Chapter - One

INTRODUCTION

PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOUR: ALTRUISM

A frequent theme in the 1988 presidential campaign of George Bush was the extent to which Americans give of themselves in order to help others in need. Bush needed the phrase a thousand points of light to describe this phenomenon. Yet the fact is that people help others is more than campaign rhetoric. Nearly half the adult population of the United States, or about ninety million people of various ages, ethnic backgrounds and economic levels voluntarily participate in charitable activities each year, examples include, visiting home bound citizens, delivering food and clothing to the homeless, serving as “buddies” for terminally ill AIDS victims, assisting runaway youth in urban shelters, and entertaining hospitalized children. A New York city accountant even volunteered to clean and bandage the infected rat bite of a homeless person each day. This statistic for Indian situation must be even higher.

We live in a society whose values require people to help and cooperate with others. Without such cooperation it would not exist. Parents help children through the process of socialization and on broader level, society has a series of formal laws and less formal norms that define acceptable and unacceptable behaviour among the members. Concepts such as altruism, charity, friendship, cooperation, helping, rescuing, bystander intervention and sacrificing involve prosocial behaviour (Wispe, 1972). He suggested this term "to describe behaviour which was the antithesis of aggressive behaviour, namely, sympathy, altruism, charity etc." If prosocial behaviour is the antithesis of negative forms of behaviour such as aggression, harm, destruction or selfishness then prosocial behaviour should include the forms that signify altruism and restitution.

Despite many examples of helpfulness and courage, there are also examples of helping behaviour withheld even though a victim is desperately in need. This response was once labeled as "bystander apathy" but research has made it clear that those who failed to help are
not really apathetic. Probably the best known of failure to help occurred on March 13, 1964, at 3.20 A.M. Catherine (kitty) Genovese was returning from her job as a manager of a bar. As she walked across the street from her car to the apartment house where she lived, a man with a knife came up to her, she ran, he chased, caught, and stabbed her. Genovse screamed for help, and lights came on the windows of many apartments that overlooked the street, the attacker retreated temporarily but then came back to his bleeding victim. Genovse screamed for help, but this time her attacker did not retreat. Almost three quarter of an hour after the attack began; Genovse lay dead from multiple stab wounds. Although thirty eight persons reported hearing Genovse's screams, not one offered any assistance, and nor even bothered to call the police (Rosenthal, 1964). This event led the social scientists to explore the field of prosocial behaviour who for many years focused their investigation on aggressive behaviour. It has become a very important area and social psychologists have proposed theories to explain the determinants and antecedents of aggressive behaviour (Dollard et al., 1939; Buss, 1961; Berkowitz, 1962). Kerbs (1970) has identified three aspects by which conventional wisdom defines prosocial act. A prosocial act is performed voluntarily by an actor, the actor intends for the act to benefit another person and the act is performed as an end in itself and not as a means of fulfilling an ulterior personal motive of an actor.

The definition of prosocial behaviour implies that the beneficial act must be carried out voluntarily, not as a result of external threat or reinforcement. Prosocial behaviour can be carried out only in situation in which the individual has the freedom to decide whether or not to help. It is, however, recognized that an individual may feel an internal pressure or obligation that can lead to prosocial behaviour.

Researchers have designed different ingenious situation in order to study prosocial behaviour. In altruistic studies, subjects were placed in situations in which another person was in need of help, and investigator observed the subjects' reactions as to whether or not they would help. For example, in one laboratory situation (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1963, 1964) subjects were playing the role of workers constructing paper boxes under indirect guidance of a peer who was ostensibly playing the role of a supervisors. Each subjects was told the supervi-
sor's likelihood of winning a prize was contingent upon their work output. In another study (Alderman, 1972) subjects were asked to volunteer to participate in an experiment investigating the effects of noxious stimulation. This volunteering did not involve any rewards such as additional credits or rewards and is performed under two circumstances: (a) the behaviour is done for its own (b) the behaviour is done as an act of restitution. This definition limits to two types of behaviour called prosocial. The first is called altruism and the second restitution.

The concept of altruism is of a recent origin. However, attempts to explain the behaviour to which the term applies are ancient: Auguste Comte, the French philosopher and sociologist, first introduced this term (Encyclopaedia of Britannica, 1967, vol. 8). Probably he came to adapt the term from the Italian "altruismo". For him altruism was an unselfish regard for the welfare of others. The egoism was also used with altruism as opposite. Egoism is the selfish, ego-centered, unsocial behaviour. The term of altruism comes from the Latin word, "alter" meaning "other", and generally connotes an orientation towards others rather than toward self. Altruism refers to acts that bring benefits to other people, and are aimed at producing, maintaining or improving the physically and psychologically welfare and integrity of other (Staub, 1970 and Wispe, 1978). At times, the responses to someone in need go beyond simple helpfulness. Altruism refers to truly selfless acts that can include heroism in that they involve risk for the helpers. An example of such response occurred on January 13, 1982 when Air Florida flight 90 crashed into the icy water of the Potomac river in Washington, D.C. The ultimate act of heroic sacrifice was carried out by a man whose identity was never determined. When a life ring was thrown to him from a helicopter, he passed it on to other victims who were more badly hurt than he. By the time the rescue helicopter returned to pull him to safety, he had died beneath the frigid water. And similarly, on a spring day in 1986, one-year old Jennifer Kroll of west Chicago, Illinois fell into her family's swimming pool. Jennifer's mother, after pulling her out of the pool and discovering that she was not breathing, ran outside and began screaming for help. Her screams were heard by James Patridge who had been confined to a wheelchair since losing his legs in a land-mine explosion during the Vietnam war. Patridge responded by rolling his wheelchair toward the pool, until he encoun-
tered heavy bush, forcing him to crawl the final 20 yards. Patridge revived Jennifer by using cardiopulmonary resuscitation (God’s Hand, 1986). Patridge’s heroic act led offers of financial rewards, which he declined to accept, saying that Jennifer’s life was reward enough.

The study of altruism is particularly important for understanding socialization process (Rushton, 1976). The emergence of the present technologically secular mode of civilization reduces the chances of flourishing of altruism. Therefore, the study of conditions of altruism becomes important for conducting the affairs of life. Actually altruism is indispensable for the survival of society and human life.

The term altruism describes behaviour that is directed in a positive way and is given the name of positive social behaviour by Wispe (1978), who distinguishes its three principal forms altruism, sympathy and helping.

Some of the psychologists told that altruism is unambiguous situation. Experimental evidence suggests that altruistic behaviour is much more likely to occur in unambiguous situation.

Clark and Word (1972, 1974) set up an "emergency" in a room adjoining the subjects' work room, a maintenance worker (a confederate) climbed a mental ladder, fell off of it, and pulled the ladder over on the top of him. He grunted heavily and cried, "oh, my back; I can’t move!". He continued groaning with each breath, than he gave a cry for help. In all conditions whether they were alone, with other naive subjects, or with confederates of the researcher. 100 percent of the subjects went to the aid of the victim.

In a second experiment Clark and Word (1972, 1974) staged the same fall in ambiguous manner without any verbal cues of injury. Under these circumstances only 30 percent of the subjects helped. Further, subjects in two and five person groups were less likely to help and intervened more slowly than would have been expected on the basis of the responses by subjects who were alone.

