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One of the most obvious occurrences during the early years is the development of play. Although infants and children often may play alone, as children grow older, play becomes more a social phenomenon (Cooper, 1977; Hartup, 1983). Playing can be simple and unstructured, as in a game of hide-and-seek, or it can be more complex and structured, as in a school/college basketball and football game.

Play has never been defined precisely. Word play is used to describe such diverse behaviors as adolescents assembling model ships and dogs frolicking in a yard (Vandenberg, 1978). Most people seem to know what is meant by play (Smith & Vollstedt, 1985), but researchers wish to define it. In an attempt to define play, they have tried to isolate different aspects of behaviour. It has been suggested that there are five descriptors of play and that the greater the number of descriptors that can be applied in any given situation, the more likely people are to call those circumstances play (Rubin, Fein & Vandenberg, 1983; Smith & Vollstedt, 1985).

These descriptors are
1. **Intrinsic motivation**: The behavior is motivated from within; that is, it is done for its own sake and not to satisfy social demands or bodily functions.

2. **Positive affect**: The behaviour appears to be pleasurable or fun to do.

3. **Non-laterality**: The behavior is not lateral; that is, it does not follow a serious pattern or sequence, having more a pretend quality about it.

4. **Means/ends**: The means are emphasized rather than the ends; that is, there is more interest in the behaviour itself than in any outcomes it may produce.

5. **Flexibility**: The behavior is not rigid. It shows flexibility in form and context and across situations.

In view of above descriptions we may say that a child who is manipulating toy animals in a flexible way with no apparent goal in mind, who is pretending, who is enjoying herself, and who is doing the activity for its own sake is playing. Such an activity fits all five criteria, and almost any observer would call it playing. A major league football or cricket or hockey player in a tournament, however, may
only one or two of these criteria. For this reason, fewer people would call this activity play, although some would.

Social scientists are busy to know why children play? and they generally believe that play has evolved because it has a function (Vandenberg, 1978). It may be that playing with objects, playing make-believe, and playing together at various games help children to become skilled at manipulating objects (Cheyne & Rubin, 1983) and to learn adult roles or, once they are grown, to cooperate while dealing with serious and complex tasks. Some ethologists have argued that there is an exploration-play-application sequence found in humans and more advanced animals (Vandenberg, 1978; Wilson, 1975).

When people are confronted with a completely novel object they tend to explore it before using it (Belsky & Most, 1981; Vandenberg, 1984). It's as though they want to be sure that it is safe before they use it in purposeful manner (Weisler & McCall, 1976). This same kind of exploration has also been observed in Chimpanzees (Loizos, 1967; Mason, 1965).

During play, the skills necessary for serious application are acquired. For example, it was discovered many years ago that chimpanzees needed to spend time playing with sticks before they
could use sticks for purposeful applications such as food gathering (Birch, 1945). Researchers have found similar play-before-application sequences while investigating children (Vandenberg, 1978). Perhaps, then, play has evolved as a means of helping children practice motor and cognitive skills they may later apply.

**Types of Play:**

Parten (1932) classified play activities into five categories, arranged from least to most socially complex:

**Nonsocial activity:** Children watch other children play or they engage in their own solitary play and largely ignore what other children are doing.

**Onlooker play:** Children linger around other children, watching them play, but making no attempts to join in the play.

**Parallel play:** Children play side by side but interact with each other very little and do not try to influence the behavior of other children.

**Associative play:** Children now share toys and swap materials, but each child is focused mostly on his or her own play and they do not cooperate with each other to achieve shared goals.
Cooperative play: Children now act out make-believe themes, assume reciprocal roles in their play together, and collaborate to achieve shared goals.

Howes and Matheson (1992) found that play became more and more cognitively complex with age, as described by the category sequence. They also found a clear relationship between the cognitive complexity of play and the child's social competence with peers: children whose play was more complex at any given age were rated as more outgoing and prosocially inclined, and as less aggressive and withdrawn. So it seems that the cognitive complexity of a play (particularly pretend play) is a reliable predictor of his or her future social competencies with peers (Doyle et al., 1992; Rubin, Fein, & Vandenberg, 1983; Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 1998).

