

**‘HELPING OTHERS WHEN YOU’VE NOT HELPED YOURSELF’: A
MULTIFACETED INVESTIGATION OF THE PREDICTIVE VALUE OF
PERSONALITY ON PHILANTHROPY AMONG DISTRESSED EMPLOYEES**

Fabian O. Ugwu

Chiedozie O. Okafor

Department of Psychology, Federal University, Ndufu-Alike, Ikwo, Abakaliki, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

This present study examined the predictive value of personality on philanthropy among distressed employees. One hundred and nine (109) local government employees, who owed several months salaries were sampled from South-east Nigeria, participated in the study. Agreeableness, conscientiousness and extraversion sub-scales from the 44-item version of the Big Five Inventory, the psychological entitlement scale, the moral identity scale and the philanthropic scale were used to elicit information from participants. Consistent with hypotheses, the result of the regression analyses computed revealed that all the three factors from the Big Five considered in the study (agreeableness, conscientiousness, and extraversion) significantly predicted philanthropic behaviour. Perceived psychological entitlement did not predict philanthropy whereas moral identity significantly predicted philanthropic behaviour of participants. This study emphasises the relevance of personality in accounting for philanthropy and it is suggested that by so doing individuals’ personalities may guarantee social cohesion in society in that giving creates good feeling on the part of the giver and receiver and thus the society becomes a better place.

Keywords: Agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, moral identity, psychological entitlement, philanthropy

Helping others when one has not helped oneself is something of a misnomer. But the parable of the Widow's Mite and of the Good Samaritan could be pointed at as models of helping that challenge the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). Reasons to justify why people engage in philanthropy is enigmatic, suggesting the need for more investigation into revealing what drives the behaviour of 'doing something for nothing'. Prior studies provided limited insight in the relation between the Big Five, prosocial behaviour, empathy and volunteering. No study to our knowledge has related the dimensions of the Big Five with philanthropy among distressed employees. More so, prior studies with these variables that are related to philanthropy were carried out in developed economies of North America and Europe (e.g., Babiak, Mills, Tainsky, & Juravich, 2012; Kampriani, 2009), where employees have stable income and resources. Therefore, it would be unfair to base our understanding of these concepts on Western data only. To ensure a more comprehensive understanding and knowledge of philanthropy and its antecedents, moving such studies away from the advanced societies to under developed ones is imperative as it is likely to provide new knowledge and more insight.

The basic idea of the integrated theory of helping is that, in order to give, the giver must be able to give (Bekkers, 2006), but there are factors that could compel individuals who lack sufficient resources to give, and personality may be what propels such behaviour. During the past several decades, there has been a renaissance of interest in personality concept. Scholars have continued to expand conceptual models to account for the links between personality traits and behaviours. Personality refers to enduring characteristics that individuals carry from one situation to another, which affects their behaviour across contexts.

Over the years, personality has been linked to prosocial or voluntary behaviours among normal population (e.g., Bekkers, 2006; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011), but researchers have failed to investigate the link between personality and philanthropy among distressed population. The present study is the first attempt to explore the personality profile of distressed employees who go the extra mile to render help to individuals they perceive to be in need despite being owed salaries.

One of the most popular personality factors that have received massive research interest is the Big-Five personality model. There is abundant evidence that the Big-Five has over-bearing influence in the study of personality (Matthews & Deary, 1998). Some studies (e.g., Chiaburu, Oh, Berry, Li, & Gardner, 2011) examined all the Big- Five traits (Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness) as predictors of some prosocial behaviour. Hertz and Donovan (2000) included all these traits in their study on personality and job performance. Carlo, Okun, Knight, and Guzman (2005) accused such researchers of failing to focus on specific traits that are conceptually most relevant to the particular social behaviour being studied. This has been identified as being responsible for the relatively modest and inconsistent results often observed in many studies (Knight, Johnson, Carlo, & Eisenberg, 1994). The present study is guided by Carlo and colleagues' (2005) assertion that researchers should focus on specific personality traits that are theoretically coherent to the social behaviour they want to examine.

