

The Joy of Giving

Draft prepared for *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising, 5th Edition* (2022)

Note: This is an extended version of the chapter, and differs from the final published version.

References are included in this document, but not in the published version.

Sara Konrath, PhD

Indiana University, Lilly Family School of Philanthropy

Notre Dame Institute for Advanced Study

Table of Contents

Psychological outcomes	3
Social outcomes	4
Cognitive and academic outcomes.....	5
Economic outcomes	6
Physical outcomes.....	6
The joy of giving around the world	8
The joy of giving across the lifespan	8
The joy of giving during difficult times.....	8
Why does giving feel so good?	9
The limits of giving.....	9
More joyful giving	10
Summary and conclusion	10
References.....	11

“It is more blessed to give than to receive.” ~Acts 20:35
“Most people would rather give than get affection.” ~Aristotle

The belief that it is better to give than to receive has a long history, with examples from ancient religious texts and philosophers. The earliest known scientific evidence, from the early 1970s, discovered that people learned faster when doing so helped someone avoid suffering—such altruism was motivating and rewarding (1). This chapter reviews scientific research on how giving time and money affects givers. In 2018, 77.34 million Americans (30.3%) volunteered for 6.9 billion hours, valued at approximately \$167 billion (Americorps). Americans also donated over \$352 billion to charitable organizations in 2019 (GivingUSA). Besides giving through nonprofit organizations, many helped informally: supporting friends and family (43.1%), helping neighbors (51.4%; Americorps), and helping strangers (72%; Gallup).

Fundraising professionals facilitate a significant portion of donations to nonprofit organizations, both through donor interactions, and their own personal giving (2). Fundraisers are the high priests of giving: they help to match people’s values with opportunities to give, and in doing so, they are helping to feed the hungry, take care of the sick, share musical and cultural experiences, and educate generations of students. When fundraisers help givers to give, they may not realize that they are bringing these givers more happiness and better health. By being mindful of these benefits of giving, hopefully fundraisers can see themselves as givers too, and can personally experience the joy of giving.

Psychological outcomes

Many of us believe that if we only had more time and money, we would be happier. In fact, there is much research finding that *giving away* our time and money makes us happier, even though after giving we have less for ourselves.

For example, research finds that *volunteers* have higher happiness, life satisfaction, and psychological well-being than those who do not volunteer (3-6). Of course, volunteers are different than non-volunteers in a number of ways that could explain why they are happier. For example, they tend to have higher incomes and more social and psychological resources than non-volunteers (7-10). But most research finds that these differences do not fully explain the happiness effects of giving time. Even when scholars statistically control for these variables, the results remain similar.

Similarly, lots of research finds that *giving away money* also promotes more well-being in givers, with similar benefits for *everyday kind acts* like helping strangers, sharing with neighbors, and supporting loved ones (11, 12). For example, a meta-analysis that examined 201 studies with 198,213 participants found that various types of giving and helping were associated with higher well-being (12).

The best evidence for the causal effects of giving uses a method that is also used to test if a new drug or vaccine works, a *randomized control trial (RCT)*. Scientists start with a group of people who are pretty similar at the beginning, and then ask half of these people to give time or money. The other half are in the control group (e.g. do kind acts for themselves, try new things, or join a waiting list). For example, one study asked participants to spend a small amount of money (either \$5 or \$20) on themselves versus another person, and then the researchers measured participants’ mood at the end of the day. People who spent their money on someone else were happier than those who spent it on themselves, regardless of the amount of money spent (13).

Randomized control trials consistently find that giving money, volunteering time, and doing kind acts all lead to more psychological benefits for givers, compared to control groups (7, 11, 13-23).

Does the joy of giving last?

Research finds that giving to oneself quickly loses its luster, whereas the happiness of giving to others has lasting happiness-boosting power. Many enjoyable activities lose some of their pleasure when repeated. But when researchers compared the experience of giving money away repeatedly (up to 10 times) versus the experience of receiving it, they found that the joy people experienced from getting was quick to fade with repetition. However, the joy of giving had staying power and was less likely to fade over time (24).

Several studies confirm that giving is associated with long-lasting good feelings. For example, people who are asked to regularly and frequently do small kind acts for others feel happier up to 2 months later (15). There are similar effects of giving money: one study found that people who spent more of their employment bonus on others felt happier up to 2 months later (13), while another found that participants who donated more to charity at one time were happier up to 9 years later (25).

The joy of giving runs deep

Giving time and money not only affects givers' happiness, but runs deeper into fulfilling feelings of meaning and purpose in life (26-31). In fact, giving increases people's perceptions of a life well-lived with meaning and purpose (i.e. *eudaimonic* well-being) more than their simple feelings of happiness (i.e. *hedonic* well-being; (12).

The psychological benefits of giving extend into mental health symptoms, with much research finding that givers experience fewer symptoms of depression and anxiety (5, 17, 31-35), which, if untreated, could become full blown psychological disorders.

Fundraisers need not worry that they might erase these benefits of giving by sharing the news with potential donors. Even when people are aware of the potential happiness effects of giving, this does not diminish the psychological rewards (21). Indeed, one study found that people gave *more* when they learned of the potential happiness-building effects of giving (36).

Simply recalling (37), observing (38), or counting one's own kind acts (16) also increases happiness as much as actually doing them. Even more incredible is that these happiness boosts seem to be noticeable by outside observers (39). The joy of giving is written on our faces.

The paradox of generosity

There is strong scientific support for these findings. And yet, when people are asked to guess which one will make them happier, spending money on themselves versus spending it on others, they have no clue about the powerful effects of giving on their own happiness (13). Instead, they think they will be happier when spending on themselves (13). This may help to explain the prevalence of materialistic goals (40, 41).

Not only can giving money make people happier, it also makes them feel richer (42), despite the fact that objectively, they have less money because they just gave some away. Giving time to others can similarly lead more feelings of "time affluence," the subjective feeling of having a lot of free time available (43). Amazingly, people feel like their schedules are less rushed, despite the fact that objectively they have less time because they just gave some away. The *paradox of generosity* is that people feel happier, richer, and healthier after giving their money and time to others (6). Having money in itself does not make people happier (44, 45), but the way people spend it can affect their happiness (46).

Social outcomes

Giving is contagious: people's giving behavior spreads into their closest relationships, and into their broader social networks (47-50). However, some research suggests that this may be less likely in anonymous online exchanges (51).

Not only is giving socially learned and spread, but it can also enrich people's reputations and social relationships. One study found that participants who gave more money to charity were more likely to be selected to represent their group, and also received more money from group members (52). This demonstrates how giving to charity can promote a positive reputation in givers. Kind people are likeable, and others want to be around them. Studies have found that preteens who behave more kindly are more popular with their peers (53, 54). For example, in one study, preteens who performed three kind acts (versus visited three new places) each week became more popular over time (54).

Similar results have been found in older adults. In one study, older adults who volunteered increased in their social connections after several months, while control group participants experienced a decline (55). Volunteers also increased 17% in feelings of being socially supported, while control group participants declined 25% in perceived social support (55). Givers also report less loneliness and more feelings of social connection (26, 31, 56).

People with higher giving-related traits like empathy both provide *and* receive more social support, which suggests a balanced give-and-take in their relationships (57-60). They also try harder to maintain their relationships (61), and report more love and affection for those they interact with (58, 62). Overall, people with higher giving-related traits and behaviors have more positive and satisfying relationships (27, 60, 62-65).

Is generosity good for romance? Research finds that being generous can help to encourage new romances. For example, kindness is the top trait that both men and women are looking for in a romantic relationship (66, 67), and generous people are seen as more desirable romantic partners (68-70). Our research has found that generous people are rated as more physically attractive: the *good-looking giver* effect (71). And, a large national study found that more helpful single people were more likely to be in a relationship the following year (72).

As for *existing* romantic relationships, there is very little research on the implications of outside giving (i.e. volunteering, charitable donating) for romantic relationships, but giving support within relationships helps them to thrive (73, 74). And people with higher giving-related traits like empathy have more satisfying romantic relationships and even better sex lives (74-76).

Cognitive and academic outcomes

Just 10 minutes of social interaction acts like a type of mental exercise that improves people's memories, mental speed, cognitive flexibility, and attention (77, 78). So it is perhaps not surprising that several studies have found that volunteering and other forms of helping can improve older adults' cognitive functioning (79-81), perhaps because they increase intellectually stimulating activities (82). For example, older adults who volunteered (compared to a control group) increased in their cognitive activity and skills, including improved memory and focus, after 4-8 months (55, 83). These improvements run deep, to attentional networks in the brain (84).

