DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 443 CG 017 717

AUTHOR Renner, Patricia; Eagly, Alice H.
TITLE Sex Differences in Helping Behavior: A Meta-Analytic Study.
SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 84
GRANT NSF-BNS-8216742
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association (56th, Chicago, IL, May 3-5, 1984). Table 3 is marginally legible.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Helping Relationship; Higher Education; Meta Analysis; Moral Values; Predictor Variables; Role Theory; *Sex Differences; Sex Stereotypes
IDENTIFIERS *Helping Behavior

ABSTRACT

Whether or not there are sex differences in helping behavior is a question that has attracted interest from both theoretical and applied perspectives. A meta-analysis was conducted of 172 studies of helping behavior, coded for publication date, source, sex of author, sample size, setting, type of appeal for help, availability of other helpers, sex of victim/requester, and observation by another person. To generate measures of the extent to which each helping behavior was sex-typed in the male or female direction, undergraduate students rated a brief description of each helping behavior appearing in the studies in the sample. Results showed that, in general, helping behaviors were not strongly sex-typed. Men were especially helpful when under surveillance by persons other than the victim/requester, when a need was present, and when there was no direct request. Female victims/requesters received more aid, especially when the helper was under surveillance. The theoretical analysis of helping behavior in terms of social roles and social influence is generally consistent with the findings of the meta-analysis, suggesting that researchers should describe the variability of sex differences and attempt to account for it in terms of a detailed analysis of situations and behaviors. Although sex differences are seldom well represented by averaging them out, gender is sometimes an important variable in social interaction. (JAC)

Sex Differences in Helping Behavior: A Meta-Analytic Study

Patricia Renner and Alice H. Eagly

Purdue University

Paper presented at the meetings of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, May 1984. The research reported in this paper was supported by National Science Foundation Grant BNS-8216742.

(A complete report on this meta-analysis will be available this summer from Alice Eagly.)

Sex Differences in Helping Behavior: A Meta-Analytic Study

Whether there are sex differences in helping behavior is a question of considerable interest from both theoretical and applied perspectives. To examine this research literature, meta-analytic methods are especially appropriate because of the large number of studies. Yet quantitative methods of research integration are hardly sufficient to disentangle the conceptual issues involved in understanding how gender affects helping. A good meta-analytic review is guided by an effective theory. For gender differences in helping, there are several sources of relevant theory.

Despite their questionable reputation, the stereotypes that people hold about women and men are worth considering as a source of theory. According to stereotype research, women are believed to be kinder and more helpful than men (e.g., Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; Eagly & Steffen, 1984; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Yet if we think more deeply about gender stereotypes, it is clear that there are contrasting characterizations of sex differences in helping. One such theme is that some men are heroic, at least on an occasional basis. Heroic behavior is certainly helpful behavior. According to the Oxford English Dictionary (1971, Vol. V, p. 245), a hero is "A man distinguished by extraordinary valour and martial achievements; one who does brave or noble deeds." Although our culture also provides the concept of heroine, most of the people singled out as heroes by historians and other writers are men.

Men are also believed to be more helpful than women in at least certain classes of situations calling for courteous behavior. The particularly masculine forms of courtesy can be labeled chivalrous behavior, which is "characterized by pure and noble gallantry, honor, courtesy, and disinterested devotion to the cause of the weak or oppressed" (Oxford English Dictionary,

1971, Vol. II, p. 363). The weak and oppressed, of course, are usually understood to include women.

Conventional wisdom also has implications for sex differences in receiving help. Because women are believed to be weaker and more dependent than men (e.g., Broverman et al., 1972), they are thought to be more helpless, at least in threatening situations not ordinarily encountered within the confines of the domestic role. Yet helplessness does not necessarily lead to being helped--victimization is another likely consequence.

Contrasting with this idea that weakness may elicit helping is the well known principle that power and privilege allow one to demand help from others. Thus, in certain social settings men are more likely to receive aid than women are because of their generally higher rank in hierarchies of status and authority.

These various stereotypic beliefs suggest that it is sometimes men and sometimes women who are likely to be especially helpful or especially likely to receive help. To understand more systematically the conditions under which one rather than the other prediction should be made, it is appropriate to examine psychological theory and research pertaining to helping behavior.

Because a decision to help is often morally relevant, theories of morality and moral reasoning may suggest ways in which men and women differ in their approach to helping. Most notably, Freud (e.g., 1965) argued that men have a stronger superego than women, and this theme of men's superior morality is also found in research pertaining to Kohlberg's (1969) stage theory of moral reasoning. These theories suggest that men may help more than women when helping is consistent with conventional norms and values.

Yet the idea that men are generally more moral and ethical than women has been repeatedly challenged (e.g., Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Sherman, 1971),

most recently by Gilligan (1982). Gilligan has argued that women's moral reasoning is not inferior to men's but is qualitatively different because it is guided by commitments to people and a concern with their welfare. From Gilligan's standpoint, women would be more helpful than men when helpful actions are an expression of a caring and nurturant orientation.

From a social psychological perspective, obtaining help can be viewed in terms of social influence. The person who asks for aid is attempting to influence another person, and helping in response to such a appeal is a compliant behavior. In contrast, when an individual helps in response to the mere portrayal of a need and in the absence of a direct request, as in bystander intervention studies, the act of helping is more correctly viewed as an assertive act.

Given that some kinds of helping are assertive and others are compliant, theory about sex differences in dominant and compliant behaviors is relevant to predicting helping behavior. Consistent with Eagly's (1983) analysis of gender and social influence, there are two reasons why women tend to be less dominant and more compliant than men: (a) women tend to occupy lower-status roles than men, and such roles require that assertiveness be tempered and compliance be emphasized; (b) even in the absence of a hierarchy of roles, women are expected to be relatively weak and unassertive, and such expectancies have at least a small tendency to engender behaviors that confirm them. From this perspective, men would be particularly likely to be helpful in situations in which helping is elicited by the mere portrayal of a need and is therefore an assertive act. Women would be more likely to be helpful in situations in which helping is elicited by a direct request and is therefore a compliant act.