Current study

The present study attempts to regard agreeableness, conscientiousness and extraversion only as components of the Big-Five that are theoretically related to philanthropy. Besides, personality researchers have emphasised that agreeableness, conscientiousness and extraversion are among the personality traits that can be interpreted based on individuals' desire to be (pro)social (Carlo et al., 2005; Hogan & Holland, 2003), respect for social conventions (Paulhus & John, 1998), and impulse restraint (Digman, 1997). Individuals with these traits have the tendencies to value socialisation, solidarity, and communion (Saucier & Goldberg, 2003). From the foregoing, these three dimensions of the Big-Five personality model appear to be relevant to philanthropy.

Agreeableness is a trait of persons who engage in all kinds of prosocial and altruistic behaviours more often than others. Agreeable individuals are friendly, helpful, sympathetic, cooperative altruistic, straight-forward, trusting, soft-hearted, modest, and compliant in a variety of contexts (McCrae & Costa, 1999). Conscientiousness is reflective of dependability, dutifulness, and self-discipline, a tendency to follow rules and value order. Extraversion includes such behavioural tendencies as being sociable, gregarious, assertive, talkative, and active (Barrick & Mount, 1991). However, the influence of personality on social behaviour is

not limited to agreeableness, conscientiousness and extraversion; perceptions of entitlement, which is perceived as a stable individual difference characteristic and moral identity could also be related to pro(social) behaviour.

Although the dimensionality of the Big-Five has been found to generalise across virtually all cultures (McCrae & Costa, 1997) and remains fairly stable overtime (Ardelt, 2000); other models of personality such as moral identity and psychological entitlement have kept their tempo and have exerted significant influence on social behaviour till date.

There is an emerging consensus that the study of moral identity, a relatively new construct (Reed et al., 2007) defined as one's self-concept that is organised around a set of moral traits, such as compassion, fairness, generosity, and honesty (Aquino & Reed, 2002; Reed et al., 2007) can no longer be studied in isolation from the broader context of personality (Lapsley & Narvaez, 2004). Moral identity has been conceptualised as an important construct that may predict ethical judgements, intentions, and moral actions in situations involving ethical issues (Trevino, Weaver, & Scott, 2006). It is one promising framework that accounts for the unexplained variance between moral function and moral behaviour (Xu & Ma, 2014). Moral identity is considered in the present study for two reasons: it has been understudied (Reed, Aquino, & Levy, 2007) and it occupies a central position in social context. Although, moral identity has demonstrated significant predictive utility in Western context, there is room left to improve on the activation potential of those moral stimuli in Nigerian context. This is imperative given that moral identity is a critical component of the very nature of morality (Reed et al., 2007).

Individuals' perceptions of what they are entitled to, have long been regarded as an important area of debate. It seems as though individuals are increasingly subscribing to the belief that they should be given exactly what they desire, often times without regard for the well-being of others. Psychological entitlement has not attracted the attention of industrial researchers. Although most past research has focused on entitlement as a stable individual difference, Zitek, Jordan, Monin and Leach (2010) propose that an individual can also vary in the extent to which he or she feels entitled in the course of any given day, depending on what past experiences are salient in the individual's mind when the opportunity for selfish behaviour

presents itself. Zitek and colleagues (2010) alluded that this perception of being wronged increases individuals' sense of entitlement to avoid further suffering and to obtain positive outcomes for themselves. This feeling of entitlement tends to lead people to behave in a more selfish manner (Zitek et al., 2010). The goal of the present study is to empirically examine whether agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, moral identity, and perceived psychological entitlement all of which are aspects of personality could have a predictive value on philanthropy.

Empirical Review

Agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion and philanthropy

A range of traits of the Big-Five are related to prosocial behaviours. For instance, Barrio, Aluja and Garcia (2004) observed that agreeableness is related to empathy. Graziano and Eisenberg (1997) observed that agreeableness strongly predicts prosocial behaviours such as volunteering. Agreeableness also correlates positively with actual donations in a “public good” game in a laboratory experiment (Ben-Ner, Avner, Putterman, Kong, & Magan, 2004). If agreeableness could predict empathy, volunteering and actual donations (Piliavin & Callero, 1991), it may make a complete empirical sense to speculate that agreeableness could also predict philanthropic behaviour among distressed employees.

