A study was conducted by (Eisenberg N & Lennon R, 1983) Reviews the literature on sex differences in

empathy (defined as vicarious affective responding to the emotional state of another) and related

capacities (affective role taking and decoding of nonverbal cues). The literature is discussed according to

method used to assess empathy and affective role taking. Where appropriate, meta-analyses were also

computed. In general, sex differences in empathy were found to be a function of the methods used to

assess empathy. There was a large sex difference favoring women when the measure of empathy was

self-report scales; moderate differences (favoring females) were found for reflexive crying and self-

report measures in laboratory situations; and no sex differences were evident when the measure of

empathy was either physiological or unobtrusive observations of nonverbal reactions to another's

emotional state. Moreover, few sex differences were found for children's affective role taking and

decoding abilities.

A study was conducted by (Macro Bani , Barbara Giussani, 2010) An overview of European blood donors

shows that the distribution of men and women donors is similar in many countries, with Italy being an

exception in that women account for only 30% of donors. Gender medicine is a key issue in this context,

even though gender studies are very limited in the transfusion field, whether considered broadly or with

specific regards to the selection, management and retention of donors. It, therefore, seemed important

to compare the presence of women among blood donors in different European countries and examine

the roles that gender is reported to play in the donation of blood in order to identify possible

implications for communication with and management of the donor. The published studies showed that

gender plays key roles in the motivation to give blood (women being more altruistic, men being more

individualistic) and in adverse reactions, which was a particularly critical problem leading to fewer

women become regular donors. A few aspects specific to the management of donors in Italy also

emerged.

A study was conducted by (Debra J. Mesch Melissa S Brown Zachary I Moore Amir Daniel Hayat, 2011)

The paper examined the mechanisms for giving by investigating the psychological and values differences

between men and women's motivations for giving. They explored two of the eight mechanisms for

giving developed by Bekkers and Wiepking as a framework for why people give—principle of care and

empathic concern. Are there differences in these motives for giving by gender, and can these differences

in values and the psychological benefits that people receive when making donations explain gender

differences in charitable giving? Are women more likely to give and give more than men because of their

higher levels of empathic concern and principle of care? They used two US national data sets to test our

hypotheses. The results for both data sets indicate significant differences in motives by gender, as well

as differences in the probability of giving and amount given by gender, even after controlling for

empathic concern and principle of care measures. The findings are discussed in terms of the importance

of viewing charitable giving through a gender lens as well as practical implications for practitioners.

A study was conducted by (Eisenberg ,N.,Fabes, R.A.,Miller, P,A., Fultz,J.,Shell,R.,Mathy,R.M.,& Reno,R.R, 1989)Assessed sympathy and personal distress with facial and physiological indexes (heart rate) as well

as self-report indexes and examined the relations of these various indexes to prosocial behavior for

children and adults in an easy escape condition. Heart rate deceleration during exposure to the needy

others was associated with increased willingness to help. In addition, adults' reports of sympathy, as

well as facial sadness and concerned attention, were positively related to their intention to assist. For

children, there was some indication that report of positive affect and facial distress were negatively

related to prosocial intentions and behavior, whereas facial concern was positively related to the

indexes of prosocial behavior. These findings are interpreted as providing additional, convergent

support for the notion that sympathy and personal distress are differentially related to prosocial

behavior.

A study was conducted by (James Andreoni & Lise Vesterlund) FEB 2001 We study gender differences in

altruism by examining a modified dictator game with varying incomes and prices. Our results indicate

that the question “which is the fair sex?” has a complicated answer—when altruism is expensive,

women are kinder, but when it is cheap, men are more altruistic. That is, we find that the male and

female “demand curves for altruism” cross, and that men are more responsive to price changes.

Furthermore, men are more likely to be either perfectly selfish or perfectly selfless, whereas women

tend to be “equalitarians” who prefer to share evenly.

A study was conducted by (Einolf, 2010) Psychological research has found that women score higher on

most measures of the traits, motivations, and values that predict helping others, and women are more

likely to help family and friends. However, sex differences in the institutional helping behaviors of

volunteering and charitable giving are small. The article seeks to explain this apparent contradiction with

the hypotheses that men have more resources and more social capital than women, which compensates

for their lower level of motivation. The article tests these hypotheses using data from the 1995 Midlife

in the United States (MIDUS) survey. The data showed partial support for these hypotheses, as men

score higher on measures of income, education, trust, and secular social networks. However, women

had broader social networks through religious participation.