Volunteering improves cognitive outcomes in older adults for several years (80, 85, 86), especially for higher-risk individuals like those who are less educated or with Alzheimer's genes (81, 87). Volunteering for 2 years increases older adults' brain volume, including the hippocampus, a memory-related region (88). In fact, older adults who volunteer need over 2.4 times less dementia medications over time (85). Although most studies find cognitive benefits of volunteering, a few find no differences (31, 79), which points to the need for future research.

As for giving money, overall, research finds that people who donate to charity have higher cognitive ability, especially verbal or visuospatial skills (89-92). This result remains even when statistically controlling for education and income, which are also associated with giving. Yet unlike with the research on volunteering, these studies leave open the chicken-egg question of whether generosity causes intelligence, or intelligence causes generosity.

Research on children and young adults finds that those with higher giving-related traits and behaviors perform better academically and have higher IQs (53, 93-97). These studies tell us that giving and cognitive outcomes go together, but not which causes which. Studies that have followed children for several years have found more prosocial kindergarteners (e.g. comforts or helps other children, shows sensitivity to others' feelings) score higher on academic tests in 8th grade (98). This means prosocial traits and behaviors may encourage cognitive development.

The opposite direction has also been found—that more academically successful children behave more prosocially in later years—but this is a smaller effect (98). Randomized control trials that have specifically focused on teaching empathy and kind behaviors (compared to control groups) also find academic benefits (99, 100). For example, teens who were assigned to a volunteering program (compared to non-volunteers) had 58% fewer suspensions, 61% fewer course failures, and 59% fewer pregnancies by the end of the school year (20).

As for another cognitive outcome—creativity—more empathic people have higher self-reported creativity (101-103), higher observer-rated creativity (104), and better performance on objective tests of creative thinking (105, 106). In fact, a temporary reminder to focus on others' needs can cause more

creative thinking (104). Yet there is limited and inconsistent research on giving *behaviors* and creativity (107, 108), so more research is needed.

Economic outcomes

Giving may be beneficial for a number of economic outcomes, ranging from educational attainment, to employment, to income, and occupational status.

For example, high school or college students who volunteer end up having higher *educational attainment* in future years (109-111). Volunteering is also beneficial for *employment opportunities*. Randomized control trials find that employers are between 7-45% more likely to contact job applicants when volunteering is listed on a resume, compared to when it's not (112, 113). Volunteers are also more likely to be employed than non-volunteers, holding background factors constant (114), and unemployed people are more likely to become employed over time if they volunteer (115, 116). However, not all studies find this employment premium (117) and scholars caution that although volunteering may improve employability in some cases, this depends on features of the person and the situation (118, 119).

As for *income*, even when controlling for background factors like education and marital status, volunteers have 7-22% higher incomes than non-volunteers (120-122). Studies that follow teens through young adulthood have confirmed the economic benefits of volunteering among young people (109, 111). However, again there are some studies that do not find this wage premium of volunteering (123). And as for *occupational status*, volunteers have higher status jobs, and again, this is not fully explained by their education or other background variables (117, 124).

Most research on the economic implications of giving is focused on volunteering, but there is some evidence that everyday kind behaviors also matter. A study followed 753 low-income children for 19 years found that children who were more cooperative, helpful, and empathic in kindergarten were more likely to graduate high school and college, more likely to be employed, and less likely to be on public assistance in young adulthood (125). They were also less likely to be arrested or imprisoned for a crime, used less alcohol and marijuana, and were less likely to be on psychological medications in young adulthood (125). Other research confirms that teen volunteers are less likely to be arrested when followed into young adulthood (126). These results are not explained by background factors like family income.

Physical outcomes

There are many physical health implications of giving time and money, ranging from immediate physiological processes, to healthy lifestyle behaviors, to healthcare usage, to longevity. [For reviews, see (3-6, 127)].

Brain responses

For example, when donating money, the pleasure and reward centers of the brain light up as much as when receiving money (128-130). Giving support to loved ones also activates neural reward centers, while simultaneously lowering neural fear and stress areas (131, 132). When directly compared, giving to loved ones has more neural benefits than donating to charity (133).

Stress hormones

When people experience daily stressors like arguments or work deadlines, this increases cortisol, a stress hormone that is toxic for health and predicts early mortality, especially cardiovascular-related (134, 135). Volunteering buffers people from cortisol response to stressors—on days that they volunteer, their cortisol remains low, even in the presence of stressors (136, 137). People with giving-related traits like empathy also have lower stress hormones during stressful tasks, and small actions (e.g. shifting one's focus to others; writing an affectionate letter) have similar effects (138-142).

Gene regulation and cellular aging

Scientists have examined changes in people's genetic expressions after doing more kind acts (versus control activities) for 1 month. Such kind behaviors cause inflammation-related genes to be down-regulated (143). Similar results are found in volunteers, in addition to the up-regulation of antiviral genes

(144). Yet, research examining cellular aging finds that performing kind acts does *not* affect cellular aging (telomere length) after 1 month (145). Larger studies over longer time periods are needed.

Strength and energy

Giving can also make people physically stronger, at least temporarily (146). For example, researchers asked people to hold a 5 pound weight with their arms stretched horizontally for as long as they could. They were then given a \$1 payment and half of them were asked to donate it to UNICEF (100% agreed), while the other half just kept it. People who donated the money held the 5 pound weight longer than those who didn't. Other research confirms that giving time has similar effects. Older adults who volunteered for 4-8 months (compared to controls) reported increased strength and energy, better grip strength, and faster walking and stair climbing speeds (55, 147).

Pain responses

Giving can also reduce physiological responses to pain (148, 149). For example, people who gave to charity tolerated higher levels of pain compared to those who kept money for themselves. Givers also show less activation in pain-related areas of their brain compared to non-givers (149). Volunteering and other forms of helping can even help to reduce pain among chronic pain patients (149, 150).

Cardiovascular risk

Much research examines giving and cardiovascular risk factors. It finds that volunteering, giving money, and giving support to loved ones are associated with lower blood pressure (151-155), lower blood glucose (152), and fewer inflammatory markers (156-158).

Most research is on older adults, who are at higher risk, however, an experiment that assigned some teens to volunteer, compared to a control group, found that volunteering for 4 months decreased several cardiovascular risk factors (inflammation, cholesterol, body mass index; (159). And simply engaging in lovingkindness or compassion meditation programs for 2 weeks to 2 months can improve cardiovascular health (160-163).

Volunteers and everyday helpers are also less likely to be diagnosed with cardiovascular disease over time (164, 165). Even in cardiovascular disease patients, helpful people are less likely to have another cardiovascular incident over the next 2 years (166). However, one study finds that volunteering is unrelated to rates of cardiovascular disease or other chronic conditions like diabetes, cancer, lung disease, arthritis (31). This suggests that more research on health conditions is needed.

Health behaviors and healthcare usage

Volunteering increases physical activity, which is perhaps not surprising, since it gets people out of the house (31, 55, 82, 147, 167, 168). Volunteering is especially beneficial for older adults who were previously inactive, with one study finding that their physical activity increased 110% after being assigned to 4-8 months of volunteering (168). Older adults who help others more informally also have more physical activity (169). However, there are inconsistent results when it comes to volunteering and other health behaviors like drinking or smoking (31, 170), and volunteering is unrelated to subjective sleep quality (31, 157).

As for healthcare usage, we have found that older adult volunteers are more likely to use preventative healthcare services: they are 30% more likely to get a flu shot, 47% more likely to get cholesterol tests, females are 53% more likely to receive mammograms and 21% more likely to receive Pap smears, and males are 59% more likely to receive prostate exams (171). These can help to identify or prevent more serious health conditions. We also found that volunteers spend 38% less time in the hospital (171).

Longevity

A meta-analysis that included 14 studies with over 74,000 older adults found that volunteering was associated with a 47% decreased risk of dying overall, and a smaller (24%) decreased risk when adjusting for background factors like age, sex, socioeconomic status, physical health, health behaviors, and social connections. Since then, a high-quality national study of older adults found that volunteers were 44% less likely to die than non-volunteers (31).

To put this in perspective, eating 6 or more fruit and vegetables a day lowers mortality risk 26% (172), and regular exercise lowers mortality risk between 23-33% (173, 174). So, volunteering lowers the

risk of early death at least as much as traditional health behaviors. When comparing *types* of giving, we have found that people who give *time* (volunteering, giving support, or caregiving), but not money, are less likely to die (175). Although lots of research finds that charitable giving feels good, this doesn't necessarily translate to longer life.

The joy of giving around the world

Most research on the effects of giving has focused on people from Western cultures. However, there is an emerging cross-cultural literature that suggests people from all over the world experience the joy of giving and volunteering. These studies take advantage of the Gallup World Poll, which conducts regular large surveys representing ~95% of the world's population. These studies have examined between 136 to 142 countries worldwide, and confirmed that in most cultures, volunteering is associated with higher well-being [86% of cultures studied; (176)] and better physical health [88% of cultures studied: (177)], and donating to charity is associated with higher well-being [90%; (178)]. These results are found even in poor countries where resources are scarcer, and even in an isolated rural village with limited Western influence in a South Pacific Ocean island (179). They are also not explained by the fact that volunteers and donors may differ in demographic factors like gender, age, religiosity, and income.