Functions of Play: Although cognitively complex forms of social pretend play become more frequent with age in all cultures, the forms of play is influenced by cultural values and teaches young children different cultural values (Goencue, Mistry, & Mosier, 2000). For example, Farver, Kirn, & Lee-Shin (2000) compared the pretend play of American and Korean preschoolers. They found that American preschoolers act out themes of danger, whereas Korean preschoolers act out themes of family roles and everyday activities. American
children played up their individual exploits and bossed others around, whereas Korean children were more quietly attentive to their partner's activities and more inclined to cooperate. Thus, children from an individualistic culture (Americans) used play to teach them their identities as individuals, whereas children from a collectivist culture (Korea) used play to keep their own egos and emotions under control to promote group harmony.

Regardless of the cultural variations in forms of play it serve at least three critical functions, according to Howes and Matheson (1992).

(i) Play helps in learning ways of communicating effectively with their social equals.

(ii) Play provides opportunities to learn to compromise as they negotiate the roles they will take in their play and the rules that guide these episodes.

(iii) Play is a context that allows to display feelings that may bother them.

This provides them with opportunities to (1) better understand their own (or their partner's) emotional crises, (2) receive social support from (or provide it to) playmates, and (3) develop a sense of
trust and close emotional ties to these playmates. So play may be a major contributor to the growth of communication skills, emotional understanding, social perspective-taking, and an enhanced capacity for caring. Viewed in this way, it is hardly surprising that those who are good at play tend to be popular with their peers (Farver, Kim, & Lee-Shin, 2000; Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 1992).

**Sport Psychology:**

Technical advancement in the field of mass-media and electronic communication has changed the face of sport from a source of entertainment to an attractive professional career. The World Football Cup final match was watched by 139 billion people on television all over the world generating huge amount of profit for both organizer and players. Sport players have not only become rich but they have also acquired respect and are perceived as national hero by the people of their country. When Sachin Tendulkar scored his 50th Century in the test cricket he was congratulated by the President, Prime Minister and National leaders for his achievement. There is demand that Tendulkar be awarded Bharat Ratna, the highest honour of the country. World Chess champion Vishwanath Anand was invited by the President of India to attend the dinner hosted in honour of U.S President Barak Omaba alongwith top industrialists and leaders of the
political Party. Now sport event has become more competitive and demand more emphasis on the training of psychological aspect of sport players. The high level of performance seen in sport competition is nothing but a perfect optimum harmonious relationship between one's psychological preparedness and technical preparation. In the field of Physical Education and Sports, no athlete can win or even show better performance without perfect psychological set of mind.

A group of psychologists recognized and concentrated on the study of behaviour of sport players under the heading of Sport Psychology. Sport Psychology is the branch of sports and exercise science defined as the scientific study of human behaviour in sports. The Sport Psychology has grown and changed dramatically over the past few decades. It embraces such fundamental concerns and concepts as motivation, arousal levels, skill acquisition, feedback, reinforcement, anticipation of psychological preparation, attention, attitudes, emotional health, management of stress and risk-taking behaviour.

**Definition of Sport Psychology:**

Sports Psychology was defined by Brown and Mahoney (1977) as "the application of psychological principles to sports and physical
activity, at all levels of skill improvement". Sport psychology has also been defined as a "Field encompassing scholarly, educational and practical activities associated with understanding and influencing of selected behaviors of people involved in athletics and exercise" (Singer, 1973). We can say in simple words that Sport Psychology is an applied psychology, involving psychological educational principles to the field of physical education and sport. Sport psychology is a recently developed discipline but it has a vast potential to contribute towards education, performance level of sport players and research work in the field of sports.

Physique of the player also influences sports activities both directly and indirectly. Customs and traditions are important in this regard. In cultural context, play is a unique individual piece of behavior. A sport today has been accepted as a channel for sublimation of aggressive tendencies and reduction of tension. It provides an avenue of competition that can not be studied in everyday life. Only sport psychology provide the opportunity to study these phenomena.

Earlier Coaches associated with the coaching of players has largely emphasized the development of technical ability and physical fitness to the neglect of critical psychological factors. Psychological
principles have been followed but in a haphazardly rather systematic way. Therefore, today Sport Psychology is regarded as an essential component of success in sport. It is now a recognized fact and also appreciated that mental and emotional states can make the difference between winning and losing. The role of Psychology in sport has largely been restricted to pre match advice and instruction. This is likely to be of little value. Indeed for players who are already highly activated or 'Psyched up' the arousing pre match 'pep' talk is almost certain to be counter productive and result in a deterioration in performance. The demands of competition are such that psychological preparation of sports pep talk needs to be carried out over a prolonged period of time for it to be effective.