Helping can also be viewed as regulated by social norms that apply to individuals on the basis of social roles that they occupy. Some such norms

are probably inherent in the gender role that applies to one by virtue of being a woman or a man. In particular, the norms encouraging one to be chivalrous and heroic may be embedded in the male gender role. In contrast, the female gender role may include norms encouraging more compliant and submissive forms of service to others because such behavior is consistent with women's subordinate status in human societies.

Other helping behaviors may be viewed as distinctively feminine and distinctively masculine because they are aspects of roles occupied exclusively or almost exclusively by persons of one sex. For example, mothers and wives tend to be helpful to family members, as such behaviors are important components of these roles. Other helping behaviors are aspects of occupational roles, and it is relevant to note that women are particularly well represented in occupations defined primarily in terms of helping others--for example, in the occupations of nurse, social worker, teacher, and secretary.

From a social role perspective, sex differences in helping behavior should be highly variable because helping is embedded in social roles and consequently regulated by a variety of social norms. Therefore, it is not reasonable to make a general prediction that either men or women are especially helpful, provided that helping has been studied in ways that are representative of natural settings. However, helping has been investigated almost exclusively in the context of short-term relationships between strangers. To the extent that the caring orientation that Gilligan (1982) and others have descibed is applied to people in close or long-term relationships, a substantial proportion of women's helpfulness would not be displayed in the helping literature. In contrast, the distinctively masculine chivalrous and heroic forms of helping would be displayed in relationships between strangers

and would tend to be directed by men toward women. Therefore, in view of the particular ways that helping has been studied, it is reasonable to expect that men would be found especially helpful and women especially likely to receive help.

This social-role analysis might be further confirmed by successful prediction of the direction and magnitude of sex differences from the attributes of social settings and helping acts. For example, to the extent that helping is heroic, the presence of on-lookers might elicit greater helping from men than women since the concept of hero includes public recognition for one's exploits. Masculine heroic behavior might also be especially likely when other potential helpers are available since the hero is the one who steps forward from among the many potential helpers. The analysis of helping behavior as heroic also suggests that it is relevant to examine whether helping acts are perceived as dangerous. Women may perceive many situations as more dangerous than men do, especially in interactions with strangers, and may not feel obligated to risk harm to themselves in order to help a stranger. Finally, the role analysis suggests that helping acts may be sex-typed because people often gain confidence and skill in such activities within roles that are commonly occupied only by one sex. For this reason, helping acts should be examined for the extent to which men and women feel competent and comfortable engaging in such behavior. Men's and women's competence and comfort should reflect their past experience in differing social roles.

Method

The sample of studies was obtained from existing bibliographies and from computer-based information searches of several data bases. The studies included in the sample met the following criteria: (a) the subjects were female and male adults or adolescents from the United States or Canada, and

(b) a behavioral measure of helping was included as a dependent variable. The sample consists of 172 studies, which yielded 182 sex-of-subject reports.

Among the variables coded for each study were date of publication, source of publication, sex of authors, sample size, setting, type of appeal for help (direct request or presentation of need), availability of other potential helpers, surveillance of helping act by persons other than victim or requester, and sex of victim/requester.

A questionnaire study was conducted to generate measures of the extent to which each helping behavior was sex-typed in the male or female direction. Undergraduate subjects rated a brief description of each helping behavior appearing in the studies in the sample. These ratings were performed in relation to the following six questions: How competent the subject would be to provide the help, how comfortable the subject would feel in providing the help, how much danger the subject would probably face if she/he provided the help, how likely the subject would be to provide the help, how likely the average woman would be to provide the help, and how likely the average man would be to provide the help. From these ratings, sex-typing scores were created by subtracting each female mean from the corresponding male mean and dividing by the standard deviation.

The effect size index employed in the present study is *d*, the difference between the means of two groups, divided by the pooled (within-sex) standard deviation. For dichotomous helping behaviors, probit transformations were used.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 presents a summary of the study attributes associated with the sex-of-subject effects. It should be noted that, in general, the helping behaviors were not strongly sex-typed, although women tended to regard the

behaviors as more dangerous than men. Table 2 presents the overall sex-of-subject effects. As expected, men were more helpful than women, although the extreme heterogeneity of the effects renders such summaries somewhat questionable.

Table 3 lists all of the sex-of-subject effects, together with the attributes of the studies from which they came. This information is ordered by the size of the effect, starting with the differences that most strongly favored men and ending with those that most strongly favored women. For all of the study attributes except publication date, larger numbers were expected to be associated with larger positive effects--that is, with greater helping by men than women.

Table 4 displays the effects of the categorical attributes of the helping studies (see Hedges, 1982). It should be noted that the sex difference favored men in off-campus settings and favored women in the laboratory. Men were also especially helpful when they were under surveillance by persons other than the victim or requester and when other helpers were available. In addition, men were especially helpful when a need was presented and there was no direct request.

Table 5 presents the correlation matrix for the sex-of-subject effects, and Table 6 presents a regression analysis that incorporates some of our measures of the sex-typing of the behaviors as well as the variables coded from the studies. Because many of the predictors were intercorrelated, they did not all remain significant when controlled for the effects of the other predictors. In this regression, the importance of the setting, the type of appeal, and the sex difference in perceived danger should be noted.

Table 7 presents the sex of victim/requester effects. As expected, female victims and requesters received more aid. In addition, the tendency for men to be more helpful than women was obtained only for female victims and

requesters. The sex-of-subject difference was very small for male victims and requesters. A regression analysis of the sex-of-victim/requester effects is also included in Table 6. The importance of the surveillance variable in the regression should be noted: Women received a lot of help when the helper was under surveillance.

