i>Social class</i>	A proxy variable - we used "goods" for evaluating the economic situation; the sum of the responses regarding the presence or the absence of certain expensive objects.
Independent variables	<i>Religiosity</i>	We used a dummy for "I am religious in my own way", dummy for "I am not religious", dummy for "I am absolutely not religious" (reference variable - "I am religious")
	<i>School results</i>	The average mean on the precedent year results
	<i>Living environment</i>	A dummy for <i>village</i> , dummy for <i>small town</i> (reference variable "Oradea or another big city")
	<i>Generalised trust</i>	One item with responses on a Likert scale from 0 to 10.

2.2. Procedure

We used the data from “Monitorul Educațional al rezultatelor practicilor și atitudinilor în școlile din BIHOR (MERPAS)”, 2018-2019 – an online descriptive report (MERPAS, 2019). MERPAS is a cross-sectional study realized by the University of Oradea, represented by the Doctoral School of Sociology in partnership with the County Centre for Educational Resources and Assistance of Bihor County (CJRAE) and the Bihor County School Inspectorate. Among the topics addressed in the survey we mention school and professional orientation, school outcomes, educational aspirations and expectations, class and school relationships, school deviance, risk of abandonment, bullying and cyber bullying, generosity, religiosity, and others.

Most of the data was collected through a supervised self-administered online questionnaire - google forms. For 1,000 students (random sampling), we supervised the administration of the same questionnaire in the classic manner (paper-based).

2.3. Sampling

We took into consideration all 8th grade students from Bihor county, aged 14-15, who were not included in the special education system. Our scheduling sample consisted of 5,360 students, 278 classes.

According to our calculations, approximately 1,100 pupils (68 classes) of the total number of students were selected using the systematic random sampling method - step 3. The questionnaire was drawn face-to-face (the metrical form) for the selected sample, while for all other students it was applied online.

Our accomplished sample included 4,708 8th grade students from 155 schools from Bihor county. Simple Random sampling included 999 filled surveys – 991 valid answers. Online Google Form Survey included 3,709 registered answers, respectively 3,270 valid answers.

In the end, the analysed sample (not weighted) with valid answers consisted of 4,261 8th grade students.

The period of data collection was 22 November, 2018 until 13 February, 2019.

2.4. Instruments

The questionnaire used for MERPAS was developed by a team of teachers, school inspectors, sociologists and psychologists. The language

used was Romanian. After the elaboration, the pretesting stage followed, and finally the transcript of the online questionnaire - google forms. Next, the students from the sample group, to whom the application was face-to-face, filled in the questionnaire. The duration for the completion of the questionnaire was approximately 40-50 minutes.

To evaluate generosity, we used the *Scale of generosity* included in the survey at item no. 92. The scale is made of 6 items, namely:

1. De obicei îi ajut pe cei care au într-adevăr nevoie de sprijin (I usually help those who truly need support).

2. Când cineva îmi cere ajutorul nu stau niciodată pe gânduri (When someone asks for help, I do not think twice).

3. Mă simt bine când ajut pe cineva foarte necăjit (Helping someone who is poor makes me feel good).

4. Îmi place să împart lucrurile cu alte persoane (I like sharing goods with other people).

5. Îmi place să fac donații pentru cei nevoiași (I like making donations for people in need).

6. Mi-ar plăcea să am un loc de muncă în care să ajut cât mai mulți oameni (I would like to have a job where I could help as many people as possible)

For each item, the student had to choose how much the option fits him by marking a response on a 4 points Likert scale (It fits me to a great extent/ It fits me in a certain way/ It fits me a little/It fits me very little/I do not know).

The factorial analysis showed that the scale had good validity and fidelity, Alpha Cronbach is 0.77, therefore it can be used successfully in the operationalisation of the dependent variable - generosity.

For all other variables involved, we used the response to some individual questions.

2.5. Analysis procedure

In order to test the validity and fidelity of the generosity scale, we used Factor Analysis.

For testing the group effect hypothesis, we calculated the Inter-Class Correlation Coefficient (ICC). Since the calculated ICC was 0.052 we used multiple regression rather than multi-level regression.

All the other hypotheses (religiosity influence, school results effect, environment (rural/urban) influence, trust effect) were tested using the multiple linear regression.