**Historical Origin of Sport Psychology:**

Griffith was a highly respected psychologist at the University of Illinois in the early 1900s and the first person to pursue sport psychology issues in the United States. In 1923, Griffith thought a course entitled "Psychology and athletics" and in 1925, he established the athletic research laboratory at University of Illinois. Griffith wrote two text books. "Psychology of Coaching" (1926) and "Psychology of Athletics" (1928). While Griffith was initiating psychological research
in the United States, sports psychology was also emerging in other countries.

A senior researcher in sport psychology Dr. Yun Hanin at the research Institute of Physical Culture in Leningrad, reported that sports psychology emerged as a discipline of study in the former Soviet Union during the year 1945-57. He suggests that Soviet Sports Psychology had two "fathers". Peter Roudik and A.C. Pune.

In 1960s some individuals such as William Morgon at Wisconsin and Deniel Landers and Rainer Martens at Illinois began to identify sport psychology or the social psychology of physical activities as their primary interest. Simultaneously many individuals became active sports psychologist in other countries particularly in Europe and Sports Psychology became an established area of sports and exercise science and practice.

In 1965, the International Society of Sports Psychology was formed and its first International Congress of Sports Psychology was held in Rome. Organizational meetings were held in 1965, 1966, and in 1967. The North American Society for the psychology of sports and physical activity was officially incorporated.
Sport is an institution with universal significance whether it is Baseball in Japan, Soccer in Brazil, Ice Hockey in Czechoslovakia, Cricket in England, Australia and West Indies, Field Hockey in India and Pakistan or Basketball in America. Thus, it is a significant component of human experience. Sports have certain characteristics which impel it more than other human activities toward international understanding and good will. Blanchard and Cheska (1985) suggested that sports especially competition tends to provide identity to an individual within a group and individual welcome this identity. There seems to be universal appeal and admiration for the display of the talent and achievements of the best in any human endeavors. The Olympic Games, World Cups and World Championships were occasions where the talent and achievements of athletes from around the world are presented in organized competition. In most of the sports, they are the best in the world.

Sports psychologists are interested in understanding what motivates elite athletes to excel and to discern, what preparation techniques and psychological skill need to be implemented to achieve exceptional performance. Recent investigations have recognized the complex nature of various sports personalities and have utilized multivariate techniques to provide a more comprehensive assessment
of individual athletes (Warner & Gothel. 1966; Could at al, 1980; Jarsild, 1967; Sharma et al, 1979). These studies found that varying pattern of cognition and mental preparation techniques were strongly correlated with elite performance. The elite athletes differentiate significantly between a successful and an unsuccessful athlete on psychological factors and personality traits (Cratty, 1989; Johnson, 1966; Kroll et al. 1968; Mohone and Avener, 1977; Kamlesh, 1982 & 1989; and Kane, 1972). Sports today has been accepted as a channel for sublimation of aggressive tendencies and reduction of tension (Eysenck, 1949; Gaugue & Fliespan, 1959). It provides an avenue of competition that cannot be studied in everyday life (Singer, 1973).

**Sport Psychology in India:**

In India, following the inclusion of "physical education" as co-curricular subject at the secondary education level around 1950, importance of psychological studies for sports and coaching were recognized at the training colleges for physical education teachers. Psychology for sports and sportman became gradually well recognized by 1970 through the planned effort of Ministry of Education, and later Ministry of Sports, Government of India for the development of sports sciences in our country. Indian professionals have formed distinguished national bodies viz. Indian Associations of

**Current State of Sport Psychology:**

Sports as an institution reflects society and culture. What is valued in sports historically with the exception of a few small societies; women have played a minor role in sports if they played at all a role characterized by dependency, passivity, frailty and monogassion. Since society did not place value in sports participation and competitions as part of the female role, institution custom and norms of society were arranged to greet these stereotyped traditional roles (Barrow & Brown, 1988).

