UNIT 2 PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AND FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

Structure

2.0 INTRODUCTION

Pro-social behaviour is defined as "…any act performed with the goal of benefiting another person" (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 2004 p. 382). How is it possible to differentiate the meaning or motivation or consequences between a ten rupees donation to charity and rescuing a drowning child? This is not a topic confined within one discipline. Even a cursory review of the literature reveals that psychologists, philosophers, economists, sociobiologists, and others all have distinct and often conflicting points of view. Prosocial are voluntary made with the intention of benefiting others.   This definition focuses on the potential benefits to the person performing the prosocial behaviour. In this unit we will be dealing with noticing emergency for help, understanding how and what do in such situations, and determining and taking decisions to help. Such a helping behaviour is influenced by a large number of factors such as physical attractiveness of the person who needs help, similarity in a number of factors,   whether the person is a relative and belong to kin etc. This unit deals with also the perspective of help from the victim's point of view and one's own personal experience. Many theoretical perspectives have also been put across in this unit which includes social learning theory and its influence on helping behaviour, the motivation and social identity theories contributing to understanding of helping behaviour empathic and receiprocity factors as to how they contribute to the understanding of helping behaviour. Lastly the unit discusses the current trends in regard to pro social behaviour.

2.1 OBJECTIVES

After successful completion of this Unit, you are expected to be able to:

l   Define Pro-social behaviour and altruism;

l   Have knowledge about various factors affecting pro-social behaviour;

l   Explain pro-social behaviour in the light of different theories; and

l   Analyse the current trends in research related to pro-social behaviour.

2.2 PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

2.2.1 Definition and Description

Staub (1979) defined pro-social behaviour as voluntary behaviour intended to benefit another person. "Voluntary" emphasises the spontaneous initiative by the

actor in contrast to professional help (e.g., physicians or nurses). Pro-social behaviour may include helping, sharing, giving, and comforting (Bierhoff, 2002).

Pro-social behaviour is defined as "…any act performed with the goal of benefiting another person" (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 2004 p. 382). How is it possible to differentiate the meaning or motivation or consequences between a ten rupees donation to charity and rescuing a drowning child? Many researchers have attempted to narrow the parameters of discussion by focusing on subsets of prosocial behaviour such as altruism versus self-interest, helping behaviours sustained over time versus one-time events, personality variables versus situational context, the origins of empathy and others.

Pro-social behaviour is not a topic confined within one discipline. Even a cursory review of the literature reveals that psychologists, philosophers, economists, sociobiologists, and others all have distinct and often conflicting points of view. As Kohn points out, the term pro-social is so broad that it becomes essentially meaningless.

Pro-social are voluntary made with the intention of benefiting others (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). This definition focuses on the potential benefits to the person performing the pro-social behaviour. Nevertheless, benefiting others, but whose main goal is self-advantageous (e.g. cooperative intended to obtain a common resource), typically are not considered pro-social. Typical examples include: volunteering, sharing toys, or food with friends instrumental help (e.g., helping a peer with school assignments) costly help e.g. risking one's own life to save others and emotionally supporting others in distress e.g., comforting a peer following a disappointing experience or caring for a person who is ill.

2.2.2 Pro-social Behaviour and Altruism

Pro-social behaviour is often accompanied by psychological and social rewards for its performer. In the long run, individuals can benefit from living in a society where prosociality is common. It has been difficult for researchers to identify purely altruistic behaviours, benefiting only the recipient and not the performer. Altruism is generally defined as any form of voluntary act intended to favour another without expectation of reward (Smith & Mackie, 2000; Batson et. al., 2002; Aronson et. al., 2004).

Perhaps the first person to utilise the term altruism was the French sociologist Auguste Comte, who declared that humans have inborn drives to behave sympathetically toward others (Lee, Lee and Kang, 2003). It is a specific kind of motivation to benefit another without consciously considering for one's own self interest (Hall, 1999). In other words, altruism refers to a kind of selfless help, which is based on pure desire to help others (Aronson, Wilson, Akert, & Fehr, 2004). Nevertheless, altruism is not a synonym for pro-social behaviour.

Prosocial behaviour refers to helping behaviour of favouring another person with the goal that may involve benefits to self (Smith & Mackie, 2000; Aronson et. al., 2004). For instance, people donating money to Tsunami relief fund may not always be selfless. In the case that donation is for the sake of tax exemption, its motive would not be regarded as altruistic. The major difference between altruism and pro-social behaviour is that altruism does not involve the element of self interest (Myers, 1996).

2.2.3   Certain Historical Aspects of Prosocial Behaviour

The term pro-social behaviour was introduced in the early 1970's after the incident of Kitty Genovese case in USA (Kohn, 1990) .On March 13, 1964, Kitty Genovese was murdered in front of her home. She parked her car a number of feet from her apartment when all of a sudden, a man named Winston Moseley chased her down and stabbed her in the back twice. Kitty screamed for help and a neighbour responded shouting at the criminal "Let that girl alone!" Immediately, Winston fled the scene and left the girl crawling towards her apartment. Several witnesses reported to have seen the whole scene. At that time, there was a strong degree of interest in exploring why 38 neighbours ignored the pleas and calls for help from a woman being repeatedly stabbed and ultimately murdered by her assailant.