The joy of giving across the lifespan

Most research on the effects of giving has been conducted on older adults, because they tend to have more time to volunteer for nonprofits and research studies. Yet, giving time and money also predicts better psychological well-being and health in middle-age adults (180-182), young adults (183), adolescents (18, 20, 64, 159, 184), children (54), and even toddlers (185).

The benefits of giving tend to get stronger as people age (33, 177, 186-189). This was recently confirmed in a study of over 1.7 million people from 166 nations (183). Although the study found joy of giving effects at all ages, it also found that 50-year-olds experienced double the joy of giving compared to 20-year-olds, and 80-year-olds experienced even more—2.74 times that of 20-year-olds. Similar patterns were found worldwide. This might be because of different types of volunteer jobs across different age groups, or different motives and emotional responses to giving as people age (187, 190, 191).

The joy of giving during difficult times

Giving time and money can promote increased happiness and health even during difficult times. For example, aging adults often face increased difficulty independently completing tasks like lifting heavy objects or climbing stairs. Research finds that people who have more altruistic attitudes are better able to emotionally cope with such losses (192). Indeed, those who choose to volunteer in spite of these limitations live longer than those who do not (193).

The joy of giving has been found in a number of groups who are facing challenges, including those receiving welfare benefits (194), individuals with disabilities (137, 195), those with traumatic brain injuries (196, 197), individuals with lumbar spine disorders (198), spinal cord injuries (199), multiple sclerosis (200), HIV/AIDS (201), and older adults with dementia (202), other forms of cognitive impairment (203), or living in long-term care facilities (204).

Among those with ongoing psychological problems, like post-traumatic stress disorder or social anxiety, giving can help to manage their symptoms (205, 206). In fact, research finds that more depressed young people experience more joy of giving than less depressed individuals (207). And among teens who experience adverse childhood experiences, volunteering can help to buffer them from poor mental health (208). Even individuals who have had trouble with the law experience the joy of giving, which is a hopeful finding suggesting potential motivations and pathways for rehabilitation (209).

People often increase charitable giving in response to disasters (210) and pandemics (211), and research finds that such increases in charitable donation are associated with increases in happiness—despite the stress and trauma of the situation itself (212). In the face of tragedy, giving time and money is not only good for the recipients, but for the givers themselves.

The COVID-19 pandemic created a uniquely challenging situation in that many givers found it more difficult to give, whether because of financial constraints or being homebound. Even in this time, givers experienced more positive emotions overall (213, 214). However, givers who also perceived high risk to themselves or their loved ones actually experienced *more* negative emotions than less generous people {Feng, 2020 #19279}. More research will help to uncover the complex implications of giving during the pandemic.

Why does giving feel so good?

1) It satisfies core psychological needs

Giving time and money increases well-being because it helps to satisfy people's core psychological needs for social connection, competence, autonomy, and meaning in life (29, 30, 215-220). But an equally important reason that giving makes people happy is because it also helps to satisfy *receivers'* needs (215). Giving experiences that mutually satisfy givers' and receivers' needs are more likely to increase the well-being of both.

2) It shifts focus and gives perspective

Giving causes people to shift their focus of attention away from themselves and toward others. Focusing on the self can be toxic for mental health (221, 222), while shifting one's focus of attention toward others can reduce anxiety and stress (139, 223). Giving can also make people realize that they are better off than others, which puts things in perspective in their own life (224). Since giving time and money makes people feel richer in both (42, 43), it may also increase gratitude (225), which in itself has a number of benefits (226, 227).

3) It interrupts stress cycles and helps with coping

Stress is toxic for health and well-being. Volunteering and other types of giving behaviors help people recover from the daily stressors of work or home life (216, 228, 229), thereby reducing burnout and increasing work engagement (230). One study found that older adults who experienced serious stressful events (e.g. job loss, death of a loved one) were more likely to die in the next 5 years—except for those who also provided help to loved ones (231). Giving can be a powerful stress buffer.

The limits of giving

This chapter covers *voluntary* giving behaviors like volunteering for nonprofits, giving money, and giving support to loved ones. Involuntary giving such as that required by schools, parents, or courts is unlikely to have the same benefits (109). In addition, caregiving is a more extreme form of giving that is often less voluntary, more intensive, and can include seeing loved ones in pain or distress. Some research finds that caregiving is associated with poorer well-being and health outcomes (232, 233). Yet, other research finds that the helping itself can be beneficial, especially with enough support, but seeing loved ones in distress is harmful (234-237). However, this complex type of giving goes beyond the scope of this review.

When it comes to other types of giving, it is possible for people to give beyond their means, but I suspect that joyful givers know their limits. Studies have found that volunteering between 1 and 15 hours per week is associated with optimal health and well-being (25, 238, 239).

As for charitable giving, one recent study found that Americans who donated 10% of their incomes were happier than those who donated less (6). The authors used 10% as a cutoff point since some religions encourage tithing, however, they didn't explore whether there was a point at which giving was no longer beneficial. This could be because it was highly unusual for people to give this much away—only 2.7% of participants did so. Another study found that the more money people gave, the higher their psychological well-being, and the authors did not find any cutoff point after which there were fewer benefits of giving (25). In fact, spending money on others is associated with increased well-being even in lower-income countries (178). However, it is reasonable to assume that at a certain point, donating to charity might be bad for well-being, especially if people give to the point that they cannot take care of their own needs. Such over-giving is rare, and the more common problem is *under-giving*.

In general, it seems wise to give from one's surplus resources. For example, it might be better for lower income people to give their time than their money, since volunteering predicts higher happiness in lower income people compared to higher income people (240).

Finally, when it comes to everyday kindness, the more people give, and the more they make giving part of the practice of their everyday life, the more joy they experience from giving (6, 15). For example, performing 9 acts of kindness per week leads to more happiness than performing 3 acts per week (15). Future research should try to better understand potential limits of giving for well-being and health.

More joyful giving

There are a number of practices that can help to increase the joy of giving.

Variety

Research finds that giving in a variety of different ways and to different types of people makes people happier than giving the same way and to the same people over and over again (15). Just like a healthy diet of food, a healthy giving diet ideally involves variety to avoid the acts becoming routine.

Altruism

Altruistic attitudes also matter for happiness, like saying that you enjoy helping others, or that you try to help even if others can't return the favor (63). In fact, one study found that altruistic attitudes were more important for happiness than giving behaviors themselves (241). And we have found that seeing oneself as caring predicts a lower risk of dying in older adults than actual giving behaviors (175). The thought counts—being ready to serve and help matters, even if actual opportunities for helping do not present themselves.

Choice

When giving is mandatory, it doesn't feel good; givers experience the most psychological benefits of giving when they can freely choose to do so (109, 242, 243). This is supported by research finding that voluntary giving activated reward centers in the brain, but required giving did not (128).

Concrete

Thinking about giving as more concrete (e.g. make someone smile) instead of more abstract (e.g. make someone happy) increases the joy of giving (244). So, fundraisers should consider designing their donation appeals to encourage simple concrete behaviors, rather than higher-level conceptual ones.

Social

The social aspects of giving also matter. For example, volunteering is associated with *double* the happiness when it involves directly interacting with others, versus more indirect types of helping (245). There are no known studies that examine similar questions regarding charitable giving, but I would expect that giving in person (e.g. to nonprofit staff; at charity events) would increase happiness more than giving in other ways (e.g. mail, online, automatic payroll deductions).

Giving joyfully

Many are aware of the power of vaccines, and we can increase our joy of giving by giving ourselves a V.A.C.C.S. Giving behaviors that have **Variety, Altruism, Choice, are Concrete, and Social** can increase the joy of giving.

Summary and conclusion

Fundraisers are givers, and also encourage giving in others. This chapter reviewed research finding that giving time and money can promote psychological well-being, the quantity and quality of social relationships, sharper cognitive processes, economic success, and better physical health—even a longer life. Although the majority of research has been done in Western countries and among older adults, these benefits have been found for people of all ages, and all over the world. It is even possible to experience the joy of giving during difficult times. Giving feels good because it satisfies people's core psychological needs and helps them to shift their perspectives and manage stress. Giving is more beneficial when it is voluntary and not a burden, and there are a number of practices that can help to increase the joy of giving. Some people say that we should give until it hurts, but research suggests that giving until it *feels good* may be more accurate.