Piliavin et al. (1969) involved the subjects in a faked emergency on a New York
A young man with a cane staggered forward and collapsed. They found that help was forthcoming in sixty-two out of sixty-five trials (95 percent).

Pilivain et al. (1969, 1975) suggest that whether or not a person intervenes in an emergency depends on his or her assessment of costs relative to rewards: (1) cost associated with helping (effort, embarrassment, possible distasteful experiences, and potential censure from others) (2) cost associated with not helping (self-blame and potential censure from others) (3) rewards associated with helping are higher (since disgust is greater) and cost associated with not helping are lower (there is less self-blame, since the individual seen as partially responsible for his difficulty). In still another test of the model, Piliavin and Piliavin (1972) employed a victim with a cane who collapsed in a moving subway car and either "bled" from the mouth or did not. As they predicted help was significantly slower and less frequent with the bloody victim (greater cost was presumably associated with the blood because of the tear or revulsion that many people experience at the sight of it). The same was true in similar test using a man who had a large birth mark on his face (Piliavin et al., 1975).

THEORIES OF ALTRUISM

Why do people help each other, share, or donate? This theoretical question has drawn much attention of social scientists who have been keenly interested in the search for origin of altruistic behaviour. All the offered answers can be classified into four different approaches: the exchange approach, the normative approach, the developmental approach, and the cultural approach.

Exchange Approach

Homans (1958), a proponent of the exchange approach has proposed the fundamental premises of the social exchange analysis of human interaction. He asserts "Social behaviour is an exchange of goods, material goods but also non-material ones, such as the symbols of approval or prestige. Persons that give much to others try to get much from them,
and persons that get much from others are under pressure to give much to them. This process of influence tends to work out an equilibrium to a balance in the exchanges. For a person engaged in exchange, what he gives may be a cost to him, just as what he gets may be a reward, and his behaviour changes less as profit, that is, reward less cost, tends to a maximum. Not only does he seek a maximum for himself, but he tries to see to it that no one in his group makes more profit than he does. The cost and the value of what he gives and of what he gets vary with the quantity of what he gives and gets" (P. 606).

According to exchange theorists (Thibaut & Kelly, 1959, Homans, 1961, and Blau, 1964) an individual’s behaviour is guided by the principle of maximizing rewards and minimizing costs in order to obtain the most profitable outcomes in any human interaction. Individuals choose one activity or situation instead of another if the one is more profitable and less costly to them than the other one. Thus, social interactions will be repeated only if the participants in that interaction are reinforced as a function of having participated in the relationship, that is, the goal of each individual in any social interaction is the maximization of his profits. The profits include material benefits such as money or goods, and social rewards such as approval, recognition, or power.

According to the exchange approach, altruism is a behaviour instrumental in receiving future rewards. Social exchange involves the principle that one who does a favour for another expects future return (Gouldner, 1960; Blau 1964). Gouldner (1960) even suggested that "there is a norm of reciprocity which obliges the one who has first received a benefit to repay it at some time; it thus provides some realistic grounds for confidence, in the one who first parts with his valuables, that he will be repaid" (P.177)

Although for many people in many situations externally derived incentives are more important determinants of behaviour than are internalized ideals, profits such as social approval, gratitude, or personal obligation are also important "goods" of social interaction. Thus, according to the social exchange approach, altruistic acts may be carried out with expectations of social rewards. Blau (1964) suggested that these expectations are important causes for altruistic behaviour.
Going a step ahead, Homans (1961) suggested that satisfaction of one’s values can be an important reward. He argued that "as long as man’s values are altruistic, they can take a profit in altruism too" (P. 79). Thus, Homans agreed that doing good to another person may be a payoff by itself". Blau (1964) suggested that "on rare occasions an individual will help another in need even without expecting any form of gratitude from them" (P. 91). Blau (1964) considers such an act an exchange of help for the internal approval of the superego.

In general, exchange theorists consider altruism an exceptional, rare behaviour. The exchange approach maintains that individuals in most situations help other because they expect material or social rewards. According to the definition of the altruistic behaviour, such help is not considered altruistic. The view that people are by nature utilitarian precludes in general the possibility that individuals would carry out altruistic acts. However, the exchange approach does recognize that on rare occasions individuals can help others without expecting external rewards. In these situations, the exchange theorists argue that individuals reward themselves for the carried-out help.

**Normative Approach**

The normative approach attempts to explain altruistic behaviour as being dictated by social norms. The term ‘norm’ is typically used to refer to a set of expectations members of a group hold concerning how one ought to behave (Thibaut & Kelly, 1959: Homans, 1961). Many norms are stable because many of the sets of expected behaviours are passed from generation to generation as a part of a culture. Thibaut & Kelly (1956) suggest that norms replace interpersonal influence in the control of individuals behaviour. Individuals usually regard norms as rules of behaviour and conform to the norms’ prescriptions. One of the important reasons why individuals usually confirm to these recognized standards of behaviours is the concern about reactions of other individuals. A group uses sanctions in order to enforce conformity to its normative standard of behaviour. An individual whose behaviour departs from the prescribed norms is subject to a negative consequence, which may include disapproval by others. Individuals who follow the norms are socially rewarded by the group. An-
other reason why people behave according to the prescribed norms is that norms can help define realities and reduce uncertainty (Jones & Gerard, 1967). Faced with an ambiguous situation, people tend to rely on norms that prescribe how to react rather than evaluating the particular situation. Finally, on the basis of Heider’s (1958) assumption that people have a need for predictability, the conformity to norms can be seen as deriving from the willingness to live in a world in which the behaviour is regulated by rules. In such a world a person knows what to expect and what is expected from him in order to behave in an acceptable way.

Individuals follow the prescription of the norms not only because of external pressure. On the contrary most of the norms are internalized during the early phases of socializations. The child is taught to behave according to the prescription of norms. Later, he internalizes many of the norms and follows them without any external pressure. On the basis of this assumption individual differences are attributed to differences in the degree to which the relevant norms have been internalized. Several theorists (Berkowitz, 1972; Staub, 1972) have suggested that altruistic behaviour is also guided by prescriptions of social norms. Specifically, it has been proposed that altruism is regulated by two social norms - the norm of giving and the norm of social responsibilities.

Leeds (1963) proposed the existence of the ‘norm of giving’, which states that one should want to give, not because he may anticipate returns but for its own value. A person who has internalized this norm "has a need disposition to give" There are three criteria for evaluating whether a person has reacted according to the norm of giving.

1. The helping act must be an end in itself without anticipation of any gains.
2. The helping act must be emitted voluntarily.
3. The helping act must do good.

A person who fulfils all the criteria and thus complying with the ‘norm of giving’ is considered as the pure type altruist. The norm of giving is usually carried out in situations where there is ‘role vaccum’ and/or ‘social vaccum’. Role vaccum exists when the norms accompanying a given role do not cover the entire range of possible actions that within norma-
tive limits are possible, but not obligatory. Thus, a nurse who takes care of a patient after working hours is an example of one who provides beyond the expectations of role. A social vacuum exists in a situation in which action is required that has not been provided through institutional means or is not capable of immediate mobilization. For example, a natural disaster provides opportunities for altruistic behaviour.