Why were such apathy, indifference and lack of concern observed from all the neighbours of Kitty? Two social psychologists, John Darley & Bibb Latane, started asking questions why the witnesses demonstrated a lack of reaction towards the victim's need for help. They found bystander apathy is the major factor that influences helping behaviour.

The term bystander effect refers to the phenomenon in which greater the numbers of people present, the less likely people are to help a person in distress. When an emergency situation occurs, observers are more likely to take action if there are few or no other witnesses.

In a series of classic study, researchers Bibb Latane and John Darley (1969) found that the amount of time it takes the participant to take action and seek help varies depending on how many other observers are in the room. In one experiment, subjects were placed in one of three treatment conditions: alone in a room, with two other participants or with two confederates who pretended to be normal participants.

As the participants sat filling out questionnaires, smoke began to fill the room. When participants were alone, 75% reported the smoke to the experimenters. In contrast, just 38% of participants in a room with two other people reported the smoke. In the final group, the two confederates in the experiment noted the smoke and then ignored it, which resulted in only 10% of the participants reporting the smoke.

There are two major factors that contribute to the bystander effect. First, the presence of other people creates a diffusion of responsibility. Because there are other observers, individuals do not feel as much pressure to take action, since the responsibility to take action is thought to be shared among all of the present. The second reason is the need to behave in correct and socially acceptable ways. When other observers fail to react, individuals often take this as a signal that a response is not needed or not appropriate. Other researchers have found that onlookers are less likely to intervene if the situation is ambiguous (Solomon, 1978). In the case of Kitty Genovese, many of the 38 witnesses reported that they believed that they were witnessing a "lover's quarrel," and did not realise that the young woman was actually being murdered.

2.3 PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR IN EMERGENCY SITUATIONS

There are five step response in emergency situations (Darley & Latane, 1969), which include the following:

2.3.1 Noticing the Emergency

In order for people to help, they must notice that an emergency has occurred. Sometimes very trivial things, such as how much of a hurry a person is in, can prevent them from noticing someone else in trouble. Darley and Batson (1973) showed that seminary students who were in a hurry to give a sermon on campus were much less likely to help an ostensibly injured confederate groaning in a doorway than were those who were not in a hurry.

2.3.2 Interpreting an Emergency as an Emergency

The next determinant of helping is whether the bystander interprets the event as an emergency. Ironically, when other bystanders are present, people are more likely to assume an emergency is something innocuous. This pluralistic ignorance occurs because people look to see others' reactions (informational influence); when they see that everyone else has a blank expression, they assume there must be no danger (Latané and Darley, 1970)

2.3.3 Assuming that it is your Responsibility to Help

The next step that must occur if helping is to take place is for someone to take responsibility. When there are many witnesses, there is a diffusion of responsibility, the phenomenon whereby each bystander's sense of responsibility to help decreases as the number of witnesses increases. Everyone assumes that someone else will help, and as a result, no one does, as happened with the Kitty Genovese murder.

2.3.4 Knowing what to do

Even if all the previous conditions are met, a person must know what form of assistance to give. If they don't, they will be unable to help.

2.3.5 Making the Decision to Help

Finally, even if you know what kind of help to give, you might decide not to intervene because you feel unqualified to help or you are too afraid of the costs to yourself. Markey (2000) examined helping in an Internet chat room situation; when the chat room group as a whole was asked to provide some information about finding profiles, the larger the group, the longer it took for anyone to help. However, when a specific person was addressed by name, that person helped quickly, regardless of group size.

2.4 FACTORS AFFECTING HELPING BEHAVIOUR

2.4.1 Physical Attractiveness

Attractiveness is defined as physical attractiveness or the attractiveness of a person's

personality or behaviour (DeVito, 1976). Researchers believe physical attractiveness can be defined for any one individual situationally (DeVito, 1976). Physically attractive people are more likely to receive help than unattractive people (Harrell, 1978). The explanation lies in the fact, that as a society, we consciously or subconsciously tend to treat attractive individuals differently, expecting better lives for them (Berscheid, Walster, Bohrnstedt, 1973). Adams and Cohen (1976) feel physical attractiveness is a major factor in the development of prosocial behaviour in a child.

2.4.2   Similarity and Kinship

Finally, individuals are more likely to behave prosocially towards similar or likable others (Penner et al., 2005), and towards others considered to be close, especially kin (Graziano et al., 2007). Genetic relatedness aside, pro-social behaviour towards family members probably involves a sense of duty, reciprocity, and affective relationships. Individuals care more for victims who belong to their in-group rather than to their out-group (Dovidio et al. 1997; Flippen et al. 1996; Levine et al. 2002). Park and Schaller (2005) found that attitude similarity serves as a heuristic cue signaling kinship, which may motivate kin-recognition responses (e.g., prosocial behaviour) even to unrelated individuals.

2.4.3   Religiosity

Although several studies have examined the impact of donor characteristics across various domains, the findings are not as robust as those about victim characteristics. One consistent finding is that humanitarian values and religiosity are correlated with giving (Burnett 1981; Pessemier, Bemmaor, and Hanssens 1977).