References

1. R. F. Weiss, W. Buchanan, L. Altstatt, J. P. Lombardo, Altruism is rewarding. *Science*, (1971).
2. G. G. Shaker, P. M. Rooney, J. Bergdoll, S. K. Nathan, E. R. Tempel, Professional Identity and the Determinants of Fundraisers' Charitable Behavior. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 49, 677-706 (2020).
3. S. Konrath, S. L. Brown, in *Handbook of Health and Social Relationships*, N. Roberts, M. Newman, Eds. (American Psychological Association, 2012).
4. S. Konrath, in *Wellbeing: A Complete Reference Guide. Interventions and Policies to Enhance Wellbeing*, F. Huppert, C. L. Cooper, Eds. (John Wiley & Sons Ltd, West Sussex, UK, 2014), vol. VI, pp. 387-426.
5. N. D. Anderson *et al.*, The benefits associated with volunteering among seniors: A critical review and recommendations for future research. *Psychological Bulletin* 140, 1505-1533 (2014).
6. C. Smith, H. Davidson, *The Paradox of Generosity: Giving We Receive, Grasping We Lose*. (Oxford University Press, New York, NY, 2014).
7. Y. Li, K. F. Ferraro, Volunteering and Depression in Later Life: Social Benefit or Selection Processes? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 46, 68-84 (2005).
8. J. Wilson, M. Musick, *Who cares? Toward an integrated theory of volunteer work*. (Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, ETATS-UNIS, 1997), vol. 62.
9. J. Wilson, Volunteering. *Annual review of sociology* 26, 215-240 (2000).
10. J. Wilson, M. Musick, The contribution of social resources to volunteering. *Social Science Quarterly*, 799-814 (1998).
11. O. S. Curry *et al.*, Happy to help? A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects of performing acts of kindness on the well-being of the actor. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 76, 320-329 (2018).
12. B. P. Hui, J. C. Ng, E. Berzaghi, L. A. Cunningham-Amos, A. Kogan, Rewards of kindness? A meta-analysis of the link between prosociality and well-being. *Psychological Bulletin* 146, 1084-1116 (2020).
13. E. W. Dunn, L. B. Aknin, M. I. Norton, Spending Money on Others Promotes Happiness. *Science* 319, 1687-1688 (2008).
14. S. K. Nelson, K. Layous, S. W. Cole, S. Lyubomirsky, Do unto others or treat yourself? The effects of prosocial and self-focused behavior on psychological flourishing. *Emotion* 16, 850 (2016).
15. C. Tkach, *Unlocking the treasury of human kindness : enduring improvements in mood, happiness, and self-evaluations*. (University of California, Riverside, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, 2005).
16. K. Otake, S. Shimai, J. Tanaka-Matsumi, K. Otsui, B. L. Fredrickson, Happy people become happier through kindness: A counting kindnesses intervention. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 7, 361-375 (2006).
17. S. I. Hong, N. Morrow-Howell, Health outcomes of Experience Corps®: A high-commitment volunteer program. *Social Science & Medicine* 71, 414-420 (2010).
18. G. E. Switzer, R. G. Simmons, M. A. Dew, J. M. Regalski, C.-H. Wang, The Effect of a School-Based Helper Program on Adolescent Self-Image, Attitudes, and Behavior. *The Journal of Early Adolescence* 15, 429-455 (1995).
19. E. Midlarsky, E. Kahana, in *Altruism in later life*, E. Midlarsky, E. Kahana, Eds. (Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA, 1994), chap. 6, pp. 189-220.
20. J. P. Allen, S. Philliber, S. Herrling, G. P. Kuperminc, Preventing teen pregnancy and academic failure: Experimental evaluation of a developmentally based approach. *Child Development* 68, 729-742 (1997).
21. L. Anik, L. B. Aknin, M. I. Norton, E. W. Dunn, in *Harvard Business School Marketing Unit Working Paper No. 10-012*. (2009).

22. E. W. Dunn, C. E. Ashton-James, M. D. Hanson, L. B. Aknin, On the Costs of Self-interested Economic Behavior. *Journal of Health Psychology* 15, 627-633 (2010).
23. J. Konow, J. Earley, The Hedonistic Paradox: Is homo economicus happier? *Journal of Public Economics* 92, 1-33 (2008).
24. E. O'Brien, S. Kassirer, People are slow to adapt to the warm glow of giving. *Psychological Science* 30, 193-204 (2019).
25. N. G. Choi, J. Kim, The effect of time volunteering and charitable donations in later life on psychological wellbeing. *Ageing & Society* 31, 590-610 (2011).
26. N. Klein, Prosocial behavior increases perceptions of meaning in life. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 12, 354-361 (2017).
27. D. R. Van Tongeren, J. D. Green, D. E. Davis, J. N. Hook, T. L. Hulsey, Prosociality enhances meaning in life. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 11, 225-236 (2016).
28. N. Bowman, J. Brandenberger, D. Lapsley, P. Hill, J. Quaranto, Serving in college, flourishing in adulthood: Does community engagement during the college years predict adult well-being? *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being* 2, 14-34 (2010).
29. J. Yang, C. Matz, A Latent Deprivation Perspective: Mechanisms Linking Volunteering to Mental Health in Later Life. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 0091415020959767 (2020).
30. P. A. Thoits, Role-identity salience, purpose and meaning in life, and well-being among volunteers. *Social psychology quarterly* 75, 360-384 (2012).
31. E. S. Kim, A. V. Whillans, M. T. Lee, Y. Chen, T. J. VanderWeele, Volunteering and subsequent health and well-being in older adults: an outcome-wide longitudinal approach. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, (2020).
32. K. I. Hunter, M. W. Linn, Psychosocial Differences between Elderly Volunteers and Non-Volunteers. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development* 12, 205-213 (1980).
33. M. A. Musick, J. Wilson, Volunteering and depression: the role of psychological and social resources in different age groups. *Social Science & Medicine* 56, 259-269 (2003).
34. M. Mongrain, C. Barnes, R. Barnhart, L. B. Zalan, Acts of kindness reduce depression in individuals low on agreeableness. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science* 4, 323 (2018).
35. L. Wray-Lake, J. Shubert, L. Lin, L. R. Starr, Examining associations between civic engagement and depressive symptoms from adolescence to young adulthood in a national US sample. *Applied Developmental Science* 23, 119-131 (2019).
36. P. L. Benson, V. L. Catt, Soliciting Charity Contributions: The Parlance of Asking for Money1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 8, 84-95 (1978).
37. K. Ko, S. Margolis, J. Revord, S. Lyubomirsky, Comparing the effects of performing and recalling acts of kindness. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 16, 73-81 (2021).
38. L. Rowland, O. S. Curry, A range of kindness activities boost happiness. *The Journal of social psychology* 159, 340-343 (2019).
39. L. B. Aknin, A. L. Fleerackers, J. K. Hamlin, Can third-party observers detect the emotional rewards of generous spending? *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 9, 198-203 (2014).
40. J. Twenge, T. Kasser, Generational changes in materialism and work centrality, 1976-2007: Associations with temporal changes in societal insecurity and materialistic role modeling. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 39, 883-897 (2013).
41. Z. Wang, J. Jetten, N. K. Steffens, The more you have, the more you want? Higher social class predicts a greater desire for wealth and status. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 50, 360-375 (2020).
42. Z. Chance, M. Norton, I Give, Therefore I Have: Giving and Subjective Wealth. *Unpublished manuscript*, (2015).
43. C. Mogilner, Z. Chance, M. I. Norton, Giving time gives you time. *Psychological Science* 23, 1233-1238 (2012).