Recent advances in the sports sciences and technology have served to sport persons for competition, video cameras, rehabilitative equipment, training videos coupled with training methods. These latest techniques are in inordinate demand of coaches to "Keep up" with the latest development in their sport. In this way the challenge for coaches is to maintain their being for the art of coaching while at the same time mastering the science of their sports.
Sports women are seldom alone, however, in their quest for better performance. Coaches, trainers, managers and sports scientists contribute greatly in the continuous improvement of elite performance. Sport scientists are instrumental in the preparation and developmental phases because they provide elite players with pertinent information concerning techniques, training and psychological preparation.

The present study therefore seeks to study the risk-taking behaviour and social responsibility of sport players playing individual game and team game, considering their level of participation in sub-junior, junior and senior level tournament and gender of the players.

**Risk-Taking Behaviour:**

The term "risk" has become now a very common and prominent term as it is used very frequently in day-to-day life. There is very popular proverb "no risk no gain". It has been observed that a high risk-taker is mostly successful and becomes leading personality. A layman is of the opinion that term 'risk' mean dangerous element of factor where an individual is put in willingly or unwillingly in that situation. Generally, a risk-taker is an individual who takes an act in his hands involving danger to his life, social prestige or economic
setup. To take risk, in several environmental situations, is an interesting phenomenon of human life. Risk-taking behavior has its own importance in life, where on one hand, it prepares a person to face the challenging situations and on the other hand, helps in the channelization of abundant body energy in different creative ways.

Researchers clearly differ in the definitions they provide for risk taking, but most refer to constructs such as goals, values, options, and outcomes (e.g., Byrnes, 1998; Furby & Beyth-Marom, 1992; Lopes, 1987; Slovic, Lichtenstein, & Fischhoff, 1998). Goals and values determine the kinds of outcomes that are pursued by an individual (e.g., good grades in school vs. being popular with friends) and also determine the kinds of options that are considered (e.g., studying vs. socializing). The act of implementing a goal-directed option qualifies as an instance of risk-taking whenever two things are true: (a) the behavior in question could lead to more than one outcome and (b) some of these outcomes are undesirable or even dangerous (Furby & Beyth-Marom, 1992). In essence, then, risk taking involves the implementation of options that could lead to negative consequences.

Definition:

Hobrin (1964) defines the term 'risk' as a condition where there
Finally, innocuous behaviors (e.g., spinning a roulette wheel to win however, the definition may seem to be too broad because it lumped e.g., one cannot ask a minor to gamble or drive fast). To others, it gives them the illusory to study risk taking in younger age groups believer in the perspicacity of risk taking in daily life. In addition, it breadth of this definition is desirable because it is consistent with their physical injury, financial and social loss. To some researchers, the raising one's hand in class, smoking, choosing a behavior leading to behaviors would qualify as instances of risk taking (e.g., telling a joke). This somewhat standard definition implies that a wide range of

**Approaches to Risk-taking:**

ways. For this he usually prays himself for the criticalism emphasized that a risk-taker acts always in unusual and non-traditional perspective of its futurity and harming nature. Aroma (1861) that from the very beginning the risk-taker is aware of the outcome that only clearly defines the success and failure. Here it is noticeable where both the aspects of a thing are clearer to the individual and the Chandy (1974) is of the opinion that the risk is a condition the intended or expected situation. is a possibility of the occurrence of loss as a result of deviation from
candy) together with rather dangerous ones (e.g., drunk driving). From an assessment standpoint, this split among researchers is problematic because it raises questions about the validity of certain measures of risk taking.