There are two reasons for expecting a positive correlation between conscientiousness and philanthropy: high scores on this trait inhibit aggressive behaviours (Barrio et al., 2004), conscientiousness correlates negatively with a lack of empathy (Aluja et al., 2002). It is however conceptually sound to argue that conscientiousness will be significantly related to philanthropic behaviour.

Extraversion is associated with sociability, companionability, assertiveness, positive emotions, warmth, and activity (McCrae & Costa, 1999); and has shown to predict volunteering (Kosek, 1995). Research shows that extraverts are disposed to experience more positive affect (Costa & McCrae, 1980) and higher subjective well-being (Diener, 1984) than those who are low on extraversion. Therefore, given the propensity of extraverts to be optimistic, it makes sense to assume that those individuals high on extraversion will more likely engage in philanthropy.

Hypothesis 1a: Agreeableness will have a main effect predictive value on philanthropy.

Hypothesis 1b: Conscientiousness will have a main effect predictive value on philanthropy.

Hypothesis 1c: Extraversion will have a main effect predictive value on philanthropy.

Moral identity and philanthropy

Prior research has revealed that moral identity operates to motivate behaviour across a variety of social settings. One recent study (Reynolds & Ceranic, 2007) found that moral identity did not influence behaviour if social consensus against the action was not high. A strong moral identity thus compels the individual to act in a moral manner (Colby & Damon, 1992). Drawing from the social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner & Oakes, 1986), Aquino and Reed demonstrated that these dimensions effectively predict several moral behaviours, including self-reported volunteering and the willingness to minimise harm (Aquino & Reed, 2002; Reed & Aquino, 2003). If moral identity could predict volunteering and willingness to minimise harm, it makes empirical sense to hypothesise that:

Hypothesis 2: Moral identity will have a main effect predictive value on philanthropy.

Perceived psychological entitlement and philanthropy

There has been some research evidence that support the hypothesis that feeling wronged could lead to selfish behaviour. In one study, individuals who scored higher on the Psychological Entitlement Scale said they deserved higher salaries than other workers (Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton, Exline, & Bushman, 2004). Campbell and colleagues also reported that individuals with high perception of psychological entitlement showed more greedy tendencies, and treated their romantic partners in a more selfish manner. In another study, higher scores on the Exploitativeness/Entitlement dimension of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Hall, 1981) predicted less social responsibility (Watson & Morris, 1991). Given such scenario, it could be speculated that:

Hypothesis 3: Perceived psychological entitlement will not have a main effect predictive value on philanthropy.

Method

Participants and Procedure

The participants for the study consisted of 109 local government employees in the South-east Nigeria that were owed several months salaries during the time for this study. They were selected through the convenient sampling technique. Their ages ranged from 28 to 53 years, with average age of 35.80 years. The sample consisted of 66 (60.55%) male workers. During data collection, there was no exclusion criterion as all employees available at the time of the study participated. The researcher utilised the opportunity offered by the National Union of Local Government Employees (NULGE) meetings to randomly administer the copies of the questionnaire to volunteers. Generally, a total of 119 copies of the questionnaire were administered to the employees, out of this number, 6 copies were lost, leaving the number of completed copies at 113 with a return rate of 95%. Out of this number, 4 copies were discarded due to improper completion and 109 copies only were used for data analyses.

Measures

Agreeableness, conscientiousness and extraversion. Agreeableness, conscientiousness and extraversion subscales from the 44-item version of the Big Five Inventory (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991) are composed of 9 items that assess agreeableness, conscientiousness and 8 items that assess extraversion were extracted and used in the study. The BFI items consist of short phrases that are used to assess the most prototypical traits associated with each of the Big Five dimensions (John et al., 1991). Ratings were made on a 5-point scale with anchor points ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree, where workers indicated how much they agreed or disagreed that each statement applied to them. A sample item for agreeableness is, "...is generally trusting", and sample item for conscientiousness is, "...does things efficiently". As scores on each scale increase, individuals are describing themselves as being higher on each personality dimension. The Cronbach's α of agreeableness, conscientiousness and extraversion subscales for the present study are 0.73, 0.81 and 0.76 respectively.