44. E. Diener, R. Biswas-Diener, Will Money Increase Subjective Well-Being?: A Literature Review and Guide to Needed Research. *Social Indicators Research* 57, 119-169 (2002).
45. D. Halpern, *The Hidden Wealth of Nations*. (Polity Press, Cambridge, UK, 2010).
46. E. Dunn, M. Norton, *Happy money: The science of smarter spending*. (Simon and Schuster, New York, NY, 2013).
47. J. H. Fowler, N. A. Christakis, Cooperative behavior cascades in human social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107, 5334-5338 (2010).
48. J. J. Jordan, D. G. Rand, S. Arbesman, J. H. Fowler, N. A. Christakis, Contagion of cooperation in static and fluid social networks. *PloS one* 8, e66199 (2013).
49. M. Tsvetkova, M. W. Macy, The Social Contagion of Generosity. *PloS one* 9, e87275 (2014).
50. J. Woo, B. I. Kwak, J. Lim, H. K. Kim, in *Social Informatics*. (Springer, 2014), pp. 191-199.
51. V. Capraro, A. Marcelletti, Do good actions inspire good actions in others? *Scientific reports* 4, 1-6 (2014).
52. M. Milinski, D. Semmann, H. Krambeck, Donors to charity gain in both indirect reciprocity and political reputation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* 269, 881-883 (2002).
53. Q. Guo, J. Zhou, L. Feng, Pro-social behavior is predictive of academic success via peer acceptance: A study of Chinese primary school children. *Learning and Individual Differences* 65, 187-194 (2018).
54. K. Layous, S. K. Nelson, E. Oberle, K. A. Schonert-Reichl, S. Lyubomirsky, Kindness counts: Prompting prosocial behavior in preadolescents boosts peer acceptance and well-being. *PloS one* 7, e51380 (2012).
55. L. Fried *et al.*, A social model for health promotion for an aging population: Initial evidence on the experience corps model. *Journal of Urban Health* 81, 64-78 (2004).
56. P. D. Pilkington, T. D. Windsor, D. A. Crisp, Volunteering and subjective well-being in midlife and older adults: The role of supportive social networks. *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* 67, 249-260 (2012).
57. M. Huo, J. L. Fuentecilla, K. S. Birditt, K. L. Fingerman, Older adults' empathy and daily support exchanges. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 36, 3814-3834 (2019).
58. M. Huo, J. L. Fuentecilla, K. S. Birditt, K. L. Fingerman, Empathy and close social ties in late life. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B* 75, 1648-1657 (2020).
59. J. Crocker, A. Canevello, Creating and undermining social support in communal relationships: The role of compassionate and self-image goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 95, 555-575 (2008).
60. A. Canevello, J. Crocker, Creating good relationships: responsiveness, relationship quality, and interpersonal goals. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 99, 78 (2010).
61. M. Sanchez, A. Haynes, J. C. Parada, M. Demir, Friendship maintenance mediates the relationship between compassion for others and happiness. *Current Psychology* 39, 581-592 (2020).
62. B. M. Le, E. A. Impett, A. Kogan, G. D. Webster, C. Cheng, The personal and interpersonal rewards of communal orientation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 30, 694-710 (2013).
63. B. M. Le, E. A. Impett, E. P. Lemay Jr, A. Muise, K. O. Tskhay, Communal motivation and well-being in interpersonal relationships: An integrative review and meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin* 144, 1 (2018).
64. C. Schwartz, P. Keyl, J. Marcum, R. Bode, Helping Others Shows Differential Benefits on Health and Well-being for Male and Female Teens. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 10, 431-448 (2009).
65. R. L. Jirovec, Differences in family functioning and health between older adult volunteers and non-volunteers. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work* 46, 23-35 (2005).
66. D. M. Buss, M. Barnes, Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 50, 559 (1986).

67. D. M. Buss *et al.*, International preferences in selecting mates: A study of 37 cultures. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology* 21, 5-47 (1990).
68. P. Barclay, Altruism as a courtship display: Some effects of third-party generosity on audience perceptions. *British Journal of Psychology* 101, 123-135 (2010).
69. L. A. Jensen-Campbell, W. G. Graziano, S. G. West, Dominance, prosocial orientation, and female preferences: Do nice guys really finish last? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68, 427 (1995).
70. D. Moore *et al.*, Selflessness is sexy: reported helping behaviour increases desirability of men and women as long-term sexual partners. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 13, 1-8 (2013).
71. S. Konrath, F. Handy, The Good-looking Giver Effect: The Relationship Between Doing Good and Looking Good. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 0899764020950835 (2020).
72. O. Stavrova, D. Ehlebracht, A longitudinal analysis of romantic relationship formation: The effect of prosocial behavior. *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 6, 521-527 (2015).
73. B. C. Feeney, N. L. Collins, Motivations for caregiving in adult intimate relationships: Influences on caregiving behavior and relationship functioning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 29, 950-968 (2003).
74. M. H. Davis, H. A. Oathout, Maintenance of satisfaction in romantic relationships: Empathy and relational competence. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 53, 397 (1987).
75. E. C. Ulloa, J. F. Hammett, N. A. Meda, S. J. Rubalcaba, Empathy and romantic relationship quality among cohabitating couples: An actor-partner interdependence model. *The Family Journal* 25, 208-214 (2017).
76. A. M. Galinsky, F. L. Sonenstein, The association between developmental assets and sexual enjoyment among emerging adults. *Journal of adolescent health* 48, 610-615 (2011).
77. O. Ybarra *et al.*, Mental exercising through simple socializing: Social interaction promotes general cognitive functioning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 34, 248-259 (2008).
78. O. Ybarra, P. Winkielman, I. Yeh, E. Burnstein, L. Kavanagh, Friends (and sometimes enemies) with cognitive benefits: What types of social interactions boost executive functioning? *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 2, 253-261 (2011).
79. H. Guiney, L. Machado, Volunteering in the community: Potential benefits for cognitive aging. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B* 73, 399-408 (2018).
80. J. C. Corrêa, M. P. W. Ávila, A. L. G. Lucchetti, G. Lucchetti, Altruism, Volunteering and Cognitive Performance Among Older Adults: A 2-Year Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry and Neurology*, 0891988720964260 (2020).
81. C. M. Proulx, A. L. Curl, A. E. Ermer, Longitudinal associations between formal volunteering and cognitive functioning. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B* 73, 522-531 (2018).
82. J. M. Parisi *et al.*, Increases in lifestyle activities as a result of Experience Corps® participation. *Journal of Urban Health* 92, 55-66 (2015).
83. M. C. Carlson *et al.*, Exploring the effects of an “everyday” activity program on executive function and memory in older adults: Experience Corps®. *The Gerontologist* 48, 793-801 (2008).
84. M. C. Carlson *et al.*, Evidence for neurocognitive plasticity in at-risk older adults: the experience corps program. *Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biomedical Sciences and Medical Sciences* 64, 1275-1282 (2009).
85. Y. Griep *et al.*, Can volunteering in later life reduce the risk of dementia? A 5-year longitudinal study among volunteering and non-volunteering retired seniors. *PloS one* 12, e0173885 (2017).
86. F. J. Infurna, M. A. Okun, K. J. Grimm, Volunteering is associated with lower risk of cognitive impairment. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society* 64, 2263-2269 (2016).
87. S. H. Han, J. S. Roberts, J. E. Mutchler, J. A. Burr, Volunteering, polygenic risk for Alzheimer's disease, and cognitive functioning among older adults. *Social Science & Medicine* 253, 112970 (2020).
88. M. C. Carlson *et al.*, Impact of the Baltimore Experience Corps Trial on cortical and hippocampal volumes. *Alzheimer's & Dementia* 11, 1340-1348 (2015).

89. R. N. James, Charitable giving and cognitive ability. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 16, 70-83 (2011).
90. P. Wiepking, I. Maas, Resources that make you generous: Effects of social and human resources on charitable giving. *Social Forces* 87, 1973-1995 (2009).
91. R. Bekkers, Traditional and health-related philanthropy: The role of resources and personality. *Social psychology quarterly* 69, 349-366 (2006).
92. R. N. James, Cognitive skills in the charitable giving decisions of the elderly. *Educational Gerontology* 37, 559-573 (2011).
93. Y.-M. Hur, Relationships between cognitive abilities and prosocial behavior are entirely explained by shared genetic influences: A Nigerian twin study. *Intelligence* 82, 101483 (2020).
94. T. D. Bonner, D. N. Aspy, A study of the relationship between student empathy and GPA. *The Journal of Humanistic Education and Development* 22, 149-154 (1984).
95. N. D. Feshbach, S. Feshbach, Affective processes and academic achievement. *Child development*, 1335-1347 (1987).
96. K. R. Wentzel, Does being good make the grade? Social behavior and academic competence in middle school. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 85, 357 (1993).
97. Q. Guo, P. Sun, M. H. Cai, X. L. Zhang, K. X. Song, Why are smarter individuals more prosocial? A study on the mediating roles of empathy and moral identity. *Intelligence* 75, 1-8 (2019).
98. J. M. Caemmerer, T. Z. Keith, Longitudinal, reciprocal effects of social skills and achievement from kindergarten to eighth grade. *Journal of school psychology* 53, 265-281 (2015).
99. L. Flook, S. B. Goldberg, L. Pinger, R. J. Davidson, Promoting prosocial behavior and self-regulatory skills in preschool children through a mindfulness-based kindness curriculum. *Developmental psychology* 51, 44 (2015).
100. L. Eskreis-Winkler, K. L. Milkman, D. M. Gromet, A. L. Duckworth, A large-scale field experiment shows giving advice improves academic outcomes for the advisor. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116, 14808-14810 (2019).
101. A. F. Carlozzi, K. S. Bull, G. T. Eells, J. D. Hurlburt, Empathy as related to creativity, dogmatism, and expressiveness. *The Journal of psychology* 129, 365-373 (1995).
102. S. Form, C. Kaernbach, More Is not Always Better: The Differentiated Influence of Empathy on Different Magnitudes of Creativity. *Europe's Journal of Psychology* 14, 54-65 (2018).
103. D. Dostál, A. Plháková, T. Zášková, Domain-specific creativity in relation to the level of empathy and systemizing. *The Journal of Creative Behavior* 51, 225-239 (2017).
104. A. M. Grant, J. W. Berry, The necessity of others is the mother of invention: Intrinsic and prosocial motivations, perspective taking, and creativity. *Academy of management journal* 54, 73-96 (2011).
105. E. Delvecchio, D. Di Riso, J.-B. Li, A. Lis, C. Mazzeschi, Affect in play scale-preschool version: validation on a sample of school age Italian Children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 25, 3523-3536 (2016).
106. H. Takeuchi *et al.*, Creativity measured by divergent thinking is associated with two axes of autistic characteristics. *Frontiers in psychology* 5, 921 (2014).
107. G. Domino, J. Short, A. Evans, P. Romano, Creativity and ego defense mechanisms: Some exploratory empirical evidence. *Communication Research Journal* 14, 17-25 (2002).
108. Y. Shin, S. Lee, What Good is Charitable Giving for the Giver? The Combined Effect of Charitable Giving and Construal Level on Giver Creativity. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, (2020).
109. J. Kim, K. Morgül, Long-term consequences of youth volunteering: Voluntary versus involuntary service. *Social Science Research* 67, 160-175 (2017).
110. A. Astin, L. Sax, J. Avalos, Long-Term Effects of Volunteerism During the Undergraduate Years *The Review of Higher Education* 22, 187-202 (1999).