In conclusion, the theoretical analysis of helping behavior in terms of social roles and social influence is generally consistent with the findings of the meta-analysis. In fact, the social psychological variables we examined allowed us to be remarkably successful in accounting for the variability in the sex differences reported in the research literature. Our success makes a persuasive case for the situational analysis of sex differences. Thus, researchers should describe the variability of sex differences and attempt to account for it in terms of a detailed analysis of situations and behaviors. Viewed from this perspective, it is usually not meaningful merely to average sex difference findings across wide domains and to argue that the resulting aggregated sex differences are small or large, or trivial or important. Although sex differences are seldom well represented by averaging them, they will usually appear to be small when such averaging is carried out. Yet as this meta-analysis shows, gender is sometimes a very important variable in social interaction. Investigators should not allow this fact to be obscured by methods that dismiss sex differences as small or trivial.

References

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. (1972). Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 59-78.

Eagly, A. H. (1983). Gender and social influence: A social psychological analysis. American Psychologist, 22, 971-981.

Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 735-754.

Freud, S. (1965). New introductory lectures on psychoanalysis. New York: W. W. Norton.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hedges, L. V. (1982). Fitting categorical models to effect sizes from a series of experiments. Journal of Educational Statistics, 7, 119-137.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Oxford English Dictionary, Compact Edition. (1971). New York: Oxford University Press.

Sherman, J. A. (1971). On the psychology of women: A survey of empirical studies. Springfield, IL: Thomas.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). Masculinity & femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, & antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Table 1

Summary of Study Attributes Associated with Sex-of-Subject Effects

Attribute	Known effects (N = 98)	All effects[a] (N = 181)
	Continuous attributes[b]	
Mdn publication year	1975.49	1975.62
Mdn N of subjects	160.25	120.06
M % of male authors	76.24 (69.59/82.88)	75.88 (70.89/80.86)
M competence	.06	.00
sex difference[c]	(-.01/ .14)	(-.05/ .06)
M comfort	-.07	-.13
sex difference[d]	(-.14/ .01)	(-.18/ -.08)
M danger	.12	.09
sex difference[e]	(.06/ .16)	(.06/ .12)
M own behavior	-.01	-.07
sex difference[f]	(-.09/ .06)	(-.12/ -.02)
M stereotypic	-.08	-.21
sex difference[g]	(-.21/ .06)	(-.30/ -.12)

(table continues)

	Categorical attributes[h]	
Setting[i]	17/33/48	44/52/85
Surveillance[j]	39/47/12	76/91/14
Availability of other helpers[k]	46/52	84/97
Type of appeal[l]	58/40	109/72

[a]Effects that could not be calculated and were reported as nonsignificant are included. [b]Below each mean, 95% confidence interval is given in parentheses. [c]Difference has a positive sign for greater male competence. [d]Difference has a positive sign for greater male comfort. [e]Difference has a positive sign for greater female danger. [f]Difference has a positive sign for greater male likelihood of helping. [g]Difference has a positive sign for stronger male stereotype. [h]Effects that could not be classified because the attribute was varied in the study were placed in the middle category for setting and surveillance and in the first category for availability of other helpers and type of appeal. [i]Categories are laboratory/campus/off-campus. [j]Categories are no surveillance/unclear surveillance. [k]Categories are not available or unclear/available. [l]Categories are direct request/presentation of need.

Table 2

Summary of Sex-of-Subject Effects

Criterion	Value
Effect size analyses	
Known effects (*N* = 98)	
M effect size (*d*.)	.12
95% CI for *M* effect size	.02/.22
Mdn effect size	.10
M weighted effect size (*g*.)[a]	.33
95% CI for *M* weighted effect size	.31/.35
Total *N* of subjects	39,290
All effects (*N* = 181)	
M effect size (*d*.)	.06
95% CI for *M* effect size	.01/.12
Total *N* of subjects	51,349
Counting methods	
	Frequencies / χ^2
Differences in male direction[b]	63/101 / 5.70^{*}
Significant differences in male direction[c]	28/181 / 104.13^{d**}

(table continues)

Note. When all effects were included, a value of 0 (no effect) was assigned to effects that could not be calculated and were reported as nonsignificant. Effect sizes were given a positive sign for differences in the male direction and a negative sign for differences in the female direction.

[a]Effects weighted by 1/variance. [b]First number is number of differences in male direction; second number is total number of studies with known direction. [c]First number is number of significant differences in male direction; second number is total number of studies with known significance. There were 18 significant differences in female direction. [d]Based on expected values of 5 and 176, or .03 and .97 of N.

*$p < .01$, one-tailed **$p < .001$, one-tailed

Table 3

Sex-of-Subject Effects and Study Attributes, Ordered by Size of Effect

Study	Behavior[a]	Effect size (d) (proportions)[b]	Confidence limits for d L	U	Situational variables[c]	Competence sex difference[d]	Comfort sex difference[e]	Danger sex difference[f]	Own behavior sex difference[g]	Stereotypic sex difference[h]
Pomazal & Clore (1973), Study 3	Helping person with flat tire or picking up hitchhiker	1.48 (.34/.03)	1.29	1.66	3/3/2/2	.96	.59	.69	.72	1.37
Piliavin, Piliavin, & Rodin (1975)	Helping man who fell in subway	1.44 (.10/.00)	1.32	1.56	3/3/2/2	.52	-.03	.34	.23	.00
Pomazal & Clore (1973), Study 1	Helping person with flat tire	1.44 (.21/.01)	1.22	1.66	3/3/2/2	1.11	.26	.72	.56	1.35
Pomazal & Clore (1973), Study 2	Giving ride to hitchhiker	1.42 (.20/.01)	1.20	1.64	3/3/2/2	.73	.91	.66	.90	1.39
Borofsky, Stollak, & Messé (1971)	Stopping brutal fight between two subjects	1.23 (.48/.10)	.57	1.89	1/3/2/2	.85	.49	.52	.76	.98
Piliavin & Piliavin (1972)	Helping man who fell in subway	1.03 (.08/.00)	.88	1.18	3/3/2/2	.52	-.03	.34	.23	.00
Kleinke, MacIntire, & Riddle (1978), Study 1	Mailing letter for woman in shopping mall	.86 (.85/.57)	.41	1.31	3/2/2/1	-.09	-.28	-.03	-.13	-.13
Solomon & Herman (1977)	Picking up fallen groceries for woman at her car	.79 (.53/.24)	.26	1.31	3/2/1/2	.03	-.11	.13	-.07	.26
West, Whitney, & Schnedler (1975), Study 1	Helping person with car trouble on busy street	.75 (.04/.01)	.66	.84	3/3/2/2	.34	.50	.08	.45	1.28