The independent variables were grouped into *3 blocks*. In organizing the blocks of variables, we took into consideration the theoretical models in the literature (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007a; Herzog & Price, 2016; Wiepking & Bekkers, 2012).

In the *first block*, we introduced the demographic variables that are also the control variables (already analysed in our previous research) namely gender, social class and social status. We introduced an extra variable in the first block, namely living environment. Even if this is not a control variable, we introduced it because it is a demographic variable. In the *second block* we decided to introduce the school results variable and in the *last block* religiosity and generalised trust.

3. Results

3.1. Determining the properties of the Generosity Scale

A first step in validating the construction of the generosity assessment scale was the confirmatory factorial analysis, the method of analysis of the main factors.

Table 2. The factorial matrix

<i>Item</i>	<i>1 Component</i>
Generosity1	.753
Generosity2	.773
Generosity3	.723
Generosity4	.734
Generosity5	.753
Generosity6	.721

Extraction Method: Principal
Component Analysis, 1 component extracted

As it can be seen in the matrix, behind the variance of the 6 items there is only one construct, the measurement is one-dimensional, which shows us a good construct validity.

Table 3. The explained total variance

<i>Component</i>	<i>Initial Eigen values</i>		
	Total	% of Covariance	Cumulative %
1	3.312	55.202	55.202
2	.722	12.036	67.238
3	.561	9.349	76.587
4	.527	8.786	85.373
5	.468	7.794	93.167
6	.410	6.833	100.000

Extraction/Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Going in more detail, in Table 3, we notice that item 1 is the most powerful item, explaining more than half of the total variance. The internal consistency to establish fidelity was achieved by Alpha factorization. The Alpha Cronbach value is .77, which confirms that the scale has a good fidelity. Considering the analyses conducted, we conclude that the scale has good fidelity and validity, so it can be used to measure generosity.

3.2. Calculating the Inter-Class Correlation Coefficient (ICC)

In terms of intergroup variance, we obtained an $ICC = 0.052$. The result proves the differences between schools regarding generosity and these differences between schools explain 5.2% of the total variance, which confirms our first hypotheses regarding group effects – according to LeBreton and Senter (2008: 838) this represents a small to medium effect. The most agreed upon cut-off point for ICC is 0.1. Values higher than 0.1 require the use of multilevel regression. (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2013). Although others (Reise & Duan, 2003) suggest using multilevel regression even for small values of ICC, we decided to use multiple regression.

3.3. Multiple linear regression for testing hypotheses 2, 3, 4 and 5

Please note that preliminary analyses were performed to verify multicollinearity, the results indicating its absence.

Considering that the values from block one and two are similar to the values in the third block, further, we chose to present only the last block of the regression model.

Table 4. Regression coefficients of generosity

Block	B	Standard Error	Beta	t	sig.
3 (Constant)	-.088	.336		-.261	.794
Gender	-.330	.072	-.173	-4.558	.000**
Dummy maternal level of education_gymnasium	.163	.117	.071	1.391	.165
Dummy_maternal level of education_high school	.118	.092	.061	1.271	.204
Dummy_ maternal level of education_vocational school (3 years)	-.108	.131	-.034	-.820	.412
Dummy village	.054	.084	.028	.639	.523
Dummy small town	.034	.125	.011	.271	.786
Goods	.073	.020	.151	3.725	.000**
School results	-.045	.033	-.057	-1.348	.178
Dummy religiosity1_no	-.141	.241	-.022	-.585	.559
Dummy religiosity2_no	-.467	.164	-.108	-2.845	.005**
Dummy religiosity3_yes	-.085	.073	-.044	-1.164	.245
General trust	.011	.012	.032	.877	.381

** sig. < .01

Table 5. Regression model of generosity

<i>Model</i>	<i>Adjusted R Square</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>
1	.037	.938
2	.037	.938
3	.045	.934

As we can see in previous tables gender, environment and economic background introduced in the first block account for 3.7% of the total variation. School results, variable introduced in the second block, has no effect on the generosity variance.

Religiosity introduced in the third stage explains 0.7% of the total variation as we kept under control gender, social background and economic background effects. The whole model explains 4,5 % of the variance.