111. P. J. Ballard, L. T. Hoyt, M. C. Pachucki, Impacts of adolescent and young adult civic engagement on health and socioeconomic status in adulthood. *Child development* 90, 1138-1154 (2019).
112. A. Alfonso-Costillo, R. Morales-Sánchez, D. López-Pintado, Does volunteering increase employment opportunities? An experimental approach. (2020).
113. S. Baert, S. Vujić, Does it pay to care? Volunteering and employment opportunities. *Journal of Population Economics* 31, 819-836 (2018).
114. N. O'Higgins, Volunteer work and its links to the labour market experiences of young people. (2020).
115. C. Spera, R. Ghertner, A. Nerino, A. DiTommaso, *Volunteering as a pathway to employment: Does volunteering increase odds of finding a job for the out of work?*, (Office of Research & Evaluation, Corporation for National and Community Service, 2013).
116. V. Konstam, S. Tomek, S. Celen-Demirtas, K. Sweeney, Volunteering and reemployment status in unemployed emerging adults: a time-worthy investment? *Journal of Career Assessment* 23, 152-165 (2015).
117. J. Wilson, M. Musick, Doing well by doing good: Volunteering and occupational achievement among American women. *Sociological Quarterly* 44, 433-450 (2003).
118. A. Ellis Paine, S. McKay, D. Moro, Does volunteering improve employability? Evidence from the British household panel survey. *Third Sector Research Centre*. Retrieved August 21, 2017 (2013).
119. D. Kamerade, A. Ellis Paine, Volunteering and employability: implications for policy and practice. *Voluntary Sector Review* 5, 259 (2014).
120. K. M. Day, R. A. Devlin, Can volunteer work help explain the male-female earnings gap? *Applied Economics* 29, 707-721 (1997).
121. K. M. Day, R. A. Devlin, The payoff to work without pay: Volunteer work as an investment in human capital. *Canadian journal of economics*, 1179-1191 (1998).
122. F. Hackl, M. Halla, G. J. Pruckner, Volunteering and income—the fallacy of the good Samaritan? *Kyklos* 60, 77-104 (2007).
123. J. Wilson, N. Mantovan, R. M. Sauer, The economic benefits of volunteering and social class. *Social science research* 85, 102368 (2020).
124. S. Ruiter, N. D. De Graaf, Socio-economic payoffs of voluntary association involvement: A Dutch life course study. *European Sociological Review* 25, 425-442 (2009).
125. D. E. Jones, M. Greenberg, M. Crowley, Early social-emotional functioning and public health: The relationship between kindergarten social competence and future wellness. *American journal of public health* 105, 2283-2290 (2015).
126. C. Uggen, J. Janikula, Volunteerism and arrest in the transition to adulthood. *Social Forces* 78, 331-362 (1999).
127. R. Bekkers, S. Konrath, D. H. Smith, in *The Palgrave Research Handbook of Volunteering and Nonprofit Associations*, D. H. Smith, R. Stebbins, J. Grotz, Eds. (2014, in press).
128. W. T. Harbaugh, U. Mayr, D. R. Burghart, Neural responses to taxation and voluntary giving reveal motives for charitable donations. *Science* 316, 1622-1625 (2007).
129. J. Moll *et al.*, Human fronto-mesolimbic networks guide decisions about charitable donation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103, 15623-15628 (2006).
130. J. Cutler, D. Campbell-Meiklejohn, A comparative fMRI meta-analysis of altruistic and strategic decisions to give. *Neuroimage* 184, 227-241 (2019).
131. T. K. Inagaki, N. I. Eisenberger, Neural correlates of giving support to a loved one. *Psychosomatic Medicine* 74, 3-7 (2012).
132. T. K. Inagaki *et al.*, The neurobiology of giving versus receiving support: the role of stress-related and social reward-related neural activity. *Psychosomatic medicine* 78, 443 (2016).
133. T. K. Inagaki, L. P. Ross, Neural correlates of giving social support: differences between giving targeted versus untargeted support. *Psychosomatic medicine* 80, 724-732 (2018).

134. R. Schoorlemmer, G. Peeters, N. Van Schoor, P. Lips, Relationships between cortisol level, mortality and chronic diseases in older persons. *Clinical endocrinology* 71, 779-786 (2009).
135. N. Vogelzangs *et al.*, Urinary cortisol and six-year risk of all-cause and cardiovascular mortality. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism* 95, 4959-4964 (2010).
136. S. H. Han, K. Kim, J. A. Burr, Stress-buffering effects of volunteering on salivary cortisol: Results from a daily diary study. *Social Science & Medicine* 201, 120-126 (2018).
137. M. Huo, S. H. Han, K. Kim, J. Choi, Functional Limitations, Volunteering, and Diurnal Cortisol Patterns in Older Adults. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*, (2020).
138. S. S. Ho, S. Konrath, S. Brown, J. E. Swain, Empathy and stress related neural responses in maternal decision making. *Frontiers in neuroscience* 8, (2014).
139. J. L. Abelson *et al.*, Brief cognitive intervention can modulate neuroendocrine stress responses to the Trier Social Stress Test: Buffering effects of a compassionate goal orientation. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 44, 60-70 (2014).
140. B. J. Cosley, S. K. McCoy, L. R. Saslow, E. S. Epel, Is compassion for others stress buffering? Consequences of compassion and social support for physiological reactivity to stress. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 46, 816-823 (2010).
141. V. Engert, B. E. Kok, I. Papassotiropoulos, G. P. Chrousos, T. Singer, Specific reduction in cortisol stress reactivity after social but not attention-based mental training. *Science Advances* 3, e1700495 (2017).
142. K. Floyd *et al.*, Human affection exchange: XIII. Affectionate communication accelerates neuroendocrine stress recovery. *Health Communication* 22, 123-132 (2007).
143. S. K. Nelson-Coffey, M. M. Fritz, S. Lyubomirsky, S. W. Cole, Kindness in the blood: A randomized controlled trial of the gene regulatory impact of prosocial behavior. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 81, 8-13 (2017).
144. T. Seeman, S. S. Merkin, D. Goldwater, S. W. Cole, Intergenerational mentoring, eudaimonic well-being and gene regulation in older adults: A pilot study. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 111, 104468 (2020).
145. M. M. Fritz, L. C. Walsh, S. W. Cole, E. Epel, S. Lyubomirsky, Kindness and cellular aging: A pre-registered experiment testing the effects of prosocial behavior on telomere length and well-being. *Brain, Behavior, & Immunity-Health* 11, 100187 (2021).
146. K. Gray, Moral transformation good and evil turn the weak into the mighty. *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 1, 253-258 (2010).
147. J. S. Barron *et al.*, Potential for intensive volunteering to promote the health of older adults in fair health. *Journal of Urban Health* 86, 641-653 (2009).
148. F. A. Maratos, D. Sheffield, Brief Compassion-Focused Imagery Dampens Physiological Pain Responses. *Mindfulness* 11, 2730-2740 (2020).
149. Y. Wang, J. Ge, H. Zhang, H. Wang, X. Xie, Altruistic behaviors relieve physical pain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117, 950-958 (2020).
150. P. Arnstein, M. Vidal, C. Wells-Federman, B. Morgan, M. Caudill, From chronic pain patient to peer: Benefits and risks of volunteering. *Pain Management Nursing* 3, 94-103 (2002).
151. J. A. Burr, J. Tavares, J. E. Mutchler, Volunteering and hypertension risk in later life. *Journal of aging and health* 23, 24-51 (2011).
152. J. A. Burr, S. H. Han, J. L. Tavares, Volunteering and cardiovascular disease risk: Does helping others get “under the skin?”. *The Gerontologist* 56, 937-947 (2016).
153. R. S. Sneed, S. Cohen, A prospective study of volunteerism and hypertension risk in older adults. *Psychology and aging* 28, 578 (2013).
154. A. V. Whillans, E. W. Dunn, G. M. Sandstrom, S. S. Dickerson, K. M. Madden, Is spending money on others good for your heart? *Health Psychology* 35, 574 (2016).
155. R. L. Piferi, K. A. Lawler, Social support and ambulatory blood pressure: An examination of both receiving and giving. *International Journal of Psychophysiology* 62, 328-336 (2006).