(Table continues)

Study	Behavior[a]	Effect size (d) (proportions)[b]	Confidence limits for d L	U	Situational variables[c]	Competence sex difference[d]	Comfort sex difference[e]	Danger sex difference[f]	Own behavior sex difference[g]	Stereotypic sex difference[h]
Schopler & Bateson (1965), Study 1	Volunteering for experiment on exposure to heat	.72 (.61/.33)	.31	1.13	2/2/2/1	.85	.72	.55	.52	.38
Wispé & Freshley (1971)	Helping woman with fallen groceries at store	.71 (.59/.32)	.41	1.02	3/2/1/2	-.36	-.54	-.03	-.32	.19
Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin (1969)	Helping man who fell in subway	.65 (.03/.00)	.59/	.71	3/3/2/2	.30	.49	.26	.30	.30
Blevins & Murphy (1974)	Helping woman pick up dropped packages	.60 (.54/.31)	.04	1.16	3/2/1/2	-.09	-.40	-.22	-.22	.35
Feinman (1978)	Letting stranger into your home to use phone	.59 (.95/.85)	.27/	.91	3/1/2/1	.66	.57	.84	.68	1.26
Gelfand, Hartmann, Walder, & Page (1973)	Reporting theft by shoplifter	.57 (.38/.19)	.14/	.99	3/2/1/2	.50	.29	.45	.34	-.04
Shaffer, Rogel, & Hendrick (1975), Study 1	Stopping someone from stealing student's belongings in library	.54 (.50/.29)	-.03	1.12	2/2/1/1	.02	.19	.00	.07	.76
Shotland & Huston (1979), Study 8	Giving stranger a ride home from campus	.53 (.61/.40)	.27/	.80	2/2/1/1	.36	.43	.62	.35	.57
Benson & Catt (1978)	Giving money to United Way worker at door	.51	.25/	.76	3/1/2/1	-.25	-.29	.31	-.03	-.85

(table continues)

Study	Behavior[a]	Effect size (d) (proportions)[b]	Confidence limits for d L	U	Situational variables[c]	Competence sex difference[d]	Comfort sex difference[e]	Danger sex difference[f]	Own behavior sex difference[g]	Stereotypic sex difference[h]
Kleinke, MacIntire, & Riddle (1978), Study 2	Lending dime to woman in park	.49 (.41/.24)	.21/	.77	3/2/2/1	-.15	-.14	.13	-.06	.20
Dutton & Lake (1973)	Giving money to panhandler on campus	.46 (.70/.52)	.01/	.90	2/2/2/1	-.14	-.05	.20	-.11	-.65
Latané & Dabbs (1975)	Picking up items someone dropped in elevator	.46 (.35/.20)	.40/	.51	3/2/2/2	-.31	-.75	-.29	-.38	-.05
Seaman, Barnes, Klentz, & McQuirk (1978), Study 2	Helping man sprawled on floor of campus building	.44 (.41/.26)	.03/	.84	2/2/1/2	.03	-.16	-.42	.30	.25
Seaman (1979)	Helping man on crutches who fell at mall	.42 (.59/.42)	-.09/	.93	3/3/2/2	-.13	-.31	-.05	-.02	.06
Rudestam, Richards, & Garrison (1971)	Helping attractive woman carry heavy boxes on campus	.40 (.45/.30)	-.04/	.84	2/1/1/2	.86	1.26	.31	1.49	1.66
Goldman, Florez, & Fuller (1981)	Returning act of holding doors open	.39 (.48/.33)	.08/	.69	3/2/1/2	-.09	-.31	.17	-.28	.09
Latané (1970), Study 1, Part 4	Answering request for your name, on street	.38 (.53/.38)	.14/	.62	3/2/1/1	-.07	.34	.43	.17	.44
Morgan (1973), Part 2	Answering request for your name, in public	.36 (.65/.51)	.17/	.56	3/2/1/1	.22	.14	.67	.19	.41

(Table continues)

Study	Behavior[a]	Effect size (d) (proportions)[b]	Confidence limits for d L	U	Situational variables[c]	Competence sex difference[d]	Comfort sex difference[e]	Danger sex difference[f]	Own behavior sex difference[g]	Stereotypic sex difference[h]
Schwarz, Jennings, Petrillo, & Kidd (1980)	Stopping man from stealing student's calculator in library	.36 (.73/.60)	-.36	1.08	2/2/1/1	.07	.24	.00	.17	.79
Kleinke (1977)	Lending dime to woman who asked, at airport	.36 (.64/.50)	.00	.71	3/2/2/1	-.15	-.20	.08	-.17	.29
Bégin (1976)	Signing petition for campus spotlights to add beauty	.35 (.78/.67)	.11	.59	2/2/2/1	-.22	.04	.04	.06	-.80
Cunningham (1978), Study 1	Helping woman with dropped papers at mall	.34	-.10	.79	3/2/1/2	-.10	-.29	-.04	-.18	.23
[illegible], Whitney, & Schnedler (1975), Study 2	Helping person with car trouble on street	.34 (.04/.02)	.26	.42	3/3/2/2	.39	.72	.18	.84	1.50
Harris, Benson, & Hall (1975)	Donating money to March of Dimes after church	.34 (.32/.21)	.03	.64	3/2/2/1	-.03	-.32	-.14	-.16	-.51
Jackson & Latané (1981)	Donating money to Leukemia Society to women at door	.31	.09	.54	3/1/2/1	-.10	-.47	-.01	-.12	-.60
Senneker (1979)	Helping choking female student at experiment	.31 (.74/.63)	.00	.62	1/2/1/2	.07	.13	-.11	-.03	.18
Latané (1970), Study 2	Giving 20 cents to stranger for subway	.30 (.52/.40)	.21	.40	3/2/2/1	-.23	-.44	.21	-.03	-.09
Gaertner (1973), Study 1	Calling garage for person with car problem	.29 (.80/.71)	.11	.47	3/1/1/1	.14	-.46	.06	-.34	-.29