Moral Identity. Moral identity was measured with the scale developed by Aquino and Reed (2002). This scale measures two dimensions of moral identity, internalisation (five items) and symbolisation (five items). The scale follows 7-point Likert-type response format, which ranged from 1 (completely disagree) to 7 (completely agree). The present study reduced it to 5-point to make responses easier and to align the scale with other scales for the study. Sample

items include: “It would make me feel good to be a person who has these characteristics” (measuring the internalisation dimension) and “I am actively involved in activities that communicate to others that I have these characteristics” (measuring the symbolisation dimension). For the present study, Cronbach’s α is 0.85.

Psychological Entitlement Scale. The Psychological Entitlement Scale (PES) (Campbell et al., 2004) is a 9-item self-report measures of the extent to which individuals believe that they deserve and are entitled to more than others. Items are scored on a 1 (*strong disagreement*) to 7 (*strong agreement*) scale. The present author reduced the response format to 5-point to make responses easier and to align the scale with other scales for the study. Sample items include: “I honestly feel I’m just more deserving than others”, “I deserve more things in my life”. The Scale’s Cronbach’s α for the present study is 0.77.

Philanthropy. Philanthropy was assessed with the 8-item philanthropic scale developed by Schuyt, Smit and Bekkers (2010). The scale follows a 5-point Likert-type response format that ranged from (1 = disagree completely to 5 = agree completely). Sample items include: “We have to leave this world a better place for the next generation,” “I give money to charitable causes, no matter what the government does.” Cronbach’s α of the scale for the present study is 0.79.

Control variables

The hierarchical regression analysis was adopted to examine the predictive value of personality variables on the criterion variable. First, age, gender, marital status, level of education, Perceived Financial Position (PFP), and job tenure were compulsorily entered into the equation model as a check on the influence of those variables on the criterion variable. Next, five personality factors were compulsorily entered into the equation to see the influence of those variables beyond the control variables. These variables were controlled because previous studies have linked them to philanthropy. Specifically, researchers found that age (e.g., Weerts & Ronca, 2007), gender (Brown & Ferris, 2007), marital status (Brown & Ferris, 2007), level of education (Brown & Ferris, 2007), perceived financial position (Havens, O’Herlihy, & Schervish, 2007) were all related to philanthropic giving.

Results

Table 1: Means, standard deviations and intercorrelations among study variables

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 Philanthropy	28.80	3.05	-											
2 Age	35.80	6.67	-.08	-										
3 Gender	1.62	.49	.05	.01	-									
4 Marital status	1.39	.49	-.02	-.04	.36***	-								
5 Education	1.41	.49	-.05	.12	-.16*	-.03	-							
6 PFP	1.60	.49	-.01	-.02	.13	-.10	.08	-						
7 Job tenure	10.58	5.08	-.09	.34***	-.07	-.04	.10	-.05	-					
8 Agreeableness	25.61	2.96	.32***	.06	.26**	.15*	-.03	-.03	.03	(.73)				
9 Conscientiousness	25.95	2.72	.25**	.03	-.05	-.03	-.11	-.03	.08	.13	(.81)			
10 Extraversion	25.62	2.57	.33***	-.22**	.14*	.22**	-.10	.14*	-.24**	-.06	.18*	(.76)		
11 Entitlement	26.71	3.00	-.15*	.14*	.00	-.08	.13	-.02	.03	-.08	.00	-.07	(.77)	
12 Moral identity	26.12	3.31	.25**	.05	-.01	-.20**	-.04	-.03	.09	-.02	.12	.09	-.05	(.79)

Key: *** = $p < .001$; ** = $p < .01$; * = $p < .05$

Note: PFP = Perceived Financial Position. $N = 109$, Cronbach's α for applicable scales are reported in parenthesis along the diagonal. Gender was coded 1 = male, 2 = female; Marital status (1 = single, 2 = married), Education (1 = low, 2 = high), Perceived financial position (1 = positive, 2 = negative). Age and job tenure were entered as they were collected. Agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, perceived psychological entitlement and moral identity were coded, such that higher scores indicated higher exhibition of these behaviors.