Berkowitz et al. (1963, 1966 and 1967) suggested the existence of a social responsibility norm, which prescribes that an individual should help those who depend on him and his assistance. An individual learns that somebody is dependent on his help feels an obligation to aid that person, even though he can anticipate no direct return benefits. However, there is common agreement that the altruistic behaviour of individual is not determined by the prescription of moral norms. The situation characteristics together with the characteristics of the person's interest interact strongly with the prescription of the norm (Staub, 1972).

Derley and Latane (1970) and Krebs (1970) have criticized the normative explanation of altruistic behaviour being it a tautology. As a result of this criticism Schwartz (1973) suggested that altruistic behaviour is guided to a large extent by personal norms which are defined as the individual's self-expectations which derive from socially shared norms. These norms are products of an interaction between learned expectations of societal norms and personal experience in the socialization process. Whether a person acts according to the norms depends on his awareness of the consequences the act may have for other people, on the extent to which his personal norms correspond to the consequences of the act, and on his feelings of personal responsibility to carry out the act. The personal norms are tied to the person's self-concept. Individual differences in altruistic behaviour are the result of differential awareness of consequences and feelings or responsibility experienced by different people. Individual differences in altruistic behaviour are also caused by individual calculations of costs involved in violation of the norm in relation to rewards resulting from conformity. Several studies (Schwartz, 1968, 1970 and 1973) have confirmed the hypothesis derived from the theory of personal norms that individuals who are aware of the consequences of their acts and who feel personal responsibility to carry out altruistic acts tend to be more altruistic. Simmons
(1991) reviews the history of altruism from studies on the motives for and social psychological consequences of altruism. One study comprised survey data from kidney recipients between 1970 and 1973. Another study involved bone-marrow donation to strangers by a national marrow-donor registry. The sociological mechanism producing altruism, particularly normative obligation are emphasized along with psychological mechanism (e.g., empathy). Some individuals focus more than others on victims' feelings and experience more empathic concern leading to more volunteering behavior. Empathic concern appears to increase a person's distress in the form of anxiety or sadness, happiness and self-enhancement may be consequences of altruism (e.g., increased happiness and self-esteem after the kidney donation).

In summary, the normative approach explains altruistic behavior by postulating that many people in our society have acquired norms of conduct to carry out altruistic acts not for tangible gains of social approval, but primarily for approval for themselves. This approach recognizes that, on the one hand, situations are important determinants of altruistic behavior and, on the other, individuals differ in the degree to which they internalize norms. Therefore, one individual may behave consistently in different situations, and several individuals may behave differently in the same situation.

**Developmental Approach**

The developmental approach views altruism as a learned behavior, which can be explained within the framework of cognitive development according to the principle of social learning (e.g., McCandless & Evans, 1973; Mussen et al. 1974; Hetherington & Parke, 1975). That is, while it is recognized that the cognitive ability to carry out altruistic acts depends on the development of moral judgement and on the capabilities to empathize with others' needs. One has to learn to be altruistic through the learning opportunities provided by parents, peers and other adults. In contrast to the normative approach, which analyses altruistic behavior on the social level, the developmental approach focuses on the behavior of the individual. Individuals learn to be altruistic and thus there is individual differences because individuals differ in their personal experience and in their learning opportunities. A number of psychologists
(Aronfreed, 1968; Rosenhan 1969) have argued that the acquisition of altruistic responses requires a history of reinforcement and development of self-reward mechanism. Fisher (1963) and Midlarsky et al. (1973) have shown that when helping is rewarded either materially or with social reinforcer the tendency of children to be altruistic in particular situation increases. An observation of helping behaviour is another process through which altruistic behaviour can be learned (Hornstein, 1970; Rosenhan, 1972). Similarly, Hartup and Coates (1967), Rosenhan & White (1967) and Bryan & Walbek (1970) have shown that observation of peer, of adult models who are behaving altruistically enhances children’s subsequent generosity. The parents, as primary agents of socialization, are important figures who influence the learning of altruistic behaviour (Rutherford & Mussen, 1968; Rosenhan, 1970). Johnson (1982) studied the reactions of twenty four 18 - 24 months olds to simulated and naturally occurring incidents of distress in others and the relationship between self-recognition and subjects prosocial or altruistic responses to others in distress. Results show that subjects displayed a variety of forms of direct prosocial intervention (e.g., helping, comforting) in both laboratory and naturalistic settings. In the laboratory, subjects were more likely to intervene when the mother was distressed. In the naturalistic settings, subjects intervened when distress was observed in other children and siblings as well as in parents. Recognition of the self in a mirror was positively related to prosocial intervention in the mother-distress situation in the laboratory. Findings provide evidence for infants tendency to help and comfort others in distress and tentative support to the hypothesis that self-other differentiation may underlie altruistic behaviour in very young children.

Cultural Approach

The cultural approach attempts to explain altruism on a societal level, looking for the cultural conditions that may enhance altruistic behaviour. Campbell (1965) proposed an explanation of altruistic behaviour based on biological and social evolution. He pointed out that an external threat to the existence of any society or group increases individuals' solidarity within the group which is exhibited through loyalty, co-operation and altruistic behaviour. In a recent paper Campbell (1972) modified his original position proposing that genetic com-
petition and selfishness in man preclude the possibility of evolving genetic altruism. Man can achieve altruistic behaviour only through socio-cultural evaluation which is carried out through cultural indoctrination. Cohen (1972) too agreed that man operates by guidance of self-interest motivation. Altruism is developed only in certain socio-cultural reality in which individuals find themselves. The development of altruism depends on the extent to which individuals acquire feelings of empathy. They can acquire such feelings in social and cultural settings that reward this type of feeling. Cohen’s analysis suggest that altruism can be learned, but its learning can originate only in cultures with certain social structures. Studies of Rheingold (1982) explored the possibilities that a set of behaviours that could be characterized as helping would be exhibited by young children. In a laboratory setting that simulated a home, parents and other adults were asked to perform some common household chores, and the children’s participation was recorded. In Experiment I, 20 twenty-four months old children were studied with their mothers and female adults. Sixty 18-24 and 30-months old children were studied with their mothers and female with male or female persons in Experiment II. In both studies, the children spontaneously and promptly assisted the adults in a majority of the tasks they performed. Furthermore, the children accompanied their assistance by relevant verbalizations and by evidence that they know the goals of the tasks, even adding appropriate behaviours not modeled by the adults. Their efforts were construed as prosocial not only because they contributed to the completion of the tasks, but also because the children showed an awareness of themselves as actors working with other to a common end. Bryan and Crokenberg (1980) investigated the maternal and situational correlates of prosocial behaviour between siblings and the relationship of prosocial to antisocial behaviour. Fifty mothers were videotaped with their first and later born daughters (mean ages 10 years 5 months and 7 years 11 months, respectively) in a seminaturalistic game playing setting. The relative absence of significant correlations among child prosocial behaviours supports the view that there are distinct dimensions of prosocial activity. Moderate but significant correlations were observed between children’s prosocial and antisocial behaviours toward sisters and a variety of parenting behaviours considered relevant to the development of prosocial behaviour, of particular theoretical importance was the relationship between a mother’s responsiveness to her child’s expressed
needs and infrequent - antisocial, frequent - prosocial interaction between her children. Mc
McDonald (1984) presents on ethological - social learning theory of the development of hu-
man altruism that emphasizes the idea that altruism is a biological system involving the inter-
action of cognitive, affective, and perceptual processes. These affective processes are viewed
as depending crucially on biologically based predispositions to respond to social stimuli, espe-
cially parents, during processes central to altruism. Cross - cultural and historical evidence
indicate associations between the degree of genetic relatedness in societies and cultural con-
trols on altruism have operated by manipulating the affective environment during develop-
ment.