A study was conducted by (Nancy Eisenberg , Tracy L. Spinrad & Ariel Knafo‐Noam, 2015) of the review

research and some current theory on the development of prosocial responding (including

prosocial behavior and empathy‐related responding) and possible antecedents/causes, outcomes, and

correlates. In the initial section of this chapter, we briefly present a general framework for integrating

factors that contribute to prosocial responding. Then the empirical literature related to the

development of prosocial behavior, with an emphasis on the emerging literature on early development

and development during adolescence, is reviewed. Next we review literature on the potential origins of

prosocial responding, including potential biological, cultural, familial, and peer/school factors. Then we

address sociocognitive correlates of prosocial responding and the relations of

temperamental/personality and social‐behavioral individual differences (e.g., aggression) to prosocial

behavior and/or empathy‐related responding. Due to space constraints, we focus more on current

rather than older publications and disproportionately on topics of central importance to prosocial

development and issues that have been foci of interest in the past decade. In the final section also, gaps

in the field and future directions are discussed.

A study was conducted by (Oswald, 2010)The impact of cognitive and affective perspective taking on

empathic arousal and altruistic responding was investigated in an American, working adult, ethnically

diverse population. Altruistic helping, operationalized as the number of hours a participant volunteered

to help counsel other adult students, depended on the type of perspective induced. Cognitive and

affective perspectives were induced by instructing participants to pay attention to and discern (a) the

thoughts of the stimulus person, (b) the feelings of the stimulus person, or (c) distracting, irrelevant

details that provided a comparison condition. Participants in the affective perspective-taking condition

reported greater empathic arousal than control participants. Participants in the affective perspective-

taking condition also offered more help than did those in the cognitive perspective-taking condition or in

the control condition.

A study was conducted by (Krebs, 1970)Reviews literature relating to altruism and suggests that the

study of altruism is important at 3 levels: (a) as it relates to the main goal of socialization, (b) to a core

attribute of personality, and (c) to theories concerned with human nature. Independent variables

associated with altruism are organized in a 2 \* 4 framework on the basis of the source of experimental

measurement and level of generality. Characteristics of the benefactor and characteristics of the

recipient are categorized as state variables, trait variables, social roles and demographic attributes, and

characteristics influenced by social norms. Research at each level is critically reviewed. Positive and

negative affective states, and states induced by the observation of models are found to influence the

altruism of benefactors; and dependency and interpersonal attractiveness are found to influence the

altruism-eliciting capacity of recipients. Research relevant to personality traits were criticized. Effects

were found for sex, age, ordinal position, social class, and nationality in relation to benefactors, and for

friendship status, ingroup affiliation, and social class in relation to recipients.

A study was conducted by (Robert F. Krueger, Brian M. Hicks, Matt McGue, 2001)The relationship

between altruism and antisocial behavior has received limited attention because altruism and antisocial

behavior tend to be studied and discussed in distinct literatures. The research bridges these literatures

by focusing on three fundamental questions. First, are altruism and antisocial behavior opposite ends of

a single dimension, or can they coexist in the same individual? Second, do altruism and antisocial

behavior have the same or distinct etiologies? Third, do they stem from the same or from distinct

aspects of a person's personality? Our findings indicate that altruism and antisocial behavior are

uncorrelated tendencies stemming from different sources. Whereas altruism was linked primarily to

shared (i.e., familial) environments, unique (i.e., nonfamilial) environments, and personality traits

reflecting positive emotionality, antisocial behavior was linked primarily to genes, unique environments,

and personality traits reflecting negative emotionality and a lack of constraint.

A study was conducted by (C. Daniel Batson PhD Adam A. Powell MBA, MA, 2003) Prosocial behavior

covers the broad range of actions intended to benefit one or more people other than oneself—actions

such as helping, comforting, sharing, and cooperation. Altruism is motivation to increase another

person's welfare; it is contrasted to egoism, the motivation to increase one's own welfare. There is no

one‐to‐one correspondence between prosocial behavior and altruism. Prosocial behavior need not be

motivated by altruism; altruistic motivation need not produce prosocial behavior. Over the past 30

years, the practical concern to promote prosocial behavior has led to both a variance‐accounted‐for

empirical approach, which focuses on identifying situational and dispositional determinants of helping,

and the application of existing psychological theories. Theories invoked to explain prosocial behavior

include social learning, tension reduction, norm, exchange or equity, attribution, esteem‐enhancement,

and moral reasoning theories. In addition, new theoretical perspectives have been developed by

researchers focused on anomalous aspects of why people do—and don't—act prosocially. Their research

has raised the possibility of a multiplicity of social motives—altruism, collectivism, and principlism, as

well as egoism. It has also raised questions—as yet unanswered—about how these motives might be

most effectively orchestrated to increase prosocial behavior.
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