One way to reconcile the two approaches is to suggest that the category of risky behaviours is not an equivalence class (Byrnes, 1988). In an equivalence class, any two members of the class are equally good examples of the category (e.g., the numbers 3 and 217 in the case of numbers). Clearly, actions that are likely to lead to distressing outcomes (e.g., reckless driving of unprotected paragliding) are generally thought to be more representative of the category of risky behaviors than actions that are significantly less likely to produce such outcomes (e.g., driving within the speed limit, protected jump) or actions in which seemingly trivial outcomes are at stake (e.g., voicing one's opinion, not carrying an umbrella on a cloudy day). Thus, one could say that researchers who prefer a more restrictive definition would admit only the prototypical cases into the category of risky behaviors. In contrast, those who prefer the less restrictive definition would admit both prototypical and less prototypical cases into the category.
A second issue that would affect a researcher's judgment of validity is the distinction between an individual's subjective perception of risk and the perceptions of the larger community (Furby & Beyth-Marom, 1992). Consider the case of a boy who does not know swimming and jump in the pool to save his younger brother though many observers would argue that boy has taken a risk when he jumped but other may say that he has not. Conversely, consider the case of an 8-year-old girl who does not want to lose a small amount of candy that she has won on early trials of a risk-taking game. Losing candy may seem trivial to an adult, but it may be very undesirable to the child. As a result, the task would be subjectively risky to the child but not very risky to adult onlookers. Some researchers have argued that subjective perceptions of risk constitute the minimum standard to be met in any study of risk taking. Others, however, seem to require higher and more objective standards (Slovic, 1964). Either way, the subjectivity criterion implies that people take risks only when they are aware of the fact that they are taking risks. However, there are many behaviors that seem to qualify as prototypical instances of risk taking that are performed out of naivete (e.g., a young child playing in the streets etc.). Thus, agree with Furby and Beyth-Marom's (1992) suggestion that behaviors can be appropriately defined as risky even when the
person performing these actions is unaware of possible negative consequences.

A third factor that affects judgments of validity is the relation between a person's skill level and risk taking. By definition, a highly skilled individual fails less often than an unskilled peer on tasks relevant to that skill. As a result, skill-related actions might only be risky for the latter. This analysis implies, therefore, that a researcher could not use the tendency to engage in skilled behaviors as the only evidence of risk taking in a particular study (Miller & Byrnes, 1997).

A fourth and final issue pertains to the contextualization of behaviors. Clearly, there are ways to perform an action and situations in which it is performed that make it more or less risky. For example, drinking a small amount of alcohol is less risky than drinking a large amount of alcohol. Similarly leaving your bags with a stronger on a platform is riskier than leaving it with a familiar person who is known.

Theories of Gender Differences in Risk Taking:

Theories are often judged to be adequate to the extent that they can explain similarities or differences in performance among various groups (e.g., male vs. female participants, younger vs. older students, experimental vs. control groups). All things being equal, a theory that
can explain gender differences is more adequate than a theory that cannot. Our reading of the risk-taking literature reveals that researchers have not been particularly interested in explaining or uncovering gender differences using the most widely cited theoretical models of risk taking. Instead, they have tended to examine gender differences in an ancillary manner. Nevertheless, it is useful to briefly consider the types of results that would be more or less consistent with particular types of theoretical approaches.

At a general level, theories of risk taking fall into one of three categories (Lopes, 1987). The first category consists of theories that are equipped to explain the differences between people who regularly take risks and people who regularly avoid risks. Two examples of such theories are Zuckerman's (1991) account of the sensation-seeking personality and the "Risk as Value" hypothesis as described by Kelling, Zirkes, and Myerowitz (1976). Here, a single factor such as (a) a naturally lower level of arousal in men or (b) a socially instilled belief that risk taking is a highly valued masculine tendency, motivates high levels of risk taking across contexts in men. In their simplest form, such theories predict that the size and direction of gender differences would not vary by context (i.e., men would always
take more risks than women and the gap would remain relatively the same across contexts).

The second category consists of theories that are equipped to explain the differences between situations that promote risk taking (in most people) and situations that promote risk aversion. An example would be Kahneman and Tversky's (1979) prospect theory. Prospect theory was designed, in part, to account for the fact that most people seem to prefer a risky option over a sure thing when the choices are framed in a positive way (e.g., the number of people who would be saved by a medication), but they shift their preferences when the same choices are framed in a negative way (e.g., the number who would not be saved). There are, of course, participants in each study of framing who fail to demonstrate this shift, but prospect theory was not designed to account for such individual differences (Lopes, 1987).