DETERMINANTS OF ALTRUISTIC BEHAVIOUR

The researches have tried to throw light on those factors which determine the out-
come of altruistic behaviour. The present research deals with such three factors i.e., Sex, Ap-
proval Motive and Social Facilitation.

Sex and Altruism

Sex is one of the important factors which is considered in relation to altruism. Most
of the experiments (e.g., Latane & Darley, 1970; Pomazal & Clore, 1973; Clark, 1974; West et
al., 1975) found that females are helped in general more than males.

Although the biological state of being male or female in genetically determined
three is little dependable information about the influence of genetic factors on masculine and
feminine personality. The fact that males and females in all other higher primates differ sys-
tematically in mating behaviour, way of earning for the young, and interactions with other
adults strongly suggest there must be at least some genetic determinants of masculinity and
feminity in human personality also.

On the other hand, sex role training brings in very early childhood. Parents have
been observed to talk, handle and play differently with boy and girl babies, a practice which
continues throughout childhood. Parents interaction with child depends some what on the par-
ents - child sex relationship. A father and mother may relate differently to their little girl the influence of such adult child sex relationships usually becomes even more definite as child becomes older.

One of the most important sex role model for a child is the parents of the same sex although the opposite sex parents can also serve as a model. A boy whose father is absent from the home by reason of job, desertion, or other cause lacks an important model needed for accruing the masculine role. Unless such a boy has other male models available, he is likely to take his mother as a primary model and develops feminine traits. Later on during his childhood and adolescence he is subjected to pressure from peers to act masculine. Sometimes defensive withdrawal from male relationship or sometimes exaggerated masculinity results.

The effects of sex role training carry over into adulthood where there exist differences in sex role expectations and (to some degree) discriminatory treatment of women. Women has disproportionately fewer managerial, professional and political leadership positions than do men. As in other cases of social discrimination, women are given less than adequate opportunity to prepare for such positions; moreover, those who are qualified often are given in adequate opportunity to perform.

The traditional ideal in the United States for women is to be relatively submissive, while a man is expected to be more assertive, or dominating. Some studies have shown that females are more strongly committed to humanity ideals than males (e.g. going out one's way to help others; Haffman, 1975)

Diffusion of responsibility seems to occur frequently with females than with males, and also females may respond less frequently than males. Both of these effects may be the results of the way men and women are sitalized in our society. Women are brought up to receive help, and men are raised to give it. Most researches (Gruder & Cook, 1971; Eagly & Crowley; 1986) Show that there exists something like a "Pure stimulus" effect. This means that in our society, merely being female generate more aid from potential helpers, since we are socialized to believe that females are more helpless. On the otherhand, there is consistent
evidence that both sexes prefer to help a member of the opposite sex rather than some one of
the same sex: This tendency labeled as "ingratiation" effect becomes much stronger if the emer-
gency occur after the victim has offered a bystander a favour. The reasoning is that receiving
a favour from a stranger of the opposite sex is an unusual and pleasant event and therefore,
would produce a favourable reaction toward the stranger who did the favour on the other
hand, when a favour comes from a member of the same sex, the intention may be seen as
strange, leading to a negative unfavourable reaction All the studies suggest that females tend
to help less often than males. However, females are helped more often than males, and both
males and females given the appropriate conditions, seem to be more efficient and speedy at
helping persons of the opposite sex.

Pomazal & Clore (1973), West et al. (1975) have found that gender differences are
particularly large when the recipient is a woman and there on bookers (who presumably
make the gender roles more salient). Men may also be more likely to have the acquired skills
necessary to help (e.g., knowing how to fix a flat tire, or the size and strength to make them
less vulnerable in potentially dangerous helping situations. Thus, for example, researchers
found that when a female motorist appeared to need help (she was in the process of jacking
up the car to change a tire) about one car out of every four stopped to offer assistance. When
the victim was male, only three car out of fifty stopped, and the drivers who did were almost
all males.

In other studies of helping behaviour by Bryan and Test (1967), and Whitney and
Schndler (1975) in which a distraught motorist (actually a confederate) stands by a disabled
car at the side of a busy through fare. A clear sex differences was evident. An interpretation
of these results that females are less capable of repairing cars and the perceived competence
of the victim may be an important factor. Perhaps male helpers expected a personally reward-
ing relationship with the female victim. Female drivers are more likely to be helped if they are
dressed in shorts and a midrepp top rather than in baggy sweat shirt and lose skirt (Bryan &
Test, 1976).
Females more than males tend to refuse help in situations that may be embarrassing or ambiguous (Moss and Page, 1972). The subject was first scolded while attempting to help, and a few seconds later faced a new situation in which someone had dropped a small bag without noticing it. In this condition females helped less often than males, but in the other conditions that did not involve negative experience there was no difference between males and females on helping behaviour.

Scholper & Batson (1965) and Schopler (1967) tested the hypothesis that males and females differ in the amount of help they extend to dependent person. A person in need was dependent on the potential helpers. These studies showed that males tend to help more a person who was high dependent. These findings were explained in term of traditional sex roles. Males, who are usually highly conscious of their social status tend to ignore the request of the highly dependent person because the provided help threatens to disrupt their status advantage; under these conditions, providing help is a costly act for them. Females on the other hands find a request from a highly dependent person very rewarding because it is consistent with their traditional sex role, which prescribes nurturant, helpful behaviour toward a dependent person. Similarly, Gruder and Cook (1971) found that people are more inclined to do favours for females than for males. In this study subjects reported to the appointed room, he or she found a note on the door explaining that the experimenter would be unable to attend the session. The note requested that the subject, nevertheless, go in to the room and as a favour, work on a series of tasks. The note was always signed and in this way, Gruder and Cook (1971) manipulated the apparent sex of the experiments: half the subjects thought they were responding to a female’s request for assistance and the remainder throught the experimenter was male. The findings of Gruder and Cook’s (1971) study showed that subjects were considerably more likely to comply with the request for assistance if the experimenter was a female. Results of this sort which are consistent with the stereotype that women are more dependent on others than are man have been found on a host of similar research endeavour (Clark, 1974; Pomazal & Clore, 1973, Canley & Tyler, 1989).

However, in his study Hoy-Chee (1992) did not observe any gender difference in
Motivation

In 1972, survivors of an aeroplane crash in a frigid, isolated region of the Andes mountains of Chile turned to cannibalism, eating the flesh of dead passengers to stay alive. At the 1988 Olympic Games in Korea, left handed pitcher Jim Ablott led the United States to a gold medal in baseball, even fielding well, despite being born without a right hand. Why would civilized people eat human flesh? Why would not-handed person pursue a baseball career when even excellent two handed atheles often fail?