Study	Behavior[a]	Effect size (d) (proportions)[b]	Confidence limits for d L	U	Situational variables[c]	Competence sex difference[d]	Comfort sex difference[e]	Danger sex difference[f]	Own behavior sex difference[g]	Stereotypic sex difference[h]
Moss & Page (1972)	Helping woman who dropped bag, downtown	.26 (.78/.70)	-.10/	.62	3/2/1/2	-.06	-.08	-.16	-.29	.02
Samerotte & Harris (1976)	Helping man who dropped envelopes in shopping center	.24	-.12/	.60	3/2/1/1	-.16	-.46	-.03	-.57	-.54
Gaertner & Bickman (1971)	Calling garage for person with car problem	.24 (.67/.58)	.12/	.36	3/1/1/1	-.48	-.48	.15	-.44	-.11
Pomazal (1977)	Donating money to solicitor from charity	.21 (.47/.38)	.01/	.42	2/2/2/1	.30	-.14	-.03	-.15	-.64
Darley & Latané (1968)	Helping male student who has seizure at experiment	.19 (.69/.62)	-.41/	.79	1/2/1/2	.06	-.08	-.09	.10	.07
Shotland & Stebbens (1980)	Helping woman who is sexually assaulted in campus building	.18 (.43/.36)	-.24/	.60	2/2/1/2	1.07	.83	.39	1.03	1.15
Isen, Clark, & Schwartz (1976), Study 1	Making phone call for woman with no change	.17 (.63/.56)	-.60/	.94	3/1/1/1	.12	-.29	-.19	-.30	-.35
Baker & Reitz (1978)	Making phone call for person with no change	.13 (.67/.62)	-.06/	.32	3/1/1/1	-.37	-.57	.11	-.39	-.43
Emswiller, Deaux, & Willits (1971)	Lending change to stranger for important phone call	.13 (.60/.55)	-.07/	.33	2/2/2/1	.24	-.13	.10	.02	-.12

(Table continues)

Study	Behavior[a]	Effect size (d) (proportions)[b]	Confidence limits for d L	U	Situational variables[c]	Competence sex difference[d]	Comfort sex difference[e]	Danger sex difference[f]	Own behavior sex difference[g]	Stereotypic sex difference[h]
Karabenick, Lerner, & Beecher (1975)	Helping person pick up dropped pamphlets	.13 (.70/.66)	-.05/	.30	2/2/1/2	-.32	-.19	.15	-.35	-.17
Morgan (1973), Part 1	Telling time to requester in public place	.11 (.91/.89)	-.08/	.31	3/2/2/1	.00	-.07	.09	-.24	-.01
Lindskold, Forte, Haake, & Schmidt (1977)	Giving money to crippled persons' fund, on campus	.10 (.13/.11)	.03/	.18	2/2/2/1	.19	.05	.16	-.01	-.71
Benson, Karabenick, & Lerner (1976)	Mailing stamped graduate school application left at airport	10 (.42/.38)	-.08/	.28	3/1/2/2	-.15	-.26	-.32	-.40	-.53
Bickman (1974), Study 2	Volunteering to be in experiment	.10 (.61/.58)	-.16/	.37	2/1/2/1	-.17	.01	.11	-.14	-.85
Levin & Isen (1975), Study 2	Mailing letter found in railway station	.09 (.54/.50)	-.53/	.72	3/1/2/2	.20	.02	.08	.00	-.63
Bickman (1974), Study 1	Volunteering to be in experiment	.08 (.64/.61)	-.20/	.36	2/1/2/1	-.17	.01	.11	-.14	-.85
Shotland & Straw (1976), Study 1	Aiding screaming woman being shaken by man on campus	.07 (.43/.40)	-.48/	.62	2/2/1/2	.95	.84	.31	.92	.87
Zuckerman & Reis (1978)	Donating blood during blood drive	.07 (.21/.19)	-.18/	.32	2/3/2/2	-.05	-.28	-.08	-.13	.03

(table continues)