2.4.4   Victim's Perspective

Batson and colleagues have shown consistently greater empathy and altruistic behaviour by individuals who are primed to take the victim's perspective (Batson, Early, and Salvarani 1997; Batson et al. 2003).

2.4.5   Personal Experience

A vast literature examines the impact of personal experience on self-protective behaviour (Weinstein, 1989, for a critical review). Although the majority of studies examine effects on victims themselves, a few assess the impact of knowing a victim as a form of personal experience (Manheimer, Mellinger & Crossley 1966 and Schiff 1977). Barnett et al. (1986) found that participants who had been raped reported greater empathy when watching a video about a rape victim than did those who had never been raped. Batson et al. (1996) found that for females but not males, the expectation of oneself receiving a shock affected self-reported empathy when one observed a same-sex peer receiving a shock. Christy and Voigt (1994) found that those who reported being abused as a child indicated that they would be more likely than those who had never been abused to intervene if they saw a child being abused.

2.4.6   Identifiable Victim Effect

Previous research has shown that people give more to identifiable victims than to unidentifiable or statistical victims (Kogut and Ritov 2005a, b; Small, Loewenstein, and Slovic 2006). This effect has even been demonstrated when no meaningful

information is provided about the identified victim (Small and Loewenstein 2003). Other identifying factors, such as showing a victim's face or being in the presence of a victim, also increase pro-social behaviour (Bohnet and Frey 1999). Charities do often describe or show images of specific victims to potential donors in their advertising campaigns, but such attempts seem designed to benefit from the identifiable victim effect (Kogut and Ritov, 2005a, b; Small et al. 2006), rather than to create "friendship" between donors and victims.

2.4.7   Attributions Concerning Victim's Responsibility

People also give more to victims who are perceived as "deserving," in other words, whose needs arise from external rather than internal causes (Weiner 1980). Thus, disabled children are deemed deserving; healthy unemployed men are not (Schmidt and Weiner 1988). Finally, the effect of deservingness on prosocial behaviour is mediated by sympathy, suggesting that giving decisions are not based on cold mental calculations (Weiner, 1980). A study carried out on the New York subway showed that people were more likely to help 'blind' rather than 'drunk' confederates who had collapsed (Piliavin, 1969).

2.4.8   Positive Friend Influence

Barry and Wentzel (2006) supported the notion that friends in particular can be important socialisers of pro-social behaviour. Children are similar to their friends in the degree to which they display pro-social behaviour and are motivated to behave this way (Wentzel, Barry, & Caldwell, 2004; Wentzel & Caldwell, 1997). Adolescents who have friends are more likely to be pro-social than those without friends (McGuire & Weisz, 1982).

2.4.9   Gender

Females engage in prosocial behaviours more frequently than males (Fabes, Carlo, Kupanoff, & Laible, 1999), which is consistent across ratings from parents, teachers, and peers (Holmgren, Eisenberg, & Fabes, 1998). Additionally, observational studies have indicated that females are more likely than males to share and cooperate when interacting (Burford, Foley, Rollins, & Rosario, 1996). Beutel and Johnson (2004) reported that in a study of 12 through 17 year-olds, females placed more importance on prosocial values than males at younger ages, and the gender gap in prosocial values was larger at older ages. Eagly and Crowley (1986) did a meta-analysis and found that men are more likely to help in chivalrous, heroic ways, and women are more likely to help in nurturant ways involving long-term commitment.

2.4.10   Age

Older adolescent males placed less importance on prosocial values than younger adolescent males (Beutel & Johnson, 2004). Further, in a study of adolescent soccer players' behaviours, recruited from age groups of under 13, under 15, and under 17, significant differences among the age groups indicated that the oldest group displayed more frequent antisocial behaviours and less frequent prosocial behaviours compared to the younger groups (Kavussanu, Seal, & Phillips, 2006). However, there appears to be an increase in the use of some prosocial behaviours after a certain point in adolescence, as Eisenberg et al. (2005) found that prosocial moral reasoning and perspective-taking abilities showed increases with age from

late adolescence to early adulthood, whereas helping and displaying sympathy did not increase with age.

2.4.11 Personality

Research following children from early childhood to adulthood supports the existence of the long-debated altruistic or prosocial personality (Eisenberg et al., 1999). Individual differences in prosociality are linked to sociability, low shyness, extroversion, and agreeableness, although specific prosocial behaviours may require a combination of additional traits, such as perceived self-efficacy in the case of helping (Penner et al., 2005). Personality and contextual variables are likely to interact in determining prosocial behaviour. For example, agreeable individuals were more likely to help an outgroup member than low-agreeableness individuals, but agreeableness was not associated with helping an ingroup member (Graziano et al., 2007).

While, Hartshorne and May (1929) found only a .23 correlation between different kinds of helping behaviours in children, and several studies have found that those who scored high on a personality test of altruism were not much more likely to help than those who scored low. People's personality is clearly not the only determinant of helping. Instead, it seems to be that different kinds of people are likely to help in different situations.

2.4.12 Effects of Positive Moods: Feel Good, Do Good

People who are in a good mood are more likely to help. For example, Isen and Levin (1972) did a study in a shopping mall where subjects either found or did not find a dime in a phone booth. As the person emerged from the booth, a confederate walked by and dropped a sheaf of papers; 84% of those who found the dime helped compared with 4% of those who did not find the dime. North, Tarrang, & Hargreaves (2004) found that people are more likely to help others when in a good mood for a number of other reasons, including doing well on a test, receiving a gift, thinking happy thoughts, and listening to pleasant music.