To explain extraordinary behaviour such as these, as well as every day behaviour, psychologist employ the concept of motivation, which refers to the psychological processes that arouse, direct, and maintain behaviour toward a goal. The Andes survivors were motivated by hunger, which aroused them to find food, directed them to eat human flesh, and maintained their cannibalism until they were rescued. Jim Abott was motivated by his need for achievement, which aroused him to excel as a pitcher, directed him to learn how to play baseball with one had, and maintained his participation despite periodic failures.

Motivation can be defined as "the willingness to exert high levels of efforts toward organisational goals in order to satisfy some individual need". A need is "some internal state that marks certain outcomes appear attractive".

In addition to physiological reactions behavioural adjustment are also made. When one feels cool or chilly, he puts on extra clothing or seeks a warmer place; when one feels two warm, he takes off clothing or seeks a cooler spot. These behavioural adjustment differ from the physiological ones in several respects. The behavioural adjustments are voluntary acts that one attributes to one "self" while the physiological adjustment are involuntary reactions that one attributes more to one body parts (For example, sweat glands). Our bodies make a physiological adjustment in response to a physical need (a biological imbalance), and we make a behavioural adjustment in response to a drive. Physiological adjustments directly affect our
internal environment where as behavioural adjustments affect our external environment (putting on a sweater protects us from the cool air), which in turn influence our internal environment. These two types of adjustments appear to be localized in different regions of the hypothalamus: the preoptic area regulates our physiological changes, where as the lateral area regulates our behaviour (Satinoff & Rutstein, 1970; Satinoff & Shah, 1971).

Mainly survival motives operate according to the principal of homeostasis which is body's tendency to maintain a constant internal environment in the face of changing external environment. The thermostat frame work is used to distinguish between the concept of need and drive. A need is any substantial psychological departure from the ideal value, its psychological counterpart is drive, an aroused state or urge that results from the need. Using hunger as an example, a need arises when the level of blood sugar drops substantially below an ideal value. This physiological imbalance may be corrected automatically by the pancreas signalling the lever to release sugar into the blood stream. But when these automatic mechanisms cannot maintain a balanced state, a drive is activated and aroused organism takes action to restore the balance (it seeks food with a high sugar content).

Motives also help in making prediction about behaviour. A person who seeks to hurt other, will express hostility in many different situations; a person who needs the company of others will seek it in many situations. Thus, while motives do not tell us exactly what will happen, they give us an idea about the range of things a person will do. A Person with a need to achieve will work hard in school, in business, in play, and in many other situations.

An important characteristics of motives is that they can never be observed directly. Their existence is inferred from what people say about the way they feel and from observing that people and animals work toward certain goals. For example, we might observe that a student works hard at almost every task that comes along; from this, we infer a motive to achieve to master challenges. The concept is also useful in explaining fluctuations in behaviour over time. If yesterday morning one ate three stacks of pancakes but this morning he ate only a piece of toast, his friends would not attribute his change in behaviour to change in his
personality. Instead, they would attribute it to a change in his degree of hunger - his motivation.

Types of Motivation Theory

Theories of motivation try to provide genetic sets of principle to guide the understanding of the urges, wants, needs, drives or desires, striving and goals that come under the heading of motivation.

Theories of motivation include drive reduction theories, incentive theories, the opponent process theory, arousal theory, instinct theory and optimal level theory.

Drive theory say that behaviour is pushed toward goal by internal state within the person or animal. Incentive theories stress the ability of goals to pull behaviour toward them. The opponent process theory is a hedonistic theory; as such, it says that we are motivated, seek goals which give us good emotional feelings and avoid goals resulting in displeasure. Furthermore, this theory says that many emotional motivating states are followed by opposing or opposite states. Optimal level theories are also hedonistic theories which say that behaviour is directed toward seeking an optional level of arousal or a balanced, homeostatic state in internal physiological processes.

Instinct is a complex behaviour that is rigidly patterned throughout a species and is unlearned. Drive-reduction theory is the idea that a physiological need creates an aroused tension state (a drive) that motivates an organism to satisfy the need.

TYPES OF MOTIVE

Motives are so various and numerous that many different classifications have been proposed to group similar motives together or to identify basic motives underlying the others. Human motivational states can be roughly classified as follows.

1. Biological motives or drives, such as hunger, thirst, sex, respiration (like breathing),
excretion and maintainance of normal temperature.

2. Safety motives, such as avoidance of things, events, people, and places that produce fear, anxiety, or discomfort.

3. Personal motives, like self esteem, and self respect, achievement, creativity and one's own set of values.

4. Inter personal motives, including gregariousness or affiliations, need for power and postage, and independence as well as defence.

Different classification of motives have been effected from different viewpoints, e.g., psychological, and physiological, innate and acquired, personal and social. They have been given different names also, e.g., needs, motives, propensities etc. The theory of instincts is included in this. Two types of classification of the motives are the more popular innate and acquired the innate motives include instincts, physiological and psychological needs and personal properties while the acquired motives account for the social and the learned personal needs.

Woodworths has divided into the following three categories:

1) **Organic Needs**: Those motives which are aroused by the bodily conditions, e.g.; hunger, thirst, etc.

2) **Emergency Motives**: Those motives which are aroused when the environmental conditions demand a strong and quick reaction, e.g.; the motives of escape

3) **Objective Motives**: The object of these motives is behaviour towards people and the objects in the environment. This class of motives is comprehensive

Other psychologists have classified motives under primary and complex needs, while some classify them as innate and acquired. The later classification will be the one of the basis of which the following description will be made, because it is the simplest classification.
Innate Motives: Innate motives are not learned, they are inborn, they are the primary, vital, physiological and biological needs which the person brings with him upon his entry into this world. Their fulfilment is indispensable and of primary importance. They are also necessary for the protection of life. Some motives are the result of social situations. It is apparent that many of the motives and needs of the individuals are learned in society they may be called secondary or non-vital motives.

(i) Praise and Blame: The tendencies to win praise and avoid blame motives human behaviour in nearly all societies. Every person wants to be praised by his people even though he may not like to be praised by them directly. A person learn praise worthy behaviour and avoids a detestable one. A child fights shy of punishable behaviour but gladly adopt behaviour which may earn him the love of his mother. Later this tendency takes the form of praise and blame because praise is fruitful and blame is harmful.

(ii) Mastery Motive: Alfred Adler has accepted the mastery motive to be the most important motive in human life. The mastery motive being acquired, is not inevitably found in every society.

(iii) Aggression: This is an expression of the mastery motive. There is a great diversity in this tendency, which is the result of the different existing ideals and rules in a society. In India for example, the Nagas are known as Headhunters while many other Himalayan tribes are very peaceful. The Arapesh tribe of New Guinea discourage the aggressive tendencies, while on the other side, the Mundugumore encourage it from childhood. Therefore, the aggressive tendency, like the mastery motive cannot be accepted to be innate and universal. It is an acquired motive whose existence depends upon social condition.

(iv) Self Submission: As opposed to the tendency of self assertion some psychologists have accepted the tendency of self-submission as natural. Undoubtedly, the child has many occasions for self-submission, being helpless before his elders. These childhood impressions are important and lasting but it is correct to call the submissive tendency a learned motive because it is very usually learnt in the family and society.
(v) **Gregariousness**: This tendency makes a person live in a group with the rest of the tribe. It is expressed in the form of herd mean group of tame animals behaviour. But this tendency is neither innate nor universal.