156. S. Kim, K. F. Ferraro, Do productive activities reduce inflammation in later life? Multiple roles, frequency of activities, and C-reactive protein. *The Gerontologist* 54, 830-839 (2014).
157. S. Kim, H. Yoon, Volunteering, Subjective Sleep Quality, and Chronic Inflammation: A 5-Year Follow-Up of the National Social Life, Health, and Aging Project. *Research on aging* 42, 291-299 (2020).
158. M. Moieni *et al.*, Exploring the role of gratitude and support-giving on inflammatory outcomes. *Emotion* 19, 939 (2019).
159. H. M. Schreier, K. A. Schonert-Reichl, E. Chen, Effect of Volunteering on Risk Factors for Cardiovascular Disease in Adolescents: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *JAMA pediatrics* 167, 327-332 (2013).
160. B. E. Kok *et al.*, How Positive Emotions Build Physical Health Perceived Positive Social Connections Account for the Upward Spiral Between Positive Emotions and Vagal Tone. *Psychological Science* 24, 1123-1132 (2013).
161. J. J. Kim *et al.*, Neurophysiological and behavioural markers of compassion. *Scientific reports* 10, 1-9 (2020).
162. T. W. Pace *et al.*, Effect of compassion meditation on neuroendocrine, innate immune and behavioral responses to psychosocial stress. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 34, 87-98 (2009).
163. T. W. Pace *et al.*, Engagement with cognitively-based compassion training is associated with reduced salivary C-reactive protein from before to after training in foster care program adolescents. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 38, 294-299 (2013).
164. J. A. Burr, S. Han, H. J. Lee, J. L. Tavares, J. E. Mutchler, Health benefits associated with three helping behaviors: Evidence for incident cardiovascular disease. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B* 73, 492-500 (2018).
165. S. H. Han, J. L. Tavares, M. Evans, J. Saczynski, J. A. Burr, Social activities, incident cardiovascular disease, and mortality: Health behaviors mediation. *Journal of Aging and Health* 29, 268-288 (2017).
166. M. Heisler *et al.*, Adults with cardiovascular disease who help others: a prospective study of health outcomes. *Journal of behavioral medicine* 36, 199-211 (2013).
167. V. R. Varma *et al.*, Effect of community volunteering on physical activity: a randomized controlled trial. *American journal of preventive medicine* 50, 106-110 (2016).
168. E. Tan, Q.-L. Xue, T. Li, M. Carlson, L. Fried, Volunteering: A Physical Activity Intervention for Older Adults—The Experience Corps Program in Baltimore. *Journal of Urban Health* 83, 954-969 (2006).
169. O. Sarid, I. Melzer, I. Kurz, D. R. Shahar, W. Ruch, The Effect of Helping Behavior and Physical Activity on Mood States and Depressive Symptoms of Elderly People. *Clinical Gerontologist* 33, 270-282 (2010).
170. D. Oman, C. E. Thoresen, K. McMahon, Volunteerism and Mortality among the Community-dwelling Elderly. *Journal of Health Psychology* 4, 301-316 (1999).
171. E. S. Kim, S. H. Konrath, Volunteering is prospectively associated with health care use among older adults. *Social Science & Medicine* 149, 122-129 (2016).
172. X. Wang *et al.*, Fruit and vegetable consumption and mortality from all causes, cardiovascular disease, and cancer: systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Bmj* 349, (2014).
173. M. Nocon *et al.*, Association of physical activity with all-cause and cardiovascular mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *European Journal of Preventive Cardiology* 15, 239-246 (2008).
174. W. Cheng *et al.*, Associations of leisure-time physical activity with cardiovascular mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 44 prospective cohort studies. *European journal of preventive cardiology* 25, 1864-1872 (2018).
175. H. Qu, S. Konrath, M. Poulin, Which types of giving are associated with reduced mortality risk among older adults? *Personality and Individual Differences* 154, 109668 (2020).

176. R. Calvo, Y. Zheng, S. Kumar, A. Olgiati, L. Berkman, Well-being and social capital on planet earth: cross-national evidence from 142 countries. *PLoS ONE* 7, e42793 (2012).
177. S. Kumar, R. Calvo, M. Avendano, K. Sivaramakrishnan, L. F. Berkman, Social support, volunteering and health around the world: Cross-national evidence from 139 countries. *Social Science & Medicine* 74, 696-706 (2012).
178. L. Aknin *et al.*, Prosocial Spending and Well-Being: Cross-Cultural Evidence for a Psychological Universal. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 104, 635-652 (2013).
179. L. B. Aknin, T. Broesch, J. K. Hamlin, J. W. Van de Vondervoort, Prosocial behavior leads to happiness in a small-scale rural society. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 144, 788 (2015).
180. F. Borgonovi, Doing well by doing good. The relationship between formal volunteering and self-reported health and happiness. *Social Science & Medicine* 66, 2321-2334 (2008).
181. C. Campbell *et al.*, Reduction in burnout may be a benefit for short-term medical mission volunteers. *Mental Health, Religion, & Culture* 12, 627-637 (2009).
182. S. Meier, A. Stutzer, Is Volunteering Rewarding in Itself? *Economica* 75, 39-59 (2008).
183. A. T. Jebb, M. Morrison, L. Tay, E. Diener, Subjective well-being around the world: trends and predictors across the life span. *Psychological science* 31, 293-305 (2020).
184. C. Moore, J. Allen, The effects of volunteering on the young volunteer. *The Journal of Primary Prevention* 17, 231-258 (1996).
185. L. B. Aknin, J. K. Hamlin, E. W. Dunn, Giving leads to happiness in young children. *PLoS One* 7, e39211 (2012).
186. M. Van Willigen, Differential Benefits of Volunteering Across the Life Course. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* 55, S308-S318 (2000).
187. P. Bjälkebring, D. Västfjäll, S. Dickert, P. Slovic, Greater emotional gain from giving in older adults: Age-related positivity bias in charitable giving. *Frontiers in Psychology* 7, 846 (2016).
188. Y. W. Ho, J. You, H. H. Fung, The moderating role of age in the relationship between volunteering motives and well-being. *European Journal of Ageing* 9, 319-327 (2012).
189. F. Tabassum, J. Mohan, P. Smith, Association of volunteering with mental well-being: a lifecourse analysis of a national population-based longitudinal study in the UK. *BMJ open* 6, e011327 (2016).
190. A. M. Omoto, M. Snyder, S. C. Martino, Volunteerism and the Life Course: Investigating Age-Related Agendas for Action. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 22, 181-197 (2000).
191. M. A. Okun, A. Schultz, Age and motives for volunteering: Testing hypotheses derived from socioemotional selectivity theory. *Psychology and Aging* 18, 231-239 (2003).
192. E. A. Greenfield, Felt obligation to help others as a protective factor against losses in psychological well-being following functional decline in middle and later life. *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* 64, 723-732 (2009).
193. M. A. Okun, K. J. August, K. S. Rook, J. T. Newsom, Does volunteering moderate the relation between functional limitations and mortality? *Social science & medicine* 71, 1662-1668 (2010).
194. A. Cohen, Welfare clients' volunteering as a means of empowerment. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 38, 522-534 (2009).
195. L. Kulik, Volunteering and Subjective Well-Being Among Individuals With Disabilities: A Multivariate Model. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 48, 174S-200S (2019).
196. A. Philippus, J. M. Ketchum, L. Payne, L. Hawley, C. Harrison-Felix, Volunteering and its association with participation and life satisfaction following traumatic brain injury. *Brain injury* 34, 52-61 (2020).
197. L. Payne *et al.*, Improving well-being after traumatic brain injury through volunteering: a randomized controlled trial. *Brain injury* 34, 697-707 (2020).
198. C. E. Schwartz *et al.*, Doing good, feeling good, and having more: Resources mediate the health benefits of altruism differently for males and females with lumbar spine disorders. *Applied Research in Quality of Life* 7, 263-279 (2012).