Good moods can increase helping for three reasons: (1) good moods make us interpret events in a sympathetic way; (2) helping another prolongs the good mood, whereas not helping deflates it; (3) good moods increase self-attention, and this in turn leads us to be more likely to behave according to our values and beliefs (which tend to favor altruism).

2.5 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

There are a large number of theorie which explain pro-social behaviour and these are described and discussed below:

2.5.1 Social Learning Theory

Social learning theory suggests that pro-social behaviour is learned (Bandura, 1977; Bandura & McDonald, 1963; Batson, 1998). Observing role models who are loved or respected, such as parents or authorities, engaged in pro-social behaviour, demonstrates how people can and should behave prosocially. Rewards reinforce helping behaviour; punishments reduce unhelpful or hurtful behaviour. Within a group context, social recognition, not just private reward, increases pro-

social behaviour (Fisher & Ackerman, 1998).Observational modeling processes with reinforcement will result in learning over time (Compeau & Higgins, 1995; Lim *et al.*, 1997).

2.5.2 Motivation Perspective

Theorists differentiate altruistic prosocial behaviour from egoistic prosocial behaviour depending upon the motivation of the helper (Batson, 1991; Nelson, 1999; Piliavin & Charng, 1990). Altruistic prosocial behaviour is motivated purely by the desire to increase another person's welfare; egoistic prosocial behaviour is motivated by the desire to increase one's own welfare or that of one's group or cause through helping others (Batson, 1998; MacIntyre, 1967).

Some researchers believe that pro-social behaviour does not need to be based on unobservable underlying motivations of children (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989), but other researchers believe that another person's well-being must be of primary concern in prosocial behaviours (Cialdini, Kenrick, & Bauman, 1976). It is generally understood that an intention of prosocial behaviours is to achieve positive consequences for others (Jackson & Tisak, 2001; Tisak & Ford, 1986), but it is possible that there are other reasons children behave prosocially as well. Children's expectancies may influence their likelihood of engaging in prosocial behaviours. Adolescents who expect positive adult reactions to their prosocial behaviours report engaging in more prosocial and less aggressive behaviours (Wyatt & Carlo, 2002).

2.5.3 Social Identity Theory

Social identity theory and self-categorisation theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner *et al.*, 1987) are helpful in understanding why some people exhibit substantial prosocial behaviour over time.

Social identity theory is based on the premise that people identify with particular groups in order to enhance their self-esteem. Identification leads to selective social comparisons that emphasise intergroup differences along dimensions. This leads to favouring the ingroup and confer positive distinctiveness on the ingroup when compared to the salient outgroup (Hogg & Abrams, 1988).

Categorising the self and others in terms of groups accentuates the similarities between group members with respect to their fit with the relevant group prototype or 'cognitive representation of features that describe and prescribe attributes of the group' (Hogg & Terry, 2000). The prototype guides the participants' understanding of the group and its expected behaviours and attitudes. People identified with a group will thus be more likely to exhibit behaviours that are consistent with shared group norms and will cooperate with the group and its members.

Group identification is an important antecedent to cooperative behaviours related to group maintenance and survival (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Kramer, 1993; Mael & Ashforth, 1995; Tyler, 1999).

2.5.4 Biological Perspective

 Empathy, altruism and prosocial behaviour are considered vital for the good functioning of society. Although psychological theories emphasise the importance

of cognition and socialisation, genes also have a role to play. Monozygotic (MZ) twin pairs share 100% of their genes, whereas dizygotic (DZ) twin pairs share 50%; thus the comparison of MZ and DZ twin similarities and differences allows for estimates to be made of genetic influences (Plomin et al. 2001). Several studies have found that by adulthood, approximately 50% of the variance in altruism, empathy and social responsibility is due to genes and 50% to non-genetic factors (Rushton et al. 1986; Rushton 2004).

2.6 NEGATIVE-STATE RELIEF HYPOTHESIS

Negative State Relief Model, views empathic concern as being accompanied by feelings of sadness that the helper tries to relieve through helping someone in need (Smith, Keating, & Stotland, 1989; Cialindi, et al., 1987; Schroeder, Dovidio, Sibicky, Matthews, & Allen, 1988). Here, the motivation for prosocial behaviour is based on increasing the welfare of both the helper and helpee. Three prominent features of the Negative State Relief Model are that: (1) helpers experience empathic concern; (2) such concern is accompanied by feelings of sadness and (3) helpers attempt to relieve such feelings by helping others.

Cialdini's (1987) experiments involved participants taking the place of people receiving electric shocks. However, high empathy participants were less inclined to help if they had been praised by the researchers. It is thought that this praise helped to lift their mood so that it was not necessary to help the person receiving the shocks.

When people feel guilty, they are more likely to help. For example, Harris et al. (1975) found that churchgoers were more likely to donate money after confession.