**vi) Imitation**: Though imitation is seen very much in the human beings, it is not compelling even if the existence of any such instinct is given credence. Its field is very limited. It is common knowledge that a child learns much of his behaviour by imitating others, something without a knowledge of what he is doing.

**vii) Sympathy**: This is an experience of another person’s emotional response. Seeing another person in serious trouble, a sympathetic person experiences a similar, though less intense, feeling. Actually, sympathy cannot be said to be innate. A major part of it is conditioned response while remainder, too, is in some way a learned motive.

**Personal Social Motives**: In the Social environment every individual develops many social motives. The motives that are acquired in the social environment are known as social motives. Social motives of a general sort assume more or less the same form in all individuals, the personal social motives have different forms in different individuals. For example, the attitudes and interests, life goals, level of aspiration, forces of habit and conscious motives etc. of individuals differ according to their own propensities and inherited qualities. Hence, in the study of the individuals social behaviour the personal social motives are also important besides the biogenetic and the general social motives. Here these personal social motives will be elucidated.

**(1) Life Goals**: Life goal is the object at the attainment of which the entire life of the individual is directed. this is to be large extent based upon the philosophy of life. The motivating factors are those life goals which are formed on the basis of the philosophy of life. The goal of life changes if the philosophy of life undergoes any alteration. For them the study of literature, philosophy, art, science or some other high object is the real and the most valuable goal of life.
Level of Aspiration: Just as no person in the world is devoid of a goal and philosophy of life, similarly every person maintains many aspirations. These aspirations are not all alike. While one wants to live in peace, another desires to the possessor of vast wealth. One person may not desire to have more than that can satisfy his needs for four squares meals a day and others enough to keep him within the bonds of decency while another person many not find it possible to rest satisfied unless he has a beautiful car, house and others. Levels of aspiration do not differ only on the basis of physical attributes, rather different levels of aspiration may also be seen in other field what ever the level of aspiration, or whatever the aspiration animating the heart of man, aspiration does not lose its importance in the life of man. The thoughts and conduct of the individual are formed according to these aspirations. He is perpetually involved in the effort of satisfying them.

Interests: Interests are based to certain extent upon innate behaviour or nature and tendencies, but they are also formed to some extent by circumstances. Some interests continue throughout one's life while others change as we grow in mental stature or as our status in life changes. But what ever be their condition, their importance in life and conduct does not diminish.

Attitudes: Attitudes are both favourable and unfavourable. In either condition, they exert a very important influence upon the individual's conduct. If we form an unfavourable attitude towards some object, we try to avoid it and run away from it, while on the other hand, we, or any other individual would like to possess or to be in company with the object towards which a favourable attitudes has been formed.

Force of Habits: Another important factor in human life is the force of habit. Concerning this importance James Adler has written "Habit is the enormous fly wheel of society," its most precious conservative agent.

Drug Addiction: The motivation given by drug addiction can be understood in the context of habit as a motive. People who acquire the habit of som or the other drug cannot get rid of that habit. The strength of the motive of drug addiction can be most pignantly and most
effectively seen in the lives of the unfortunate people who are drug addicts.

(7) **Unconscious Motives**: The founder of the psychoanalytic school of psychology, Dr. Sigmund Freud has laid much stress upon the unconscious motives that govern human life and behaviour. The unconscious is a very big part of human mind, and its activities though unknown to us, control and guide many of the activities of the conscious mind. It is an important hand even in day dreams. It also plays an important role in our imaginings. The unconscious can be exploited considerable in fashioning human behaviour. It usually happens that the conscious and unconscious tendencies are in conflict.

**Physiological motives or Biological Motives**: The biological motives are to a large extent, rooted in the physiological state of the body there are many such motives, including hunger, thirst, sex, temperature regulation, sleep, pain avoidance and a need for oxygen.

**Hunger**: is the biological motivational state produced by food deprivation. Hunger is a powerful motivator when food becomes scarce all our energies and thoughts are directed to obtaining it.

**Thirst**: Thirst is the biological motivational state aroused in an organism by lack of sufficient fluids. Thirst motivation and drinking are mainly triggered by two conditions of the body: loss of water from cell and reduction of blood volume.

**Sex**: The hypothalamus also plays major role in sex drive. The approval motive also reflects in other types of behaviour which is quite different from social desirability with such assumptions Tripathi and Tripathi (1980) developed a tool for measuring the strength of approval motive in broader perspective

Since sexual behaviour depends in part on physiological condition, it may be considered as biological motive. But of course sex is far more than a biological drive. Sexual motivation is social because it involves other people and provides, according to many, the basis for social ground in higher animals - baboon troops and the human family, for example; and sexual behaviour is powerfully regulated by social pressure and religious beliefs. Sex is psy-
Psychological motives are also affective in motivational types. These are guilt, love, affection, affiliation and aggression behaviour.

In summary, motivation does not automatically mean aroused, energy and high activity, and energy are part of motivated behaviour. This arousal is necessary in order, for the organism, to react to incoming stimuli, to process the information in these stimuli and thereby to engage in behaviour that will satisfy the needs.

Approval Motive

The term approval motive was first coined by Crowne and Marlowe (1964). The approval motive has been used as an explanatory construct. It has been assumed that one agrees or disagrees with socially desirable or undesirable statements because of a motivational disposition which has been designated as approval motive. This has been designed on the assumption that one having high degree of approval motive would agree to greater number and varieties of socially desirable statements. On the basis of such assumptions Tripathi and Tripathi (1980) developed a tool for measuring the strength of approval motive in broader perspective. The need for social approval according to Crowne and Marlowe (1964) meant something of a reliance on the evaluative judgement of other which has believed to stem for two factors (a) motive to seek approval (approach behaviour) and (b) a motive to shun disapproval (avoidance behaviour)

A close review of literature on approval motive indicate seven tentative areas along which behaviour indicative of approval motive occur. These areas are i.e. (i) Normative behaviour (ii) Social conformity (iii) Positive self presentation (iv) Defensiveness (v) Dependency (iv) Social responsiveness (vii) Social approval.

(i) **Normative Behaviour**: This area deals with behavioural tendencies which are largely concerned with compliance to norms shared by a cultural group. It is an important component
of social approval. Norms although they are rarely spelt in explicit manner, work as anchors of behaviours. These norms define the course of action prescribed hence distinguish approved behaviours from nonapproved ones. In a study of social approval Goffman (1971) reported that self-presentation are governed strongly by societal norms. Norms govern what people can do. Norms also suggest that people should accept the self-presentation of other people and not challenge the veracity of what another person says. In everyday social interactions norms have powerful consequences. They tend to guarantee that people will come to receive acceptance for their self-presentations, unless, of course these presentations are widely out of line. Norms are more than standards, they declare what is normative or appropriate. Most people not only prefer polite behaviour, but indeed come to expect it. Normative behaviours are useful in gaining approval. Norms ensure regularity in human behaviour, so that people need not worry about a wide range of things. Norms provide useful social service, norms serve as substitutes for indirect social influence (Jenks, 1960; Horton et al., 1963)

