Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "How Personality Traits, Social Resources, and Gender May Relate to Engagement in Prosocial Behaviour"

Aaron Duxbury[1]

1. School of Education and Psychology, University of Wolverhampton, United Kingdom

This submission is quite clear, with a good sample size and thorough methodology, which provides a novel insight into personality traits and their role in prosocial behaviour. The use of the Big Five and Prosocial Personality Battery were good choices, as they have been present within the literature previously and so have pre-existing validity.

The results were clear and partially in keeping with current literature, finding that age and personality in this study are the most consistent predictors of prosocial behaviour, with moderating factors such as socioeconomic status limiting the extent to which that behaviour is displayed.

There are, however, a few issues I have highlighted below that I would like to see addressed:

1. Introduction, line 3 - Human Capital is mentioned with no definition to clarify to the reader what this means in the context of this paper; a definition is required for better understanding.
2. Introduction, line 4 – 'both groups' are mentioned; it is assumed that this is in relation to personality psychologists and sociologists mentioned in the abstract. As this is a new section, clarification on both groups is required.
3. Introduction, lines 9-13 – the research question is presented at the end of the first paragraph; this would be better suited to being at the end of the introduction, after all relevant literature has been presented.
4. Introduction, line 15 – the use of the terms 'volunteering' and 'voluntary behaviour' has been used interchangeably. This has led to some confusion as to whether volunteering is defined as 'doing something for someone' or a more organised type of work, for example, volunteering in a charity

doi.org/10.32388/Q6T27F

shop – both are prosocial behaviours. A clarification of what is being understood in this piece as 'voluntary behaviour' would help here.

5. Personality Perspectives, line 63 – There are hypotheses missing from what is expected to be found from this research.
6. Methods (participants), line 6 – it is mentioned that "the principal investigator visited the classroom and explained the research purposes to the students." How has this study then controlled for demand characteristics? It is not clear what the explanation included, and the discussion section does not account for this either.
7. Methods (Instruments), line 7 – you have subtracted the total score on personal distress from 18; it is not clear why 18 was the number to subtract by.
8. Results (Participants Socioeconomic Profile), line 5 – the line reads "...reported higher levels of other-orientated empathy than their men," which is not clear.

Other remarks

- Within the methods section, there is also no mention of a debrief to participants, given after the study has concluded.
- No clear hypotheses, and no mention of gender here as well, despite it being extensively covered in the introduction.
- What's the difference between 'Measures' and 'Instruments'?
- You state, *"Based on social resource theory, we suggest that the more women become educated, the more likely they are to engage in prosocial behaviours because of their increased labour market outcomes and social networks through expanded employment opportunities."* This implies a level of causation based on the relationship, but this cannot be determined from the results.
- It is not clear from the analysis what gender differences were actually found (if any) from the analysis. The authors discuss the different patterns of results for men and women at times, but are these different patterns statistically different between men and women?
- There is also a large gap in the literature where the authors have not mentioned any evolutionary psychological research into prosociality, of which there is a significant amount.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.