199. H. K. Yuen, J. Burik, J. Krause, Physical and psychosocial well-being among adults with spinal cord injury: the role of volunteer activities. *Topics in Spinal Cord Injury Rehabilitation* 9, 19-25 (2004).
200. C. E. Schwartz, B. R. Quaranto, B. C. Healy, R. H. Benedict, T. L. Vollmer, Altruism and health outcomes in multiple sclerosis: The effect of cognitive reserve. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 8, 144-152 (2013).
201. G. Ironson, in *Altruism and Health*, S. Post, Ed. (Oxford University Press, New York, NY, 2007), pp. 70-81.
202. D. R. George, M. E. Singer, Intergenerational volunteering and quality of life for persons with mild to moderate dementia: results from a 5-month intervention study in the United States. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry* 19, 392-396 (2011).
203. K. Lee, H. Dabelko-Schoeny, V. E. Richardson, Volunteering Served as a Transitional Role That Enhances the Well-Being and Cognitive Health Among Older Adults With Cognitive Impairments. *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, 0733464820982731 (2020).
204. H. K. Yuen, P. Huang, J. K. Burik, T. G. Smith, Impact of participating in volunteer activities for residents living in long-term-care facilities. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy* 62, 71-76 (2008).
205. L. E. Alden, J. L. Trew, If it makes you happy: Engaging in kind acts increases positive affect in socially anxious individuals. *Emotion* 13, 64 (2013).
206. M. Warren, San Jose State University, (1993).
207. H. L. Schacter, G. Margolin, When it feels good to give: Depressive symptoms, daily prosocial behavior, and adolescent mood. *Emotion* 19, 923 (2019).
208. W. Lu, Y. Xiao, Adverse childhood experiences and adolescent mental disorders: protective mechanisms of family functioning, social capital, and civic engagement. *Health behavior research* 2, e1035-e1035 (2019).
209. K. B. Hanniball, L. B. Aknin, K. S. Douglas, J. L. Viljoen, Does helping promote well-being in at-risk youth and ex-offender samples? *Journal of experimental social psychology* 82, 307-317 (2019).
210. S. Brown, M. N. Harris, K. Taylor, Modelling charitable donations to an unexpected natural disaster: Evidence from the US Panel Study of Income Dynamics. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 84, 97-110 (2012).
211. X. Jin, E. Huang, W. Song, T. Zhao, The Effects of Public Health Emergencies on Altruistic Behaviors: Empirical Research on the COVID-19 Pandemic in China. (2020).
212. T. Tiefenbach, F. Kohlbacher, Disasters, donations, and tax law changes: Disentangling effects on subjective well-being by exploiting a natural experiment. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 50, 94-112 (2015).
213. Y. Feng *et al.*, When altruists cannot help: the influence of altruism on the mental health of university students during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Globalization and Health* 16, 1-8 (2020).
214. N. L. Sin, P. Klaiber, J. H. Wen, A. DeLongis, Helping Amid the Pandemic: Daily Affective and Social Implications of COVID-19-Related Prosocial Activities. *The Gerontologist*, (2020).
215. H. Zhang, J. Zhu, L. Wei, W. Zhang, A Comparison between the Psychological Benefits of Giving Money versus Giving Time. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 1-25 (2021).
216. E. J. Mojza, C. Lorenz, S. Sonnentag, C. Binnewies, Daily recovery experiences: The role of volunteer work during leisure time. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 15, 60 (2010).
217. F. Martela, R. M. Ryan, The Benefits of Benevolence: Basic Psychological Needs, Beneficence, and the Enhancement of Well-Being. *Journal of Personality* 84, 750-764 (2016).
218. G. Hill, R. T. Howell, Moderators and mediators of pro-social spending and well-being: The influence of values and psychological need satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences* 69, 69-74 (2014).

219. J. Jiang, T. Zeng, C. Zhang, R. Wang, The mediating role of relatedness need satisfaction in the relationship between charitable behavior and well-being: Empirical evidence from China. *International Journal of Psychology* 53, 349-355 (2018).
220. L. Wray-Lake, C. R. DeHaan, J. Shubert, R. M. Ryan, Examining links from civic engagement to daily well-being from a self-determination theory perspective. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 14, 166-177 (2019).
221. M. R. Leary, *The curse of the self: Self-awareness, egotism, and the quality of human life*. (Oxford University Press, New York, NY, 2004).
222. R. F. Baumeister, *Escaping the self: Alcoholism, spirituality, masochism, and other flights from the burden of selfhood*. (Basic Books, 1991).
223. N. Derakshan, M. W. Eysenck, Manipulation of focus of attention and its effects on anxiety in high-anxious individuals and repressors. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping* 14, 173-191 (2001).
224. Y. Huang, Downward Social Comparison Increases Life-Satisfaction in the Giving and Volunteering Context. *Social Indicators Research*, 1-12 (2014).
225. C.-J. Liu, F. Hao, Reciprocity belief and gratitude as moderators of the association between social status and charitable giving. *Personality and Individual Differences* 111, 46-50 (2017).
226. D. R. Cregg, J. S. Cheavens, Gratitude interventions: Effective self-help? A meta-analysis of the impact on symptoms of depression and anxiety. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 1-33 (2020).
227. L. Jans-Beken *et al.*, Gratitude and health: An updated review. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 15, 743-782 (2020).
228. S. H. Han, K. Kim, J. A. Burr, Stress-buffering effects of volunteering on daily well-being: Evidence from the National Study of Daily Experiences. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B* 75, 1731-1740 (2020).
229. E. B. Raposa, H. B. Laws, E. B. Ansell, Prosocial behavior mitigates the negative effects of stress in everyday life. *Clinical Psychological Science* 4, 691-698 (2016).
230. R. Ramos *et al.*, Exploring the interaction between volunteering status, paid job characteristics and quality of volunteers' motivation on mental health. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 27, 790-809 (2016).
231. M. J. Poulin, S. L. Brown, A. J. Dillard, D. M. Smith, Giving to Others and the Association Between Stress and Mortality. *American Journal of Public Health*, e1-e7 (2013).
232. M. Pinquart, S. Sörensen, Differences between caregivers and noncaregivers in psychological health and physical health: a meta-analysis. *Psychology and aging* 18, 250 (2003).
233. M. Pinquart, S. Sörensen, Correlates of Physical Health of Informal Caregivers: A Meta-Analysis. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* 62, P126-P137 (2007).
234. S. Brown *et al.*, Caregiving Behavior Is Associated With Decreased Mortality Risk. *Psychological Science* 20, 488-494 (2009).
235. S. R. Beach, R. Schulz, J. L. Yee, S. Jackson, Negative and positive health effects of caring for a disabled spouse: longitudinal findings from the caregiver health effects study. *Psychology and aging* 15, 259 (2000).
236. S. Hilbrand, D. A. Coall, D. Gerstorf, R. Hertwig, Caregiving within and beyond the family is associated with lower mortality for the caregiver: A prospective study. *Evolution and Human Behavior* 38, 397-403 (2017).
237. F.-p. Chen, J. S. Greenberg, A positive aspect of caregiving: The influence of social support on caregiving gains for family members of relatives with schizophrenia. *Community mental health journal* 40, 423-435 (2004).
238. M. A. Musick, A. R. Herzog, J. S. House, Volunteering and Mortality Among Older Adults: Findings From a National Sample. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* 54B, S173-S180 (1999).
239. T. D. Windsor, K. J. Anstey, B. Rodgers, Volunteering and Psychological Well-Being Among Young-Old Adults: How Much Is Too Much? *The Gerontologist* 48, 59-70 (2008).

240. P. L. Dulin, J. Gavala, C. Stephens, M. Kostick, J. McDonald, Volunteering predicts happiness among older Māori and non-Māori in the New Zealand health, work, and retirement longitudinal study. *Aging & mental health* 16, 617-624 (2012).
241. E. Kahana, T. Bhatta, L. D. Lovegreen, B. Kahana, E. Midlarsky, Altruism, Helping, and Volunteering Pathways to Well-Being in Late Life. *Journal of aging and health* 25, 159-187 (2013).
242. N. Weinstein, R. M. Ryan, When helping helps: autonomous motivation for prosocial behavior and its influence on well-being for the helper and recipient. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 98, 222 (2010).
243. S. K. Nelson *et al.*, 'It's up to you': Experimentally manipulated autonomy support for prosocial behavior improves well-being in two cultures over six weeks. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 10, 463-476 (2015).
244. M. Rudd, J. Aaker, M. I. Norton, Getting the most out of giving: Concretely framing a prosocial goal maximizes happiness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 54, 11-24 (2014).
245. J. A. Wheeler, K. M. Gorey, B. Greenblatt, The beneficial effects of volunteering for older volunteers and the people they serve: a meta-analysis. *International journal of aging & human development* 47, 69-79 (1998).