The results of the descriptive statistics computed indicated that among the 6 control variables tested, only marital status ($r = .36, p < .001$), education ($r = -0.16, p < .05$) and job tenure ($r = 0.34, p < .001$) were related to philanthropy. Agreeableness was positively related to philanthropy ($r = 0.32, p < .001$). Conscientiousness was significantly and positively related to philanthropy ($r = 0.25, p < .01$). Extraversion was equally significantly related to philanthropy ($r = 0.33, p < .001$). Perceived psychological entitlement was negatively related to philanthropy. Moral identity was positively and significantly related to philanthropy ($r = 0.25, p < .01$).

Table 2: Hierarchical regression results

Variables	Step1(β)	Step 2(β)	Step 3(β)	Step 4(β)	Step 5(β)	Step 6(β)
Age	-.05	-.08	-.06	-.04	.00	.02
Gender	.07	-.01	.01	-.02	-.01	-.03
Marital status	-.05	-.07	-.07	-.15	-.16	-.11
Education	-.03	-.03	-.00	.02	.03	.03
PFP	-.03	-.01	-.01	-.07	-.07	-.06
Job tenure	-.04	-.03	-.07	.00	-.03	-.07
Agreeableness		.34***	.30**	.35***	.34***	.34***
Conscientiousness			.22**	.14	.15	.13
Extraversion				.37***	.36***	.33**
Entitlement					-.12	-.10
Moral identity						.19*
R ² (Adjusted)	-.04	.06	.10	.21	.22	.25
ΔR^2	.01	.10	.05	.11	.01	.03
ΔF	.24	12.19	5.69	14.99	1.67	4.62
F-Value	.24	1.97	2.52	4.22	3.99	4.18

*** = $P < .001$; ** = $p < .01$; * = $P < .05$

The 6 control variables tested in the study combined to explain 4.4 percent of the variance in philanthropy. Agreeableness explained 5.9 percent of the variance in philanthropy far and above the control variables. The regression equation model indicated that agreeableness was significantly predicted philanthropy ($\beta = 0.34$, $p < .001$). This result is consistent with *H1a*, in that agreeableness will have a main effect predictive value on philanthropy. Conscientiousness explained 10.1 percent of the variance in philanthropy, far and above the control variables and agreeableness. In the regression equation model, conscientiousness predicted philanthropic behaviour ($\beta = 0.22$, $p < .01$). This is in line with *H1b*, in that conscientiousness will have a main effect predictive value on philanthropy. Extraversion contributed 21.1 percent of the variance on philanthropy far and above the control variables, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. In the regression equation model, extraversion predicted philanthropic behaviour ($\beta = 0.37$, $p < .001$). This is consistent with *H1c*, in that extraversion will have a main effect predictive value on philanthropy. Perceived psychological entitlement contributed 21.7 percent of the variance in philanthropy far and above the control variables, agreeableness, conscientiousness and extraversion. In the regression equation model, perceived psychological entitlement did not predict philanthropic behaviour ($p > .05$). This is in line with *H2*, which stated that perceived psychological entitlement will not have a main effect predictive value on philanthropy. Furthermore, moral identity on the other hand, explained 24.5 percent of the variance on philanthropy far and

above the control variables, agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion and perceived psychological entitlement. In the regression equation model, moral identity significantly predicted philanthropy ($\beta = 0.19, p < .05$). This is consistent with H3, in that moral identity will have a main effect predictive value on philanthropy.