4. Discussions

Our main purpose was to identify the predictors of generosity among the 8th grade students from Bihor County. Based on the results of the field studies (Bekkers, 2003, 2010, 2016; Bekkers & De Graaf, 2006; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2006, 2010; Belfield & Beney, 2000; Manski, 1993; Uslaner, 2002a), we decided to include in our analysis model the following factors: religiosity, school results, living environment and generalised trust. In addition to these possible predictors, we controlled gender and socio-economic status effects - variables whose effect was highlighted even by our previous research (Lazăr & Hatos, 2016).

The results indicate that declared religiosity positively influences students' generosity. Our conclusion is similar to that of other studies in the field (Bekkers, 2010; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2010, 2011; Eckel & Grossman, 2003; Manski, 1993; Regnerus et al., 1998; Ruiter & De Graaf, 2016; Uslaner, 2002a) according to which religious students tend to become more involved in charity.

Contrary to our expectations, school results do not seem to influence students' generosity, although the majority of the consulted studies show a strong correlation between high level of training and prosocial behaviours (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007; Lyons & Nivison-Smith, 2006; Millet & Dewitte, 2007; Wiepking & Handy, 2016; Wilhelm, 2006). The absence of this correlation from our model can be explained primarily by the fact that the pupils were in the 8th grade, practically they were still studying. Moreover, until then they benefited from an equal number of years of schooling - the number of school years is considered an important variable for the development of one's civic spirit (Hillygus, 2005). On the other hand, the level of parental education (the variable under control) is not correlated with generosity. This may explain that our findings relate to the specificity of our country – an ex-communist country. We know from previous research that in Romania (as opposed to the West) social class does not matter in terms of civic competences either (Hatos, 2006).

At the same time, education is correlated to the level of trust (Bekkers & De Graaf, 2006; Musick & Wilson, 2007; Putnam, 2000). As we have mentioned before, our model does not indicate an association between generosity and school results. This explains to some extent the absence of influence of the level of trust in generosity. Although many studies show that there is generally a positive correlation between trust and generosity (Anheier & Kendall, 2002; Bekkers, 2003; Cremer & Dewitte, 2002; De Cremer et al., 2001; Glanville et al., 2016; Helliwell et al., 2016; Putnam, 2000; Sztompka, 1996), there are studies which emphasize that we have to consider various variables regarding this correlation (De Cremer et al., 2001; Cremer & Dewitte, 2002; Helliwell et al., 2016). For example, in the present case, it is known that the post-communist countries (like Romania) remained with a low level of generalised trust (Sztompka, 1996; Edelman, 2018) and this could explain to some extent our results, which are also confirmed by Uslaner (2002b). Related to these results, an interesting aspect is that the social status of the mother (operationalised by the proxy variable, the level of maternal education) had a significant effect on generosity in our previous research (Lazăr & Hatos, 2016). We assigned this difference to the effects of the new variables introduced in the current research (such as living environment, school results).

Our hypothesis that urban people are more generous has not been confirmed either. Generally, individuals in urban environments are considered to have a higher level of training and therefore more financial resources, so they are expected to be more involved in prosocial behaviours. The fact that our results do not indicate a correlation between the level of education and generosity may also explain the absence of the influence of the living environment.

Similar to our previous research (Lazăr & Hatos, 2016), the group effect is maintained, indicating once again that pupils from the same school tend to have a similar level of generosity. This shows these pupils' tendency of becoming more uniform in terms of values and implicitly in terms of responses to social situations involving charity. On the other hand, if we take into consideration Manski's observations (1993), we may wonder whether the difference is not determined by the fact that parents with a similar level of generosity choose the same school for their children.

Our research also had certain limitations that should be mentioned. The most important limitation that affected our study was the level of desirability of the answers, which we could not control. In addition, by using the online questionnaire, we could not control whether respondents' answers were true and not influenced by others. Using a large questionnaire, which

requires an extended time of concentration, could be also considered a limitation of our research.

Considering the findings of our research, we intend to expand the research in other counties as well. In addition, we are considering the possibility of analysing whether there are differences in the influence of religiosity on generosity depending on the type of confession. We also intend to improve the explanatory model in a future research by testing other possible predictors.