2.7 EMPATHY – ALTRUISM HYPOTHESIS

Batson (1987, 1991) introduced the empathy-altruism hypothesis, which states refers to " the claim that feeling empathic emotion for someone in need evokes altruistic motivation to relieve that need has been called the empathy-altruism hypothesis. According to this hypothesis, the greater the empathetic emotion, the greater the altruistic motivation." (Batson et. al., 2002).

According to the Empathy-Altruism Hypothesis, empathic concern motivates helpers to enhance the welfare of those in need rather than avoid the situation instead (Smith, Keating, & Stotland, 1989; Baston, 1987).

In a study by Toi and Batson, (1982), students listened to a taped interview with a student who had ostensibly broken both legs in an accident and was behind in classes. Two factors were manipulated: empathetic vs. non-empathetic set, manipulated by instructions given to Ss; and the costs of helping, manipulated by whether or not the injured student was expected to be seen every day once she returned to class. The dependent variable was whether Ss responded to a request to help the injured student catch up in class. As the empathy-altruism hypothesis predicted, people in the high empathy condition helped regardless of cost, while those in the low empathy condition helped only if the cost of not helping was high.

2.7.1 Empathic-Joy Hypothesis

Smith, Keating, and Stotland's (1989) hypothesis proposes that empathic concern

is based on a helper's overarching sensitivity to a victim's emotional state and a subsequent heightened sense of vicarious happiness and relief upon the fulfillment of the recipient's needs. The authors propose that empathic witnesses to someone in need may regard empathic joy as being more achievable and rewarding than would be a self-focused witness, and thus have greater motivation to help.

The three prominent features of the Empathic-Joy Hypothesis are that:

1) helpers experience empathic concern;

2) this concern is a function of their sensitivity to another's needs; and

3) the awareness of relief for another's distress promotes subsequent relief of the helper's empathic concern as well as a sense of joy.

2.7.2 Self-Efficacy Hypothesis

This hypothesis reflects a combination of proposals from authors regarding correlates to helping behaviours. According to Midlarsky (1968) individuals? level of competence with a given skill can influence helping behaviour, especially in times of need. Such competence may increase the likelihood of helping through increased certainty over what to do, along with the decreased fear of making a mistake and decreased stress over the situation (Withey, 1962; Janis 1962, Midlarsky, 1968; Staub, 1971).

2.8 RECIPROCITY AND SOCIAL NORMS

The concept of reciprocity" is defined in settings in which individuals act in a more cooperative manner in response to the positive or friendly behaviour of others. As a result, reciprocity as a reputational motivation is very closely linked to the idea that the more others contribute, the more one gives. For instance, although contributing to charitable organisations does not benefit the donor directly, she may still gain in the long run, because she expects to benefit from reciprocity in the future when she will need help. Leider et al. (2009) established that giving is motivated, at least in part, by future interaction (enforced reciprocity).

Social norms also encourage people to find ways by which to avoid being generous when it is not completely necessary. As suggested by Stephen Meier (2004), reciprocity and concern to conform to social norms are closely tied together. In particular, by observing the behaviour of others, one translates this behaviour into a recipe of what one 'should do'.

2.9 CURRENT TRENDS

Genetics also contribute to individual variation in prosociality. Research on adults finds that prosociality is substantially heritable. Research on young children shows lower heritability, demonstrated by one longitudinal twin study showing increase in the heritability of parent-rated prosociality, from 30 % at age 2 to 60 % at age 7 (Knafo & Plomin, 2006). Gene-environment correlations can also shape individual differences in prosociality. For example, children's low prosociality is related to parents' use of negative discipline and affection.

This relationship can be traced back to children's genetic tendencies, implying that the genetically influenced low prosociality can initiate a negative reaction from

parents (Knafo & Plomin, 2006). Some evidence suggests that children in Western societies are less pro-social than children in other cultures, but some studies find no differences along these lines (see review by Eisenberg et al., 2006).

A field study by Levine, Norenzayan, and Philbrick (2001) found large cultural differences in spontaneously helping strangers. For example, the proportion of individuals helping a stranger with a hurt leg pick up dropped magazines ranged from 22 % to 95 % across 23 cultures. Perhaps, cultures differ substantially in what each promotes as prosocial behaviour (Eisenberg et al., 2006).

It has been suggested that there are two reasons for cultural differences in altruism (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989) first is Industrial societies place value on competition and personal success and secondly Co-operation at the home in non-industrial societies promotes altruism.

2.10 LET US SUM UP

Pro-social behaviours are voluntary behaviours made with the intention of benefiting others. Prosocial behaviour is often accompanied with psychological and social rewards for its performer. In the long run, individuals can benefit from living in a society where prosociality is common. Altruism is generally defined as any form of voluntary act intended to favour another withour expectation of reward. There are various factors that affect the pro-social behaviour e.g. (i) Noticing the emergency, (ii) Interpreting an emergency as an emergency. (iii) Assuming that it is your responsibility to help, (iv) Knowing what to do, (v) Making the decision to help. Amongst the various factors affecting helping behaviour, we saw that (i) Physical attractiveness, (ii) Similarity and kinship, (iii) Religiosity, (iv) Victim's perspective,(v) Personal experience, (vi) Gender, (vii) Age, (viii) Personality etc.

It has been suggested that there are two reasons for cultural differences in altruism (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989) first is Industrial societies place value on competition and personal success and secondly Co-operation at the home in non-industrial societies promotes altruism.