(ii) Social Conformity: Although from a surface point of view conformity appears to be a constituent of norms, it does differ from norms. It does differ from norms in at least one crucial respect i.e. it refers to imitative behaviours which emanate from concern of belongingness to one’s social group. It does not involve deviation from or compliance with some social standard. A conforming behaviour does not necessarily involve following of social norms. In a sense, conforming behaviour is a less stable form of normative behaviour. Social conformity refers to a person’s changing his or her behaviour to fit with the expectations or demands of others. In fact most of the time, groups or individuals make these expectations clear or the demands salient, ordinarily, one thinks of conformity as involving the persons being ‘made’ to do something he or she did not previously want to do (Asch, 1952; Marlowe & Crowne, 1961; Strickland & Crowne, 1962)

(iii) Positive Self Presentation: It refers to the content of self-disclosure to other people. There are two dimensions which serve different functions in self-presentation behaviour. Self-disclosure or intimacy behaviour usually functions as trust building mechanism. The positivity of self-presentation, on the other hand, is useful primarily for gaining approval and other
types of rewards from other people. There is no necessary suggestion that because a person tells intimate details of his or her life that person wants to build trust or that if the person provides positive self description, he or she is trying to win social approval. It is evident that how positively people describe themselves is affected by their desires for and ability to get approval (Schneider & Turkat, 1975). Positive self-descriptions contribute to development of relationship. Although self presentation helps in development of relationship, it can also be used to exploit relationship. Positive self presentations have been described as an important element in the building of personal relationship.

(iv) **Defensiveness**: One of the significant ingredients of human personality is ego and threat to ego is not a comfortable state. People try to manage threatening situations in effective manner. They, for instance, seek justifications as well as rationalizations for this purpose. The person who needs approval does not want to be ‘cornered’, He makes best of his efforts to present good account of himself in the eyes of others. (Mc Ginnies, 1949; Barthel & Crowne, 1962; Marlowe & Crowne, 1964).

(iv) **Dependency**: The inherent inability to function independently at the time of birth makes us dependent organisms. A consequence functioning within the framework of environmental demands and to cope with such demands one is bound to become dependent on individuals and social groups of various kinds. An individual with motive to seek approval perceives this reality, and probably has tendency to evaluate it in a positive manner (Schneider, 1969).

(vi) **Social Responsiveness**: The dimension of responsiveness has physical as well as social dimensions along which individuals differ. Studies of temporal quality in human reactions to stimuli has a long history and is an established reality. In the present context social responsiveness refers to individuals tendency to respond to social stimuli in high frequency and magnitude. In social situations he tends to react and sometimes over react to social stimuli (Crowne & Strickland, 1961; Marlowe, 1962).

(viii) **Social Approval**: It refers to active approval seeking from the agents of social reinforcement, because for approval motivated persons it is an important incentive. The behav-
journal tendencies implied in active approval seeking, require the individual to associate with or approach to or engage in such activities or social interactions that lead to attainment of approval from individuals, groups, or any other social organization which is perceived, directly or indirectly by the individual as socially desirable.

Hatter & Nelson (1987) examined whether elderly persons are more likely to participate in an activity designed to help or benefit others than in an activity with no such altruistic purpose. 130 persons (age 63-104 yrs). living in a home for the aged were invited to participate in a cooking decorating activity. Results indicate that significantly more subjects chose to participate when the product of the activity to be a gift for preschool children than when no altruism was involved. It is clear that social desirability (approval motive) plays its role in prosocial behaviour. Oda (1991) studied diverse work motives of volunteer. Work motive scores (WMS) were obtained and the responses were classified into "other - oriented motives" and "self-oriented motives". Most of subjects reported self-oriented motives in volunteer works. Results were discussed in terms of social desirability in responding and change in motives with actual experiences of works. Yinok-Linda (1987) and Eisenberg (1992) also emphasized on understanding of the motivation behind prosocial behaviour. Lobel and Bempechat (1993) examined the effects of 5th graders need for approval (NFA) and frequency of expectancy statements on subject achievement cognitions and behaviours. Subjects stated expectancies either prior to each trial, prior to the first and last trials, or prior to the trial trial only. Although high and low NFA subjects lowered their expectancies after failure, high NFA subjects lowered lesser than low NFA subjects. Persistence was influenced only by the frequency of expectancy statements and that by subject's NFA. In a study by Tyler & Verma (1988) 56 male and 56 female 8 to 10 years old children were selected as high and low social competent. Results showed that constructiveness of helping was a function of psycho-social competence. There seems to be ground to believe that high approval motive may lead to high psychosocial competence and thus it can also be reasoned that high approval motive may lead to high altruistic behaviour. Sharma & Rosha (1992) investigated the effect of self actualization on altruism. Forty eight female university student completed the personality orientation
inventory and a self-report altruism inventory. It was found that subjects scoring high self-actualization score were high on an altruism scale. Self actualization is a higher order need, striving the person to act specifically wherein he seeks internal pressure.

**Social Facilitation**

In 1897, the psychologist Norman Triplett was examining the speed records of bicycle racers and he noticed that many cyclist achieved higher speed when raced against each other than when they raced against the clock. He instructed children to turn a fishing reel as fast as possible for a fixed period of time. Sometimes two children worked at a same time in the same room, each with his or her own reel; other times they worked alone. Triplett (1897) reported that many children worked faster in *coaction*, that is, when another child doing the same tasks was present than when they worked alone.

Allport (1924) carried out a further series of experiments comparing individuals working alone with subjects working in groups of four or five around a table on such tasks as crossing out vowels in written material, doing simple multiplication problems, making word associations and generating arguments to refute epigrams drawn from classical literature. The subjects working in groups were not allowed to make comparative appraisals and competition between them was minimized. Subjects in the coacting groups worked more vigorously and completed greater quantity of each of the tasks than subjects who worked alone.

Rivalry has been also associated with social facilitation. Dashiell (1930) had subjects work on the same kinds of tasks used by Allport (1924) in one of three conditions: (1) in front of a passive audience, (2) together with coactors, knowing that their performances would not be compared, or (3) together with coactors. Rivalry produced faster but less accurate performance than the other two conditions. This social facilitation effect, as it come to be called, also occurs with animals. In the presence of others of their species, ants excavate more sand and chickens eat more grain.

Since this experiment many studies have demonstrated the facilitating effects of
coaction with both human and animal subjects. For example, college students complete more multiplication problems in coaction than where alone (Allport, 1920, 1924). Soon after Triplett’s experiment on coaction, psychologists discovered that the presence of a passive spectator as audience rather than a coactor also facilitates performance. For example, the presence of an audience had the same facilitating effects on students multiplication performance as did that of the coactor in the earlier study (Dashiell, 1930).

In an early demonstration of an audience effect on performance, Travis (1925) trained subjects in a task in which the objective was to hold a flexible pointer in contact with a target spot on a rotating disc. The training was carried out over several days, and the subjects were alone except for the experimenter. When the task had been well learned, each subject was asked to perform in front of a passive audience of four to eight persons. More than 80 percent of the subjects performed better in front of the audience than alone. This effect is referred to as social facilitation because the presence of an audience spurred the individual to better performance.

Many studies conform the social facilitation effect of an audience on the performance of well rehearsed, simple, motor behaviour. However, audience impair the learning of new and complex conceptual task. Passin (1933) found that subjects made more errors in learning nonsense syllables before an audience than when alone, and Husband (1931) found interference in learning a finger maze when an individual was observed by spectators.