Study	Behavior[a]	Effect size (d) (proportions)[b]	Confidence limits for d L	U	Situational variables[c]	Competence sex difference[d]	Comfort sex difference[e]	Danger sex difference[f]	Own behavior sex difference[g]	Stereotypic sex difference[h]
Foss & Dempsey (1979), Study 1	Agreeing to donate blood after agreeing to put blood drive ad on your door	.06 (.27/.25)	-.41/	.53	2/2/2/1	-.08	-.26	.13	-.08	-.22
Simon (1971)	Calling garage for person with car trouble	.01 (.71/.71)	-.15/	.17	3/1/1/1	.03	-.12	-.23	.06	.06
Bloom & Clark (1976)	Donating blood to hurt hemophiliac	.00 (.08/.08)	-.28/	.28	2/3/1/1	-.27	-.34	.11	-.10	.00
Harris & Huang (1973b)	Helping student hurt in experiment	.00 (.20/.20)	-.62/	.62	1/1/1/2	-.18	-.34	-.26	-.24	.09
Solanch (1979), Measure 2	Helping someone pick up dropped pencils at experiment	.00 (.15/.15)	-.62/	.62	1/1/1/2	-.07	-.47	-.12	-.29	-.16
Weyant & Clark, (1977), Study 1	Mailing stamped letter left in phone booth	.00 (.19/.19)	-.49/	.49	3/1/2/2	.21	.27	-.05	-.17	-.76
Levitt & Kornhaber (1977)	Giving money to handicapped woman requesting change	-.05 (.33/.35)	-.40/	.31	3/2/2/1	.27	.26	.28	.09	-.19
Thayer (1973)	Helping deaf person make phone call	-.06 (.54/.56)	-.37/	.25	3/2/2/1	-.36	-.32	.24	-.32	-.55
Harris, Liguori, & Stack (1973), Study 1	Volunteering to bake cookies or give money for ecology project, requester at door	-.07	-.30/	.16	3/1/2/1	-.55	-.20	.19	-.44	-1.51

Study	Behavior[a]	Effect size (d) (proportions)[b]	Confidence limits for d L	U	Situational variables[c]	Competence sex difference[d]	Comfort sex difference[e]	Danger sex difference[f]	Own behavior sex difference[g]	Stereotypic sex difference[h]
Shaffer, Rogel, & Hendrick (1975), Study 2	Stopping someone from stealing student's belongings in library	-.08 (.38/.41)	-.57/	.41	2/2/1/1	.02	.19	.00	.07	.76
Thalhofer (1971), Measure 3	Volunteering to be in later experiment	-.12	-.40/	.17	1/1/2/1	-.17	.01	.11	-.14	-.85
Boice & Goldman (1981)	Calling garage for someone with car trouble	-.16 (.58/.64)	-.51/	.20	3/1/1/1	-.48	-.48	.15	-.44	-.11
Harris, Liguori, & Stack (1973), Study 3	Volunteering to bake cookies or give money for ecology project, phone request	-.16	-.47/	.15	3/1/2/1	-.37	-.48	.20	-.37	-1.48
Deaux (1972)	Giving information on phone to author for book	-.17 (.69/.75)	-.56/	.22	3/1/2/1	.10	.07	-.07	-.06	-.42
Slochower, Wein, White, Firstenberg, & DiGuilio (1980)	Donating money to woman for March of Dimes on campus	-.20 (.09/.13)	-.34/	-.06	2/2/2/1	.20	-.10	.01	-.02	-.34
Cunningham (1979), Study 1	Agreeing to opinion interview on street	-.20	-.37/	-.03	3/2/2/1	.27	.28	.01	.05	-.50
Foss & Crenshaw (1978)	Helping woman who dropped box in campus parking lot	-.20 (.53/.61)	-.69/	.29	2/2/1/2	-.41	-.49	.20	-.30	-.21

(table continues)

Study	Behavior[a]	Effect size (d) (proportions)[b]	Confidence limits for d L	U	Situational variables[c]	Competence sex difference[d]	Comfort sex difference[e]	Danger sex difference[f]	Own behavior sex difference[g]	Stereotypic sex difference[h]
Thalhofer (1971), Measure 2	Changing teacher's rating to help disturbed boy avoid punishment-oriented school	-.21	-.50/	.08	1/1/1/1	-.36	-.24	.20	-.29	-.86
Thalhofer (1971), Measure 1	Giving time or money to help disturbed boy avoid punishment-oriented school	-.21	-.50/	.07	1/1/1/1	-.48	-.40	.28	-.54	-.81
Fink, Rey, Johnson, Spenner, Morton, & Flores (1975)	Donating blood in response to request on campus	-.25 (.68/.76)	-.75/	.26	2/2/2/1	.18	-.06	.38	.00	-.05
Baron & Bell (1976)	Agreeing to participate in student attitude survey	-.29	-.60/	.02	2/1/2/1	-.25	-.15	-.11	-.08	-.91
Zinser & Farra (1978)	Donating time to tutor male freshmen on academic probation	-.29	-.69/	.11	2/1/2/1	-.12	-.27	.40	-.49	-.31
Harrell & Goltz (1980)	Stopping someone from stealing student's calculator in library	-.32 (.50/.63)	-.76/	.13	2/2/1/1	.95	.40	.22	.46	.72
Bleda, Bleda, Byrne, & White (1976)	Informing experimenter about cheating subject	-.33 (.29/.41)	-.56/-.09		1/1/1/2	.23	.15	.19	.23	-.38
Solanch (1979), Measure 4	Calling garage for person with car trouble	-.33 (.72/.82)	-1.00/	.34	2/1/1/1	.03	-.12	-.23	.06	.06

(Table continues)

Study	Behavior[a]	Effect size (d) (proportions)[b]	Confidence limits for ζ L	U	Situational variables[c]	Competence sex difference[d]	Comfort sex difference[e]	Danger sex difference[f]	Own behavior sex difference[g]	Stereotypic sex difference[h]
Shotland & Johnson (1978)	Helping man who falls on campus	-.41 (.39/.55)	-.70/-.12		2/2/1/2	.23	-.24	.11	-.05	-.38
Bickman (1974), Study 3	Volunteering to be in later experiment	-.42 (.23/.38)	-.65/-.19		2/1/2/1	-.17	.01	.11	-.14	-.85
Lerner & Frank (1974)	Helping someone with fallen groceries at store	-.44 (.33/.50)	-.85/-.03		3/2/1/2	-.06	-.23	-.12	-.28	-.19
Levy, Lundgren, Ansel, Fell, Fink, & McGrath (1972)	During test, helping man find classroom	-.45	-.83/-.07		1/2/1/1	.25	.05	.35	.21	-.25
Dertke, Penner, & Ulrich (1974)	Informing bookstore employee that someone just stole book	-.47 (.04/.10)	-.73/-.22		2/1/1/1	.20	.22	.09	.16	-.24
Pandey & Griffitt (1977), Measure 1	Collating and stapling papers for no pay or credit	-.54	-.98/-.09		1/1/2/1	-.07	-.52	.25	-.36	-.85
Leftgoff-Sechooler (1979)	Helping person with dropped books in experiment waiting room	-.54	-.83/-.24		1/1/1/2	-.36	-.42	-.18	-.23	-.05
Bihm, Gaudet, & Sale (1979)	Mailing stamped letter mistakenly put on your windshield	-.56 (.51/.72)	-.84/-.28		3/1/1/2	-.41	-.46	.00	-.39	-.84