Discussion

The goal of the present study was to examine the predictive value of agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, perceived psychological entitlement, and moral identity on philanthropy among distressed employees. The result of the study is consistent with speculation that agreeableness will have a main effect predictive value on philanthropy. Since agreeableness seen as a feature of persons that engage in variety of prosocial and altruistic behaviours more often than others, it may explain the reason employees who are owed salaries and scarcely have enough for themselves and their families have the propensity to extend hands of fellowship to those they perceive to be in need. More so, African and indeed Nigerian culture, especially the south-eastern part of Nigeria is relatively high in collectivism defined as a tendency to define oneself in terms of social role or duty to the in-group (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002). It reflects the subordination of personal goals to group goals, a sense of harmony and interdependence, and concern for others (Hofstede, 1991). Collectivism fosters a climate of transcending self-interest for the sake of the group. Moorman and Blackley (1995) indicated that individuals with collectivistic values and norms are more likely to go out their way to help other people or group. This may explain why distressed employees still have the strength of character to exhibit philanthropy despite their difficult situation. This result seems to be consistent with Graziano and Eisenberg (1997) who observed that agreeableness strongly predicts prosocial behaviours. This result also corroborates Ben-Ner, Avner, Putterman, Kong and Magan (2004) who established that agreeableness correlates positively with actual donations.

The result of the present study further revealed that conscientiousness predicted philanthropy. This finding is consistent with speculation that conscientiousness will have a main effect predictive value on philanthropy. The reason for this result might be linked to the observations that conscientiousness is reflective of dependability, dutifulness, and self-discipline, a tendency to follow rules and value order. This finding seems to be in agreement

with the study of John and colleagues (1994) and that of Barrio and colleagues (2004) which established that high scores on conscientiousness inhibit aggressive behaviours.

The results of the study further indicated that extraversion had a main effect predictive value on philanthropy. This is in agreement with the conjecture that extraversion will have a main effect predictive value on philanthropy. This result is not surprising in that extraversion is associated with sociability, companionability, positive emotions, warmth, and activity (McCrae & Costa, 1999). This may explain the reason behind philanthropic behaviour exhibited by those high in extraversion. This result seems to be consistent with previous studies (e.g., Kosek, 1995) which indicated that extraversion predict volunteering, which shares affinity with philanthropy.

Furthermore, the results of the present study equally indicated that moral identity significantly predicted philanthropic behaviour. Moral identity has been consistently related to moral behaviour. Colby and Damon (1992) pointed out that a strong moral identity compels individuals to act in a moral manner. This result seems to be in agreement with Aquino and Reed (2002) and Reed and Aquino (2003) which demonstrated that moral identity significantly predicted several moral behaviours, including self-reported volunteering and the willingness to minimise harm.

Also the results of the study revealed that perceived psychological entitlement did not predict philanthropic behaviour among the samples studied. Entitled individuals are known for their chronic selfish behaviour. This result is not surprising because individuals with high perception of psychological entitlement are hardly satisfied as they often feel they deserve more than they receive. The present result seems to agree with the assertion that individuals with high perception of entitlement exhibit more greedy tendencies and often keep things to themselves. This result also seems to be consistent with Watson and Morris (1991) who established that higher scores on the Exploitativeness/Entitlement dimension of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory predicted less social responsibility.

Implications of the Study

With such a unique population for this study, the personality construct was put under scrutiny in terms of such individuals producing consistent behaviours even in very difficult times. An

interesting aspect of the findings is that it corroborates prior findings that individuals' personalities are in reality enduring as agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and moral identity all predicted philanthropy.

Although most research has identified personality as the main driver of helping behaviours and in this context philanthropy, the society should initiate actions to inculcate or orientate the public about the import of engaging in philanthropic behaviours, and also encourage or reward such behaviour, especially as we continue to experience tough economic times. This will help create harmony in the system and offers hope to the less privileged and they may in turn become useful and law abiding individuals in society.

Limitations of the Study

It should be kept in mind that the data presented in this study were from a single source. The researcher was exclusively interested in the personality profiles of employees that give money or materials to those they perceive to be in need when the employees are facing excruciating circumstances of being owed several months of their salaries. In such a study, social desirability bias is a possibility as some employees would like to appear good. Future studies should consider multiple sources of data. This is because single source is often prone to bias and as such can falsely inflate the beta weights estimated in the results, whereas multiple sources of data mitigate any spurious interpretation that may be given to data generated from a single source. The issue of research design poses another limitation to the present study. Survey research design used is not a typical experimental research design where there is random assignment of subjects to conditions or levels of the independent variables, and thus the present researcher has tested relationships between variables informed by theory, but obviously did not empirically test for causation. Experimental or longitudinal data is well known as an effective method in addressing issues of causation.