5. Conclusions

The present article is based on the findings of our previous research (Lazăr & Hatos, 2016) according to which gender and socio-economic background influence generosity. Based on the previous results, there is school homogeneity regarding generosity. In our present research, we tested other four new possible predictors of generosity, namely: religiosity, school results, living environment and generalised trust. Using a new and actual sample (from 2019), we tested five hypotheses regarding the predictors of generosity: group effect, religiosity influence, school results effect, living environment (rural/urban) influence and trust effect. The results indicate that only two of them were confirmed by statistical modelling – group effect and religiosity influence. Generalised trust and school results did not have significant effects according to the resulting model, which can be explained mainly by the cultural specificity.

The results of both researches, the one from 2016 and the current one, show that gender and the group effect are significant in both. Social status (operationalised by the proxy variable, the level of maternal education) did not have a significant effect on the present research, unlike the previous one (Lazăr & Hatos, 2016). This aspect can be attributed to the new variables introduced in the model that annulled the social status effect.

We can conclude that 8th grade religious girls from families with a better financial position have a higher level of generosity than the other 8th grade pupils from Romania.

We have to admit that the regression model does not explain generosity in a very large percentage, but our analysis gives us valuable results that underline the importance of religiosity in modelling this behaviour.

Knowing more about who gives or helps, about generosity in general, is extremely valuable for scholars in developing new theories about this prosocial behaviour that we do not fully understand yet. We consider

that the results of our research can contribute significantly to a better understanding of generosity and its specificity in our country. Moreover, the results add value to the field of generosity and prosocial behaviour, as other studies or programs run by non-profit organizations or fundraising campaigns may benefit from this research.

References

- Aguiar, F., Brañas-Garza, P., Cobo-Reyes, R., Jimenez, N., & Miller, L. M. (2009). Are women expected to be more generous? *Experimental Economics*, 12(1), 93-98. doi:10.1007/s10683-008-9199-z
- Alesina, A., & Dollar, D. (2000). Who gives foreign aid to whom and why? *Journal of Economic Growth*, 5(1), 33-63. doi:10.3386/w6612
- Anheier, H., & Kendall, J. (2002). Interpersonal trust and voluntary associations: Examining three approaches. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 53(3), 343-362. doi:10.1080/0007131022000000545
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert, R. M. (2007). *Social psychology* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, USA: Pearson Education.
- Bekkers, R. (2006). Traditional and health-related philanthropy: The role of resources and personality. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69(4), 349-366. doi:10.1177/019027250606900404
- Bekkers, R. (2003). Trust, accreditation, and philanthropy in the Netherlands. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32(4), 596-615. doi:10.1177/0899764003258102
- Bekkers, R., & De Graaf, N. D. (2006). *Education and prosocial behavior*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2007a). Generosity and philanthropy: A literature review. Retrieved from https://generosityresearch.nd.edu/assets/17632/generosity_and_philanthropy_final.pdf
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011a). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), 924-973. doi:10.1177/0899764010380927
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2007b). *Understanding philanthropy. A review of 50 years of theories and research*. Paper presented at the 35th annual conference of the Association for Research on Nonprofit and Voluntary Action, Chicago, USA. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/30485519_Understanding_Philanthropy_A_Review_of_50_Years_of_Theories_and_Research

- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011b). Who gives? A literature review of predictors of charitable giving part one: Religion, education, age and socialisation. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 2(3), 337-365. doi:10.1332/204080511x6087712
- Bielefeld, W., Rooney, P., & Steinberg, K. (2005). How do need, capacity, geography, and politics influence giving. *Gifts of Money in Americas Communities*, 127-158. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/46959817.pdf>
- Chen, Y., Zhu, L., & Chen, Z. (2013). Family income affects children's altruistic behavior in the dictator game. *PloS ONE*, 8(11), e80419. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0080419
- Collett, J. L., & Morrissey, C. A. (2007). The social psychology of generosity: The state of current interdisciplinary research. Indiana, USA: Department of Sociology, University of Notre Dame. Retrieved from https://generosityresearch.nd.edu/assets/17634/social_psychology_of_generosity_final.pdf
- Côté, S., House, J., & Willer, R. (2015). High economic inequality leads higher-income individuals to be less generous. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(52), 15838-15843. doi:10.1073/pnas.1511536112
- Cremer, D. D., & Dewitte, S. (2002). Effect of trust and accountability in mixed-motive situations. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142(4), 541-543. doi:10.1080/00224540209603917
- De Cremer, D., Snyder, M., & Dewitte, S. (2001). 'The less I trust, the less I contribute (or not)?' The effects of trust, accountability and self-monitoring in social dilemmas. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31(1), 93-107. doi:10.1002/ejsp.34
- Deary, I. J., Der, G., & Ford, G. (2001). Reaction times and intelligence differences: A population-based cohort study. *Intelligence*, 29(5), 389-399. doi:10.1016/s0160-2896(01)00062-9
- Dekker, P. (2004). Social capital of individuals: Relational asset or personal quality? In S. Prakash & P. Selle (Eds.), *Investigating social capital. Comparative perspectives on civil society, participation and governance* (pp. 88-110). New Delhi, India: Sage Publications.
- Duch, R. M., & Rueda, D. (2014). Generosity among Friends: Population homogeneity, altruism, and insurance as determinants of redistribution? Conference: Reason and Decision Making. Oxford, UK: Centre for Experimental Social Sciences, Nuffield College. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308920245_Generosity_among_Friends_Population_Homogeneity_Altruism_and_Insurance_as_Determinants_of_Redistribution

- Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (2003). Rebate versus matching: does how we subsidize charitable contributions matter? *Journal of Public Economics*, 87(3-4), 681-701. doi:10.1016/s0047-2727(01)00094-9
- Edelman, R. (2018). 2018 Edelman Trust Barometer. Retrieved from <https://cms.edelman.com/sites/default/files/2018-01/2018%20Edelman%20Trust%20Barometer%20Global%20Report.pdf>
- Einolf, C. J. (2011). Gender differences in the correlates of volunteering and charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(6), 1092-1112. doi:10.1177/0899764010385949
- Einolf, C. J. (2010). Gender differences in the correlates of volunteering and charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(6), 1092-1112. doi:10.1177/0899764010385949
- Finkelstein, M. A., Penner, L. A., & Brannick, M. T. (2005). Motive, role identity, and prosocial personality as predictors of volunteer activity. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 33(4), 403-418. doi:10.2224/sbp.2005.33.4.403
- Flanagan, C. A., Bowes, J. M., Jonsson, B., Csapo, B., & Sheblanova, E. (1998). Ties that bind: Correlates of adolescents' civic commitments in seven countries. *Journal of social issues*, 54(3), 457-475. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.771998077
- Gibbons, J. L. (2013). Guatemalan adolescents' reports of helping in urban and rural Mayan communities. In Vakoch, D. (Ed.), *Altruism in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 45-56). Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Glanville, J. L., Paxton, P., & Wang, Y. (2016). Social capital and generosity: A multilevel analysis. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45(3), 526-547. doi:10.1177/0899764015591366
- Graham, J., & Haidt, J. (2010). Beyond beliefs: Religions bind individuals into moral communities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 14(1), 140-150. doi:10.1177/1088868309353415
- Haley, K. J., & Fessler, D. M. (2005). Nobody's watching?: Subtle cues affect generosity in an anonymous economic game. *Evolution and Human behavior*, 26(3), 245-256. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2005.01.002
- Hatos, A. (2010). Multilevel analysis of academic achievements of upper secondary students in a Romanian city. *Studia Universitatis Babe-Bolyai-Sociologia*, 55(1), 89-116.
- Hatos, A. (2006). Lideri, participanți și pasivi: Resurse individuale pentru participare comunitară [Leaders, participants and liabilities: individual resources for community participation]. In C. Yamfir & L. Stoica (Coords.), *O nouă provocare: Dezvoltarea socială* (pp. 179-196). Iași, Romania: Polirom.
- Helliwell, J. F., Wang, S., & Xu, J. (2016). How durable are social norms? Immigrant trust and generosity in 132 countries. *Social Indicators Research*, 128(1), 201-219. doi:10.3386/w19855