Zajonc (1965) has suggested a parsimonious way of explaining these contradictory effects. Individuals who work in the presence of others are assumed to be more aroused than those who work alone. Aroused in turn increase the probability that a person will act in simple or well learned ways that is arousal increases the likelihood of dominant behaviour. When a task is familiar, as in the pursuit rotor study, the arousing audience facilitates performance. However, when the task has not been well learned, the most available responses of the individual are likely to be wrong for achieving success. Hence, the presence of an audience impairs performance. Zajonc (1965) has suggested that a student ought to study by him-
self in an isolated cubicle but after mastering the materials, he should prefer to be tested in the company of other students or before an audience. Jones and Gerard (1967) agreed that the presence of an audience may produce arousal but they also proposed that the audience may distract the individual and interfere with his ability to concentrate on complex tasks. They cited Passin’s (1923) finding of an equal degree of impairment in learning nonsense syllables by subjects who were bombs barred with distracting stimuli (a buzzer and a flashing light) and those who performed in front of an audience. Both groups performed less well than a group of subjects who learned while alone.

Initial studies designed to test Zajonc’s predictions generally yielded positive results (e.g., Matlin & Zajonc, 1986; Zajonc & Sales, 1966). Individuals were more likely to emit dominant responses in the presence of others than when alone, and performance on various tasks was either enhanced or impaired depending on whether these responses were correct or incorrect in each situation (Geen, 1989; Geen & Gange, 1977).

Negative reactions from an audience can shake the confidence of a speaker. In an experiment subject was provided feedback to subject that an audience considered their speeches to be either sincere or insincere. The subjects were asked to indicate how confident they were of the opinion expressed in their speeches. Subjects who believed their sincerly had been accepted were more confident about their opinions than those whose sincerly had been challenged.

The overall picture that can be drawn from the above research is two fold: (1) when the task depends on the degree of motivation of efforts he puts social facilitation: and (2) an individuals concern for evaluative audience may cause anxiety and distract him sufficiently to impair his performance on a complex motor or conceptual task.

A humber of experiments with both human and animal subjects tasted this theory of social facilitation. In one particularly clever study cockroaches were able to run down a straight runway into a darkned goal box to escape a bright floodlight. Researchers found that the cockroaches reached the goal box faster if they run in pairs than if they run
alone. But when the escape response was made more complicated by requiring the cockroaches to make a right-angle turn to find the goal box, pairs of cockroaches took longer to reach the box than did single cockroaches. In other words, the presence of coactors facilitated performance in the simple run way but impaired performance in the complex run way (Zajonc, et al, 1969). This experiment was repeated by having all the cockroaches run alone, but with an audience of four cockroaches that watched from small plexiglass boxes sat alongside the runways. Again, the presence of other cockroaches—even if they were just spectators—facilitated performances when the dominant responses (running down the straight run way) was correct and impaired performance when the dominant response was incorrect.

Studies with human subjects have also confirmed this theory of social facilitation. One such study was direct analogue of the cockroach study, showing that human subjects learn a simple maze faster, but a complex maze more slowly, when an audience is present than when it is not (Hunt & Hillery, 1973). People also memorize easy word lists faster, but difficult word lists more slowly, in the presence of an audience than when alone (Cottrell, et al. 1967).

Because social facilitation effect occur in lower organism, they would not seem to be due to complex cognitive processes. But one theory suggests that social facilitation in human is due not to the mere presence of others but to feelings of competition or to concerns about being evaluated, and it is these cognitive concern that raises the drive level. Even the early studies of coaction found that if all elements of rivalry and competition were removed, social facilitation effects were reduced or eliminated (Dashiel, 1930). Other studies show that audience effects vary, depending on how much the person feels that he or she is being evaluated. For example, social facilitation effects are enhanced if an expert watches but diminished if the audience consists only of "undergraduates who want to watch a psychology experiment" (Henchy, & Glass., 1968, Paulus & Mudock, 1971). In one study could not watch or evaluate the individuals performance, nosocial facilitation effects were found (Cottrell et al, 1968).

One problem with most of these studies, however is that subjects may still experience concern being evaluated, even when alone or in the mere presence of others, because they
know that their performances are being recorded and evaluated by the experimenter. Thus, these studies still leave open the question of whether or not social facilitation effects in human ever arises purely from the mere presence of others.

In study designed to eliminate subject's concern about being evaluated in both alone and mere presence conditions, each subject was shown to a waiting room, seated in front of a computer, and asked to provide some "back ground information before the experiment begins". The computer first prompted the subject to enter his or her name (such as "Joan Smith") and then to construct a code name by typing his or her name backwards and alternating each letter with ascending digits. An actually, that was the entire experiment, and it was over before the subject realized that the experiment had even begun. The computer automatically recorded both how long it took the subject to type his or her name (the easy task). One group while alone in the room (alone condition). Another group of subjects typed while the experimenter looked over their shoulders (evaluation condition). A third group typed in the presence of a blindfolded person who were head phones, faced away from the subject, and was said to be waiting to be in a sensory deprivation experiment (Mere presence Condition).

The result revealed that social facilitation effects can be produced by the mere presence of another individual. Compared with subjects in the alone condition subjects in both the evaluation and mere presence conditions performed the easy task more quickly but the difficult task more slowly the characteristics pattern of social facilitation (Schmitt et al. 1986).

Two additional theories have been proposed to account for social facilitation effects. Distraction conflict theory suggest that the presence of others distracts the person, causing a conflict over how to allocate attention between the others and the task to be performed. It is this attentional conflict rather than the mere presence of another person or a concern over being evaluated that raises the drive level and causes social facilitation effects (Sander 1983; Baron, 1986). Self presentation theory proposes that the presence of others enhances the individuals desire to present a favourable image on easy tasks. This leads to more efforts and concentration and thus to improved performance on difficult tasks, however, this desire magnifies
the frustrations imposed by the tasks and leads to embarrassment, withdrawal, or excessive anxiety, all of which lead to poorer performance (Bond, 1982). There are research results that support each of these theories and it seems likely that all of the proposed processes mere presence, concern over evaluation, distraction conflict, and desire to present if favourable image contribute to social facilitation effects (Sanders, 1984).

Dashiel (1930) carried out an extensive program of research on social facilitation and also found considerable improvement in performance due to audience effect on such task as simple multiplication or word association.

There seems to be great dearth of relationship between social facilitation and altruism (Guerin, 1993). Altruistic behaviour is carried out either in the presence or in the absence of other. Since the altruistic act is a socially desirable act, it can be reasoned that the presence of others will facilitate the altruistic act, at least in the condition where in the person views himself alone to be responsible to render the altruistic act and where there in no chance diffusion of responsibility in this concern. For example, if a person has to share the received reward with the coparticipant, it will only be his responsibility to share the secured reward with the coparticipant and specially when it is expected from him as a socially desirable act on a directed act. In other words when he is expected to share his reward with the coparticipant, the mere presence of some audience will certainly be facilitating condition as it is going to arouse the dominant response of the indvidual that is sharing the reward. Since, sharing the reward is not a complex situation where in the individual will not be embraced of the presence of others while sharing behaviour in going on rather will find himself in a situation through which his socially desirable act will be evidenced and thus will bring in the social facilitation effect.