2.11 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1) Define pro-social behaviour with factor leading us to help in a particular situation.

2) Discuss various factors that affect pro-social behaviour.

3) Critically evaluate theories of pro-social behaviour.

2.12 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

Aronson, E., Wilson, T., & Akert, R. (2004). *Social Psychology,* Media and Research

Update (Fourth ed.). *Upper Saddle River*, N.J.: Pearson Education.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Baron, R. A., Branscombe, N. R., & Byrne, D. (2009). *Social Psychology* (12th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 20 (p. 65-122), New York: Academic Press

Myers, D.G. (1996). *Social Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Smith, E.R. & Mackie,D.M. (2000). *Social Psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: Worth.

References

Adams, G. R., & Cohen, A. S.(1976). An examination of cumulative folder information used by teachers in making differential judgements of children's abilities. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 22, 216-224.

Aronson, R.B., Macintyre, I.G., Precht, W.F., Wapnick, C.M., Murdoch, T.J.T., 2002. The expanding scale of species turnover events on coral reefs in Belize. Ecol. Monogr. 72, 233–249.

Ashforth, B.E. and Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. Academy of Management Review, 14(1), 20–39.

Bandura, A. and McDonald, F.J. (1963). Influence of social-reinforcement and behaviour of models in shaping children's moral judgments. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67(3), 274–81.

Barnett, M. A., P. A. Tetreault, J. A. Esper, and A. R. Bristow (1986), "Similarity and Empathy -the Experience of Rape," Journal of Social Psychology, 126 (1), 47-49.

Barry, C. M., & Wentzel, K. R. (2006). Friend influence on prosocial behaviour: The role of motivational factors and friendship characteristics. Developmental Psychology, 42, 153-163.

Baston, C.D. (1987). Prosocial motivation: Is it ever truly altruistic? In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, 20 (p. 65-122), New York: Academic Press, p. 65-122.

Batson, C.D. (1991). The altruism question: toward a social psychological answer. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Batson, C. D. (1998). Altruism and prosocial behaviour. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey (eds), Handbook of social psychology (4th edn) (Vol. II, pp. 282–316). New York:McGraw-Hill.

Baston, C.D., Bolen, M.H., Cross, J.A., and Neuringer-Benefiel, H.E. (1986). Where is the altruism in the altruistic personality? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50(1), 212-220.

Batson, C.D., Chang, J., Orr, R., Rowland, J., 2002. Empathy, attitudes, and action: Can feeling for a member of a stigmatised group motivate one to help the group? Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28(12), pp. 1656-1666.

Batson, C. D., Early, S. and Salvarani, G. (1997), "Perspective taking: Imagining how another feels versus imagining how you would feel," Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23 (7), 751-58.

Batson, C. D., Lishner, L. Dulin, S. Harjusola-Webb, E.L. Stocks, S. Gale, O. Hassan, and B. Samput (2003), "…As you would have them do unto you": Does imagining yourself in the other's place stimulate moral action?," Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29 (4), 1190-201.

Batson, C. D., S. C. Sympson, J. L. Hindman, P. Decruz, R. M. Todd, J. L. Weeks, G. Jennings, and C. T. Burris (1996), ""'I've been there, too": Effect on empathy of prior experience with a need," Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22 (5), 474-82.

Berscheid, E., Walster, E., & Bohrnstedt, G. (1973). The happy American body: A survey report. Psychology Today, 7, 119-131.

Bierhoff, H.W. (2002). Prosocial behaviour. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

Bohnet, Iris and Bruno S. Frey (1999), "Social Distance and other-regarding Behaviour in Dictator Games: Comment," The American Economic Review, 89 (1), 335-39.

Burnett, John J. (1981), "Psychographic and demographic characteristics of blood donors," Journal of Consumer Research, 8 (1), 62-66.

Beutel, A. M., & Johnson, M. K. (2004). Gender and prosocial values during adolescence: A research note. Sociological Quarterly, 45, 379-393.

Burford, H. C., Foley, L. A., Rollins, P. G., & Rosario, K. S. (1996). Gender differences in preschoolers' sharing behaviour. Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 11, 17-25.

Cialdini, R., Kenrick, D., & Bauman, D. (1976). Effects of mood on prosocial behaviour in children and adults. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behaviour (pp. 339-356). New York: Academic Press.

Cialdini, R. B., Schaller, M., Houlihan, D., Arps, K., Fultz, J., & Beaman, A. L. (1987). Empathy-based helping: is it selflessly or selfishly motivated? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 749-758.

Compeau, D.R. and Higgins, C.A. (1995). Application of social cognitive theory to training for computer skills. Information Systems Research, 6(2), 118–43.

Christy, C.A. and H Voigt (1994), "Bystander responses to public episodes of child abuse," Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24 (9), 824-47.

Darley, J.M. & Batson, C.D. (1973). From Jerusalem to Jericho: A study of situational and dispositional variables in helping behaviour. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27, 100-108.

Darley, J. M. & Latané, B. (1969). Bystander "apathy." American Scientist, 57, 244-268.

DeVito, J. A. (1976). The interpersonal communication book. New York, New York: Harper and Row.