(Table continues)

Study	Behavior[a]	Effect size (d) (proportions)[b]	Confidence limits for d L	U	Situational variables[c]	Competence sex difference[d]	Comfort sex difference[e]	Danger sex difference[f]	Own behavior sex difference[g]	Stereotypic sex difference[h]
Pandey & Griffitt (1977), Measure 2	Collating and stapling papers for no pay or credit	-.57	-1.01	-.12	1/1/2/1	-.07	-.52	.25	-.36	-.85
Schwartz & Gottlieb (1980b)	Helping man with neck brace who fell in campus building	-.62 (.52/.75)	-1.04	-.20	2/2/1/2	-.04	.02	-.21	-.03	.22
Pandey & Griffitt (1974), Measure 1	Collating and stapling papers for no pay or credit	-.62	-1.20	-.04	1/1/2/1	-.07	-.52	.25	-.36	-.85
Cunningham (1979), Study 2	Leaving generous tip for waitress	-.62	-.98	-.27	3/2/1/2	.53	.15	.04	.35	.65
Pandey & Griffitt (1974), Measure 2	Collating and stapling papers for no pay or credit	-.64	-1.22	-.06	1/1/2/1	-.07	-.52	.25	-.36	-.85
Solanch (1979), Measure 1	Calling garage for person with car trouble	-.65 (.84/1.00)	-1.30	.00	2/1/1/1	.03	-.12	-.23	.06	.06
Schwartz & Ames (1977), Study 3	Mailing envelope that contains someone's important papers	-.68	-1.12	-.24	3/1/2/2	-.01	-.07	-.22	-.29	-.45
Smith, Wheeler, & Diener (1975)	Volunteering to spend time with retarded children	-.70 (.07/.22)	-.91	-.50	1/1/2/1	-.29	-.63	-.28	-.55	-1.29

(Table continues)

Study	Behavior[a]	Effect size (d) (proportions)[b]	Confidence limits for d L	U	Situational variables[c]	Competence sex difference[d]	Comfort sex difference[e]	Danger sex difference[f]	Own behavior sex difference[g]	Stereotypic sex difference[h]
Austin (1979), Study 3	Stopping someone from stealing student's belongings in classroom building	-.71 (.47/.74)	-.92	-.49	2/2/1/1	.46	.09	-.12	.04	.64
Wilson & Kahn (1975)	Helping, with some pay, graduate student with experiment	-.80	-1.44	-.15	1/1/2/1	-.57	-.60	.03	-.41	-.98

[a]Summary of description given to subjects who rated behaviors. [b]Effect sizes were given a positive sign for differences in the male direction and a negative sign for differences in the female direction; first number in parentheses is proportion of males who helped, and second number is proportion of females who helped. [c]First variable is setting (1 = laboratory; 2 = campus; 3 = off-campus); second variable is surveillance (1 = no surveillance; 2 = unclear; 3 = surveillance); third variable is availability of other helpers (1 = not available or unclear; 2 = available); fourth variable is type of appeal (1 = direct request; 2 = presentation of need). [d]Difference has a positive sign for greater male competence. [e]Difference has a positive sign for greater male comfort. [f]Difference has a positive sign for greater female danger. [g]Difference has a positive sign for greater male likelihood of helping. [h]Difference has a positive sign for stronger male stereotype.

Table 4

Tests of Categorical Models for Sex-of-Subject Effects

Variable and class	Between class effect (H_B)	N	Weighted effect size ($g_{i.}$)	95% CI for $g_{i.}$ L	U	Homogeneity within class (H_{wi})
Setting	607.22*					
Laboratory		17	-.22	-.31/	-.14	66.97*
Campus		33	.01	-.03/	.05	174.45*
Off-Campus		48	.49	.46/	.51	1045.88*
Surveillance	867.59*					
No surveillance		39	-.05	-.10/	-.01	223.13*
Unclear		47	.22	.17/	.26	360.86*
Surveillance		12	.75	.71/	.79	442.95*
Availability of other helpers	219.64*					
Not available		46	.04	.00/	.08	274.58*
Unclear or available		52	.41	.39/	.44	1400.30*
Type of appeal	538.71*					
Direct request		58	.07	.03/	.10	380.66*
Presentation of need		40	.55	.52/	.58	975.16*

(table continues)

Note. Effect sizes were given a positive sign for differences in the male direction and a negative sign for differences in the female direction.

*$p < .05$

Table 5

Correlation Matrix for Known Sex-of-Subject Effects

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Publication year												
2. Off-campus setting[a]	-.38											
3. Laboratory setting[b]	.01	-.38										
4. Surveillance[c]	-.36	.38	-.16									
5. No surveillance[d]	.03	-.11	.37	-.36								
6. Availability of other helpers[e]	-.07	.17	-.21	.34	-.39							
7. Type of appeal[f]	-.15	.44	-.08	.61	-.38	.19						
8. Competence sex difference[g]	-.05	.00	-.15	.63	-.38	.20	.26					
9. Comfort sex difference[h]	-.19	.00	-.12	.69	-.26	.14	.22	.80				
10. Danger sex difference[i]	-.28	.00	-.05	.43	-.11	.00	-.11	.61	.62			
11. Own behavior sex difference[j]	-.16	.14	-.16	.73	-.36	.21	.33	.84	.91	.59		
12. Stereotypic sex difference[k]	-.16	.42	-.23	.68	-.41	.05	.55	.58	.62	.29	.78	
13. Sex-of-subject effect[l]	-.35	.54	-.35	.64	-.44	.34	.53	.44	.28	.38	.42	.50

(table continues)

Note. $N = 98$. Correlations computed with weights equal to 1/variance of each effect. For $rs \geq .20$, $p < .05$.