Conclusion

The present study examined the predictive value of aspects of personality on philanthropy. The results of the study revealed that agreeableness conscientiousness, and extraversion

significantly predicted philanthropy; perceived psychological entitlement did not predict philanthropy whereas moral identity significantly predicted philanthropic behaviour of participants. Philanthropy as a prosocial behaviour plays a vital role in every society in that it creates a sense of comradeship, especially to the receivers and gives them sense of living and to the givers, it provides them with a huge sense of purpose and fulfilment. Having observed that conscientiousness, agreeableness, extraversion and moral identity predicted philanthropic behaviour, once more emphasised that personality is indeed an enduring disposition or pattern of behaviour that people carry to different situations. This is because despite the difficult or distressed conditions participants found themselves, they tended to exhibit behaviour consistent with their personality dispositions.

REFERENCES

- Aluja, A., García, O., & García, L. F. (2002). A Comparative Study of Zuckerman's Three Structural Models for Personality through the NEO-PI-R, ZKPQ-III-R, EPQ-RS and Goldberg's 50-bipolar adjectives. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33, 713-725.
- Aquino, K., & Reed, A. II. (2002). The Self Importance of Moral Identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(6), 1423–1440.
- Ardelt, M. (2000). Still Stable After All These Years? Personality Stability Theory Revisited. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63, 392–405.

- Babiak, K., Mills, B., Tainsky, S., & Juravich, M. (2012). An Investigation into Professional Athlete Philanthropy: Why Charity is Part of the Game. *Journal of Sport Management*, 26, 159-176.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.
- Bekkers, R. (2006). Traditional and Health Related Philanthropy: The Role of Resources and Personality. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69(4), 349-366.
- Ben-Ner, A., Putterman, L., Kong, F., & Magan, D. (2004). Reciprocity in a two-part dictator game. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 53, 333–352.
- Bekkers, R., & De Graaf N. D. (2006). Education and Prosocial Behavior. *Working paper Department of Sociology/ICS Utrecht*. Utrecht University, the Netherlands.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). Generosity and Philanthropy: A Literature Review of Empirical Studies of Philanthropy: Eight Mechanisms that Drive Charitable Giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), 924 –973.
- Block, J. (1995). A Contrarian View of the Five-factor approach to Personality Description. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 187–215.
- Brown, E., & Ferris J. M. (2007). Social Capital and Philanthropy: An Analysis of the Impact of Social Capital on Individual Giving and Volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36, 85-99.
- Campbell, W. K., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (2004). Psychological Entitlement: Interpersonal Consequences and Validation of a Self-report Measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 83, 29 - 45.
- Carlo, G., Okun, M. A., Knight, G., & Guzman, M. R. (2005). *The Interplay of Traits and Motives on Volunteering: Agreeableness, Extraversion and Prosocial Value Motivation*. Faculty Publication, Department of Psychology. Paper 9. University of Nebraska – Lincoln, USA.
- Carlo, G., Knight, G. P., Eisenberg, N., & Rotenberg, K. J. (1991). Cognitive Processes and Prosocial Behaviors among Children: The Role of Affective Attributions and Reconciliations. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 456–461.
- Chiaburu, D. S., Oh, I. S., Berry, C. M., Li, N., & Gardner, R. G. (2011). The Five-Factor Model of Personality Traits and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1140-1166.
- Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1992). *Some Do Care: Contemporary Lives of Moral Commitment*. New York: Free Press.

- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1980). Influence of Extroversion and Neuroticism on subjective well-being: Happy and unhappy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(4), 668–678.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective Well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542-575.
- Diener, E., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). Very Happy People. *Psychological Science*, 13(1), 81-84.
- Del Barrio, V. O., Aluja, A., & Garcia, L. F. (2004). Relationship between Empathy and the Big Five Personality Traits in a Sample of Spanish Adolescents. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 32(7), 677-682.
- Digman, J. M. (1997). Higher-order Factors of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1246–1256.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- Graziano, W. G., & Eisenberg, N. (1997). Agreeableness: A Dimension of Personality. In R. Hogan, J. A. Johnson, & S. R. Briggs (Eds), *Handbook of Personality Psychology*. San Diego: Academic Press. Pp 795-824.
- Hofstede, G. H. (1991). *Culture and organization: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003). Using Theory to Evaluate Personality and Job Performance Relations: A Socioanalytic Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 100–112.
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social Behavior as Exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63, 597- 606.
- Homans, G. C. (1974). *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Hurtz, G. M., & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and Job Performance: The Big Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 869–879.
- Ilies, R., Fulmer, I. S., Spitzmuller, M., & Johnson, M. D. (2009). Personality and Citizenship Behavior: The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 945–959.
- John, O. P., Caspi, A., Robins, R. W., Moffitt, T. E., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1994). The “Little Five”: Exploring the Nomological Network of the Five-Factor Model of Personality in Adolescent Boys. *Child Development*, 65, 160-178.

- Kampriani, E. (2009). Between Religious Philanthropy and Individualised Medicine: Situating Inherited Breast Cancer Risk in Greece. *Anthropology & Medicine, 16*(2), 165–178.
- Knight, G. P., Johnson, L. G., Carlo, G., & Eisenberg, N. (1994). A Multiplicative Model of the Dispositional Antecedents of a Prosocial Behavior: Predicting More of the People More of the Time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*, 178–183.
- Lapsley, D. K., & Narvaez, D. (2004). A social-cognitive approach to the moral personality. In D. K. Lapsley and D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral development, self and identity* (pp. 189–212). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric Properties of the HEXACO Personality Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 39*, 327–356.
- Matthews, G., & Deary, I. J. (1998). *Personality Traits*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1997). Conceptions and Correlates of Openness to Experience. In R. Hogan, R. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 825–847). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1999). A five-factor theory of Personality. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research (2nd ed.)* (pp. 139–153). New York: Guilford Press.
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking Individualism and Collectivism: Evaluation of Theoretical Assumptions and Meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 3-72.
- Paulhus, D. L., & John, O. P. (1998). Egoistic and Moralistic Biases in Self-perception: The Interplay of Self-deceptive styles with Basic Traits and Motives. *Journal of Personality, 66*, 1025–1060.
- Raskin, R., & Hall, C. S. (1981). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Alternate Form Reliability and Further Evidence of Construct Validity. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 45*, 159–162.
- Reed, A., II, & Aquino, K. (2003). Moral Identity and the Expanding Circle of Moral Regard toward Out-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 1270-86.
- Reed, A. II, Aquino, K., & Levy, E. (2007). Moral identity and judgments of charitable behaviors. *Journal of Marketing, 71*, 178–193.
- Reynolds, S. J., & Ceranic, T. L. (2007). The Effects of Moral Judgement and Moral Identity on Moral Behavior: An Empirical Examination of the Moral Individual. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(6), 1610-1624.

- Saucier, G., & Goldberg, L. R. (2003). The structure of personality attributes. In M. R. Barrick & A. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Personality and work* (pp.1–29). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schuylt, T. N. M., Smit, J. H., & Bekkers, R. (2010). The Philanthropy Scale: A Sociological Perspective in Measuring New Forms of Prosocial Behavior. *Social Work & Society*, 8(1), 121-135.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- Trevino, L. K., Weaver, G. R., & Scott, R. J. (2006). Behavioral Ethics in Organizations: A Review. *Journal of Management*, 32, 951–990.
- Turner, J. C., & Oakes, P. J. (1986). The Significance of the Social Identity Concept for Social Psychology with reference to Individualism, Interactionism, and Social Influence. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 237–252.
- Watson, P. J., & Morris, R. J. (1991). Narcissism, Empathy and Social Desirability. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 575–579.
- Weerts, D. J., & Ronca, J. M. (2007). Profiles of Supportive Alumni: Donors, Volunteers, and Those who “do it all”. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7, 20-34.
- Xu, Z. X., & Ma, H. K. (2014). Moral Identity in Chinese Context: Construction and Validation of an Object Measure. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 34-45.
- Zitek, E. M., Jordan, A. H., Monin, B., & Leach, F. R. (2010). Victim Entitlement to Behave Selfishly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(2), 245-255.