Dovidio, J. F., S. L. Gaertner, A. Validzic, K. Matoka, B. Johnson, and S. Frazier (1997), Extending the benefits of recategorization: Evaluations, self-disclosure, and helping," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33 (4), 401-20.

Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behaviour: A meta-analytic view of the social psychological literature. Psychological Bulletin, 100, 283-308.

Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., Guthrie, I. K., Murphy, B. C., & Shepard, S. A. (2005). Age changes in prosocial responding and moral reasoning in adolescence and early adulthood. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 15, 235-260.

Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R.A.(1998). Prosocial Development. In W. Damon, (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development (Vol. 3, pp. 701–778). New York: Wiley.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial development. In N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Series Eds.), Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development (Vol. 3, pp. 646–718). New York: Wiley.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial development. In N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Series Eds.), Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development (Vol. 3, pp. 646–718). New York: Wiley.

Eisenberg, N., & Mussen, P. (1989). The roots of prosocial behaviour in children. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fabes, R. A., Carlo, G., Kupanoff, K., & Laible, D. (1999). Early adolescence and prosocial/moral behaviour I: The role of individual processes. Journal of Early Adolescence, 19, 5-16.

Field,D. and Johnson, I. (1993). Satisfaction and change: a survey of volunteers in a hospice organisation. Social Science & Medicine, 36(12), 1625–33.

Fisher, R.J. and Ackerman, D. (1998). The effects of recognition and group need on volunteerism: a social norm perspective. Journal of Consumer Research, 25(3), 262–75.

Flippen, A.R., H.A Hornstein, W.E. Siegal, and E.A. Weitman (1996), „A comparison of similarity and interdependence as triggers for ingroup formation," Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 76, 338-402.

Graziano, W. G., Habashi, M. M., Sheese, B. E., & Tobin, R. M. (2007). Agreeableness, empathy, and helping: A person X situation perspective. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93(4), 583–59.

Hall, L. (1999). A comprehensive survey of social behaviours in O.J. Simpson case, from A to Z. Wales, United Kindom: The Edwin Meller Press.

Harrell, W.A. (1978). Physical Attractiveness, Self-Disclosure, and Helping Behaviour. The Journal of Social Psychology, 104 (1), 15-17.

Hartshorne, H. & May, M. A. (1929). Studies in the nature of character: Studies in service and self-control (Vol. 2). New York: Macmillan.

Hogg, M.A. and Abrams, D. (1988). Social identifications: a social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes. London: Routledge.

Hogg, M.A. and Terry, D.J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. Academy of Management Review, 25(1), 121–40.

Holmgren, R. A., Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1998). The relations of children's situational empathy-related emotions to dispositional prosocial behaviour. International Journal of Behavioural Development, 22, 169-193.

Isen, A. M., & Levin, P. F. (1972). Effect of feeling good on helping: Cookies and kindness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 21, 384-388.

Jackson, M., & Tisak, M. S. (2001). Is prosocial behaviour a good thing? Developmental changes in children's evaluations of helping, sharing, cooperating, and comforting. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 19, 349-367.

Kavussanu, M., Seal, A. R., & Phillips, D. R. (2006). Observed prosocial and antisocial behaviours in male soccer teams: Age differences across adolescence and the role of motivational variables. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 18, 326-344.

Knafo, A., & Plomin, R. (2006). Parental discipline and affection and children's prosocial behaviour: Genetic and environmental links. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90, 147–164.

Kogut, T. and I. Ritov (2005a), "The Identified victim effect: An identified group, or just a single individual?," Journal of Behavioural Decision Making, 18 (3), 157-67.

Kogut, T. and I. Ritov (2005b), "The singularity effect of identified victims in separate and joint evaluations," Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 97 (2), 106-16.

Kohn, A. (1990). The Brighter Side of Human Nature: altruism and empathy in everyday life. N.Y.: BasicBooks.

Kramer, R.M. (1993). Cooperation and organizational identification. In J.K.Murnighan (ed), Social psychology in organizations: advances in theory and research (pp. 244–268).

Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Latane, B., & Darley, J. 1970. The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help? New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Leider, Stephen, Markus Mobius, Tanya Rosenblat and Quoc-Anh Do. 2009. \Directed Altruism and Enforced Reciprocity in Social Networks." Forthcoming in Quarterly Journal of Economics (previously part of NBER Working Paper W13135, earlier version circulated under the title Social Capital in Social Networks).

Levine, M., C. Cassidy, G. Brazier, and S Reicher (2002), "Self-categorization and bystander non-intervention: Two experimental studies," Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32 (7), 1452-63.

Levine, R. V., Norenzayan, A., & Philbrick, K. (2001). Cross-cultural differences in helping strangers. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32, 543–560

Lim, K.H.,Ward, L.M., and Benbasat, I. (1997). An empirical study of computer system learning: comparison of co-discovery and self-discovery methods. Information Systems Research, 8(3), 254–72.

MacIntyre,A. (1967). Egoism and altruism. In P. Edwards (ed), The encyclopedia of philosophy (Vol. 2, pp. 462–6).New York:Macmillan.

Mael, F.A. and Ashforth, B.E. (1995). Loyal from day one: biodata, organizational identification, and turnover among newcomers. Personnel Psychology, 48(2), 309–33.