[a]1 = off-campus; 0 = campus or laboratory. [b]1 = laboratory; 0 = campus or off-campus. [c]1 = surveillance; 0 = unclear or no surveillance. [d]1 = no surveillance; 0 = unclear or surveillance. [e]1 = available; 0 = unclear or not available. [f]1 = presentation of need; 0 = direct request. [g]Difference has a positive sign for greater male competence. [h]Difference has a positive sign for greater male comfort. [i]Difference has a positive sign for greater female danger. [j]Difference has a positive sign for greater male likelihood of helping. [k]Difference has a positive sign for stronger male stereotype. [l]Effect size has a positive sign for greater male helping.

Table 6

Regression Analyses for Sex-of-Subject and Sex-of-Victim/Requester Effects

Variable	Sex-of-subject effects[a] b	(b*)	r	Sex-of-victim/requester effects[b] b	(b*)	r
1. Publication year	-.01	(-.07)	-.35*	.00	(.02)	.18
2. Off-campus setting[c]	.29	(.29)*	.54*	-.32	(-.38)	-.53*
3. Laboratory setting[d]	-.21	(-.11)	-.35*			
4. Surveillance[e]	.02	(.02)	.64*	-.60	(-.70)*	-.64*
5. No surveillance[f]	-.14	(-.13)	-.44*	.30	(.29)	.30
6. Availability of other helpers[g]	.15	(.14)	.34*	.10	(.10)	-.20
7. Type of appeal[h]	.29	(.32)*	.53*	.17	(.22)	-.45*
8. Competence sex difference[i]	.06	(.04)	.44*	.02	(.02)	-.31
9. Danger sex difference[j]	.63	(.34)*	.38*	.28	(.20)	-.14
Additive constant	.51	(1.12)		-.53	(-1.39)	
Multiple R	.81*			.76*		
Standard error of estimate	.28			.28		

(table continues)

Note. Models are weighted least squares regressions calculated with weights equal to 1/variance of each effect. Unstandardized regression coefficients (b) are followed by standardized regression coefficients (b*) in parentheses. Effect sizes were given a positive sign for differences in the male direction and a negative sign for differences in the female direction.

[a]N = 98. [b]N = 36. [c]1 = off-campus; 0 = campus or laboratory. [d]1 = laboratory; 0 = campus or off-campus. Eliminated for sex-of-victim/requester regression because of insufficient laboratory cases. [e]1 = surveillance; 0 = unclear or no surveillance. [f]1 = no surveillance; 0 = unclear or surveillance. [g]1 = available; 0 = unclear or not available. [h]1 = presentation of need; 0 = direct request. [i]Difference has a positive sign for greater male competence. [j]Difference has a positive sign for greater female danger.

*p < .05

Table 7

Summary of Sex-of-Victim/Requester Effects and Sex-of-Subject Effects for Female and Male Victims/Requesters from Studies with Designs Crossing Sex of Subject and Sex of Victim/Requester

Criterion	Values		
	Sex of victim/requester	Sex of subject, female victim/requester	Sex of subject, male victim/requester
		Effect size analyses	
Known effects			
M effect size (*d*.)	-.23	.27	-.08
95% *CI* for *M* effect size	-.38/-.08	.02/.51	-.35/.20
Mdn effect size	-.23	.33	-.08
M weighted effect size (*g*.)[a]	-.44	.36	.08
95% *CI* for *M* weighted effect size	-.47/-.41	.31/.40	.03/.12
N of effects	36	25	25
Total *N* of subjects	23,818	15,735	15,735

(table continues)

Criterion	Values		
	Sex of victim/requester	Sex of subject, female victim/requester	Sex of subject, male victim/requester
		Effect size analyses	
All effects[b]			
M effect size (*d*.)	-.15		
95% *CI* for *M* effect size	-.25/-.05		
N of effects	55		
Total *N* of subjects	27,799		
		Counting methods[c]	
	Freq. Exact *p*	Freq. Exact *p*	Freq. Exact *p*
Differences in hypothesized direction[d]	24/35 0.020	19/25 0.007	11/24 ---e
Significant differences in hypothesized direction[f]	14/55 <.001	11/25 <.001	4/25 <.001

(table continues)

Note. When all effects were included, a value of 0 (no effect) was assigned to effects that could not be calculated and were reported as nonsignificant. Effect sizes were given a positive sign for differences in the male direction and a negative sign for differences in the female direction. [a]Effects weighted by 1/variance. [b]No nonsignificant effects that could not be calculated were reported for sex-of-subject effects within female or male victim/requester conditions. [c]For sex-of-victim/requester effects, the hypothesized direction is female; for sex-of-subject effects for female and male victims/requesters, the hypothesized direction is male. [d]First number is number of differences in hypothesized direction; second number is total number of studies with known direction. Exact ps (one-tailed) were based on binomial distribution with $p = .5$ (Harvard Computation Laboratory, 1955). [e]There were slightly more differences in non-hypothesized direction. [f]First number is number of differences in hypothesized direction; second number is total number of studies with known significance. Exact ps were based on binomial distribution with $p = .025$ (Robertson, 1960). There were 2 significant differences in non-hypothesized direction for sex-of-victim/requester, 2 for sex-of-subject for female victim/requester, and 6 for sex-of-subject for male victim/requester.