- Herzog, P. S., & Price, H. E. (2016). *American generosity: Who gives and why*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hillygus, D. S. (2005). The missing link: Exploring the relationship between higher education and political engagement. *Political behavior*, 27(1), 25-47. doi:10.1007/s11109-005-3075-8
- Johnson, M. K., Rowatt, W. C., & LaBouff, J. (2010). Priming Christian religious concepts increases racial prejudice. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1(2), 119-126. doi:10.1177/1948550609357246
- Kolm, S.-C., & Ythier, J. M. (2006). *Handbook of the economics of giving, altruism and reciprocity: Foundations* (1st vol.). Amsterdam, Holland: Elsevier.
- Komter, A. (2010). The evolutionary origins of human generosity. *International Sociology*, 25(3), 443-464. doi:10.1177/0268580909360301
- Korndörfer, M., Egloff, B., & Schmukle, S. C. (2015). A large scale test of the effect of social class on prosocial behavior. *PloS ONE*, 10(7), e0133193. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0133193
- Kraus, M. W., Piff, P. K., Mendoza-Denton, R., Rheinschmidt, M. L., & Keltner, D. (2012). Social class, solipsism, and contextualism: how the rich are different from the poor. *Psychological Review*, 119(3), 546. doi:10.1037/a0028756
- Lazăr, A., & Hatos, A. (2016). *Generosity and prosocial behavior in middle school. The results of a survey in Bihor county schools*. Paper presented at the Emerging Markets Economics and Business. Contributions of Young Researchers. Oradea, Romania. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321749239_GENEROSITY_AND_PROSOCIAL_BEHAVIOR_IN_MIDDLE_SCHOOL_THE_RESULTS_OF_A_SURVEY_IN_BIHOR_COUNTY_SCHOOLS
- LeBreton, J. M., & Senter, J. L. (2008). Answers to 20 questions about interrater reliability and interrater agreement. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(4), 815-852. doi:10.1177/1094428106296642
- Lim, C., & MacGregor, C. A. (2012). Religion and volunteering in context: Disentangling the contextual effects of religion on voluntary behavior. *American Sociological Review*, 77(5), 747-779. doi:10.1177/0003122412457875
- Lin, N., Cook, K. S., & Burt, R. S. (2001). *Social capital: Theory and research*. Piscataway, USA: Transaction Publishers.
- Lindenberg, S., Fetchenhauer, D., Flache, A., & Buunk, B. (2006). Solidarity and prosocial behavior: A framing approach. *Solidarity and prosocial behavior*. In D. Fetchenhauer, A. Flache, A. P. Buunk & S. M. Lindenberg (Eds.), *An integration of sociological and psychological perspectives* (pp. 3-19). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

- Lyons, M., & Nivison-Smith, I. (2006). Religion and giving in Australia. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 41(4), 419-436. doi:10.1002/j.1839-4655.2006.tb00997.x
- Ma, Q., Pei, G., & Jin, J. (2015). What makes you generous? The influence of rural and urban rearing on social discounting in China. *PLoS ONE*, 10(7), e0133078. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0133078
- Manski, C. F. (1993). Identification of endogenous social effects: The reflection problem. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 60(3), 531-542. doi:10.2307/2298123
- McCullough, M. E., Hoyt, W. T., Larson, D. B., Koenig, H. G., & Thoresen, C. (2000). Religious involvement and mortality: A meta-analytic review. *Health Psychology*, 19(3), 211. doi:10.1037//0278-6133.19.3.211
- Mesch, D. J., & Pactor, A. (2016). Women and philanthropy. In T. Jung, S. D. Phillips & J. Harrow, *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy* (pp. 88-102). Abingdon, UK: Routledge
- Meyers, L. S., Gamst, G. C., & Guarino, A. (2013). *Performing data analysis using IBM SPSS*. Hoboken, USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Inspectoratul Școlar Județean Bihor, Școala Doctorală de Sociologie a Universității din Oradea, Centrul Județean de Resurse și Asistență Educațională Bihor. (2019). MERPAS - Monitorul Educațional al rezultatelor practicilor și atitudinilor în școlile din Bihor [MERPAS - Educational Monitoring of the results of practices and attitudes in schools in Bihor]. Retrieved from <http://socioumane.ro/blog/ccs/files/2019/05/MERPAS.pdf>
- Millet, K., & Dewitte, S. (2007). Altruistic behavior as a costly signal of general intelligence. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41(2), 316-326. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2006.04.002
- Molm, L. D. (2010). The structure of reciprocity. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 73(2), 119-131. doi:10.1177/0190272510369079
- Musick, M. A., & Wilson, J. (2007). *Volunteers: A social profile*. Bloomington, USA: Indiana University Press.
- Musick, M. A., Wilson, J., & Bynum, W. B. (2000). Race and formal volunteering: The differential effects of class and religion. *Social Forces*, 78(4), 1539-1570. doi:10.2307/3006184
- Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56(1), 365-392. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070141
- 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. doi:10.1037/a0020092