Manheimer, D.I., G.D. Mellinger, and H.M. Crossley (1966), "A follow-up study of seat belt usage," Traffic Safety Research Review, 10, 2-13.

Markey, P. M. (2000). Bystander intervention in computer-mediated communication. Computers in Human Behaviour, 16, 183-188.

Meier, Stephen. 2004. "An Economic Analysis of Pro-Social Behaviour." Dissertation.

McGuire, K. D., & Weisz, J. R. (1982). Social cognition and behaviour correlates of preadolescent chumship. Child Development, 53, 1478-1484.

Midlarsky, E. (1968). Aiding responses: An analysis and review. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 14, 229-269.

Nelson, T.D. (1999).Motivational bases of prosocial and altruistic behaviour: a critical reappraisal. Journal of Research, 4(1), 23–31.

North, A.C., Tarrant, M., & Hargreaves, D.J. (2004). The effects of music on helping behaviour: a field study. Environment and Behaviour, 36 (2), 266-275.

Omoto, A.M. and Snyder,M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68(4), 671–86.

Park, J.H. & Schaller, M. (2005). Does attitude similarity serve as a heuristic cue for kinship? Evidence of an implicit cognitive association. Evolution and Human Behaviour, , 26 (2), 158-170.

Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behaviour: multilevel perspectives. Annual Reviews of Psychology, 56, 365–392.

Pessemier, Edgar A., Albert C. Bemmaor, and Dominique Hanssens, M. (1977), "Willingness to supply human body parts: Some empirical results," The Journal of Consumer Research, 4(3), 131-40.

Piliavin, J.A. and Charng, H.-W. (1990). Altruism: a review of recent theory and research. Annual Review of Sociology, 16, 27–65.

Piliavin, I.M., Rodin, J.A. & Piliavin, J. (1969) Good Samaritanism: An underground phenomenon? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13, 289 -299.

Plomin, R., DeFries, J. C., McClearn, G. E. & McGuffin, P. 2001 Behavioural genetics, 4th edn. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.

Rushton, J. P. (2004), Genetic and environmental contributions to prosocial attitudes: a twin study of social responsibility. Proc. R. Soc. B 271, 2583–2585.

Rushton, J. P., Fulker, D. W., Neale, M. C., Nias, D. K. B. & Eysenck, H. J. (1986) Altruism and aggression: the heritability of individual differences. J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 50, 1192–1198.

Schiff, M. (1977), "Hazard Adjustment, Locus of Control, and Sensation Seeking - Some Null Findings," Environment and Behaviour, 9 (2), 233-54.

Schmidt, Greg and Bernard Weiner (1988), "An Attribution-Affect-Action Theory of Behaviour. Replications of Judgments of Help-Giving," Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 14 (3), 610-21.

Schroeder, D.A., Dovidio, J.F., Sibicky, M.E., Matthews, L.L. & Allen, J.L. (1988). Empathic concern and helping behaviour: Egoism or altruism? Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 24, 333-353.

Small, Deborah A. and George Loewenstein (2003), "Helping a victim or helping the victim: Altruism and identifiability," Journal of Risk and Uncertainty, 26 (1), 5-16.

Smith, K.D., Keating, J.P., and Stotland, E. (1989). Altruism reconsidered: The effect of denying feedback on a victim?s status to empathic witnesses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57(4), 641-650.

Soloman, L.Z, Solomon, H., & Stone, R. (1978). Helping as a function of number of bystanders and ambiguity of emergency. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 4, 318-321. .

Staub, E. (1971). The use of role playing and induction in children?s learning of helping and sharing behaviour. Child Development, 42, 805-816.

Staub, E. (1979). Positive social behaviour and morality:Vol. 2. Socialization and development. New York: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H. and Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In

S.Worchel and W.G. Austin (eds), Psychology of intergroup relations (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson–Hall.

Toi, M., & Batson, C. D. (1982). More evidence that empathy is a source of altruistic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 281-292.

Turner, J.C.,Hogg, M.A., Oakes, P.J., Reicher, S.D., and Wetherell, M.S. (1987). Rediscovering the social group: a self-categorization theory. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Tyler, T.R. (1999).Why people cooperate with organizations: an identity-based perspective. Research in Organizational Behaviour, 21, 201–46.

Weiner, B. (1980), "A Cognitive (Attribution) - Emotion - Action Model of Motivated Behaviour- an Analysis of Judgments of Help-Giving," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39 (2), 186-200.

Wentzel, K. R., Barry, C. M., & Caldwell, K. (2004). Friendships in middle school: Influences on motivation and school adjustment. Journal of Educational Psychology, 96, 195-203.

Wentzel, K. R., & Caldwell, K. (1997). Friendships, peer acceptance, and group membership: Relations to academic achievement in middle school. Child Development, 68, 1198-1209.

Withey, S.B. (1962). Reaction to uncertain threat. In Y. Baker and D.W. Chapman (Eds.) Man and Society in Disaster. New York: Basic

Wyatt, J. M., & Carlo, G. (2002). What will my parents think? Relations among adolescents' expected parental reactions, prosocial moral reasoning and prosocial and antisocial behaviours. Journal of Adolescent Research, 17, 646-666.

http://www.education.com/reference/article/prosocial-behaviour/