- Preston, J. L., Ritter, R. S., & Ivan Hernandez, J. (2010). Principles of religious prosociality: A review and reformulation. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(8), 574-590. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00286.x
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. In L. Crothers & C. Lockhart (Eds.), *Culture and politics* (pp. 223-234). Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- 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. doi:10.2307/1388055
- Reise, S. P., & Duan, N. (2003). *Multilevel modeling: Methodological advances, issues, and applications*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Rojas, J. A. C. (2014). The impact of capitalism and materialism on generosity: A cross-national examination. PhD Thesis. Iowa City, USA: University of Iowa. doi:10.17077/etd.z5vnrer4
- Ruiter, S., & De Graaf, N. D. (2006). National context, religiosity, and volunteering: Results from 53 countries. *American Sociological Review*, 71(2), 191-210. doi:10.1177/000312240607100202
- Safra, L., Tecu, T., Lambert, S., Sheskin, M., Baumard, N., & Chevallier, C. (2016). Neighborhood deprivation negatively impacts children's prosocial behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01760
- Sargeant, A. (1999). Charitable Giving: Towards a model of donor behaviour. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15(4), 215-238. doi:10.1362/026725799784870351
- Schmukle, S. C., Korndörfer, M., & Egloff, B. (2019). No evidence that economic inequality moderates the effect of income on generosity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(20), 9790-9795. doi:10.1073/pnas.1807942116
- Schroeder, D. A., & Graziano, W. G. (Eds.). (2015). *The Oxford handbook of prosocial behavior*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Science of Generosity. (2009). What is Generosity? Retrieved from <http://generosityresearch.nd.edu/more-about-the-initiative/what-is-generosity/>
- Sztompka, P. (1996). Trust and emerging democracy: Lessons from Poland. *International Sociology*, 11(1), 37-62. doi:10.1177/026858096011001004
- Smith, S., Windmeijer, F., & Wright, E. (2015). Peer effects in charitable giving: Evidence from the (running) field. *The Economic Journal*, 125(585), 1053-1071. doi:10.1111/econj.12114
- Son, J., & Wilson, J. (2017). Education, perceived control, and volunteering. *Sociological Forum*, 32(4), 831-849. doi:10.1111/socf.12377

- Stiller, J., & Dunbar, R. I. (2007). Perspective-taking and memory capacity predict social network size. *Social Networks*, 29(1), 93-104. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2006.04.001
- Stürmer, S., & Snyder, M. (2009). *The psychology of prosocial behavior: Group processes, intergroup relations, and helping*. Hoboken, USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Uslaner, E. M. (2002a). *The moral foundations of trust*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Uslaner, E. M. (2002b). Religion and civic engagement in Canada and the United States. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41(2), 239-254. doi:10.1111/1468-5906.00114
- Wiepking, P., & Bekkers, R. (2012). Who gives? A literature review of predictors of charitable giving. Part two: Gender, family composition and income. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 3(2), 217-245. doi:10.1332/204080512x649379
- Wiepking, P., Bekkers, R. H., & Osili, U. O. (2014). Examining the association of religious context with giving to non-profit organizations. *European Sociological Review*, 30(5), 640-654. doi:10.1093/esr/jcu064
- Wiepking, P., & Handy, F. (2016). *The Palgrave handbook of global philanthropy*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Wiepking, P., & Maas, I. (2009). Resources that make you generous: Effects of social and human resources on charitable giving. *Social Forces*, 87(4), 1973-1995. doi:10.1353/sof.0.0191
- Wilhelm, M. O. (2006). New data on charitable giving in the PSID. *Economics Letters*, 92(1), 26-31. doi:10.1016/j.econlet.2006.01.009
- 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. doi:10.2307/3711826
- Willer, R., Wimer, C., & Owens, L. A. (2015). What drives the gender gap in charitable giving? Lower empathy leads men to give less to poverty relief. *Social Science Research*, 52, 83-98. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.12.014
- Wolpert, J. (1995). Giving and region: Generous and stingy communities. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 1995(7), 11-30. doi:10.1002/pf.41219950703
- Yen, S. T. (2002). An econometric analysis of household donations in the USA. *Applied Economics Letters*, 9(13), 837-841. doi:10.1080/13504850210148189