The third category consists of theories that are equipped to explain differences among people and situations that promote risk taking. In other words, these models could explain why only certain people take risks in certain situations. To illustrate, consider multifactor models that include expectations and values in their formulation. According to these models, people take risks in a particular context because they (a) believe they will be successful and
(b) value success in that context (Atkinson, 1983; Byrnes, 1998; Irwin & Millstein, 1991; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992). As people move from one context to another, however, they generally hold different expectations and values. As a result, these models suggest that gender differences would vary by context and that some contexts would promote greater risk taking on the part of women. For example, if there was reason to believe that women might feel more confident in a particular situation than men, and it mattered more to women to be successful in that situation (e.g., volunteering to coordinate a crucial fundraiser for their children's school), expectancy-value models would support an expectation of greater risk taking on the part of women.

Other multifactor models also support the idea of context specificity, but for other reasons. For example, Arnett's (1992) theory of broad and narrow socialization suggests that the level of risk taking manifested by an individual depends on two factors: (a) endogenous tendencies such as sensation seeking and (b) the restrictions placed on risk taking by the individual's culture (e.g., laws, norms, parenting practices, etc.). Whereas cultural restrictions dampen a sensation seeker's tendency to take risks, these restrictions do not entirely eliminate the tendency. As such, Arnett's model leads to the
predication that men would take more risks than women in most cultures (because sensation seeking is found more often in man than women). However, the size of the gender gap would vary as a function of a culture's restrictiveness and the norms for appropriate gender role behaviors.

In the same way, Wilson and Daly's (1985) socio-biological model suggests that gender differences would not be found for all contexts, but that it would be men who take more risks when gender differences do occur. These authors have argued that risk taking is an "attribute of the masculine psychology" that evolved in response to the competitive demands of primate societies. According to this view, competition forces dominant individuals to engage in risk taking to gain their positions of power. The greater the spread in rewards between winners and losers, the greater the incentive to take risks. This account suggests that men would only be more likely to take risks than women when a context involves both competition and a large spread in rewards between winners and losers. For all other contexts, the gap would presumably be smaller (though Wilson and Daly do not explicitly make this claim). Moreover, their account provides little room for the possibility of greater risk taking on the part of women. One could, however, construct a different socio-biological model to
explain risky behaviors that are clearly more common in women than in man (e.g. binge eating). So, the existence of negative effect sizes is more of a problem for Wilson and Daily's model than for sociological models generally.

**Social Responsibility:**

When a human being takes birth, he is merely a living organism with some biological traits. He develops himself in the society, where he lives. He develops physically but learns lot of things through society too, and develops his personality. In the development of personality both biological and social factors work together, which factor is more essential is always a subject of conflict. Some psychologists emphasize on hereditary factors and others to social factors. Since mid 1970s, a more balanced approach to personality and social development has emerged, with social scientists acknowledging, that the nature virus nurture debate has been futile and unproductive. A controversial approach that has gained popularity is sociobiology. Much of the sociobiological literature concludes, that genetics, biology, and physiology sets parameters on a wide range of human characteristics, traits, and even temperament. Environment, socialization and experience then shape the final product (Wilson, 1978; Fisher, 1991; Gallagher, 1994). Consequently, it can be stated
with confidence, that who we are, and what we do, represents a dynamic interplay among (1) genetic traits and characteristics, (2) the environment, and (3) what we learn in interaction with others (Cherry, 1994).

Every society has some values, customs, traditions, and norms. Every person, who is the member of that society has to obey these rules. To learn according to these values and norms of society, is known as social development. A person also learns to fulfill his responsibilities towards society in the process of social development. Social responsibility is a wide concept, that ranges from family (primary institution of the society) to the whole world, from living organism to nonliving things, and from present to future. The sense of social responsibility assumes the form of a keen social sensitivity, social orientation and social perspective. Social responsibility suggests that people should respond to the reasonable needs of others, and that all the people have a societal obligation to aid those in need (Fisher et al, 1981; Fellner and Romer, 1983).

**Definition of Social Responsibility:**

The phrase "Social Responsibility" is widely used in the literature of sociology, anthropology, economics, politics and business
management. However, conceptually as well as in practice also, this has been a volatile, vague and confused area. From conceptual point of view, social responsibility has been defined by Davis (1987), as follows. "Social responsibilities refer to the business man's decisions and actions, taken to reason at least partially, beyond the firms direct economic or technical interest". This is a broad definition of social responsibility and prescribed actions, not related to the interests of the organizations.

The social responsibility committee proposed the following definition in 2003. "Social responsibility is awareness, knowledge, and behaviour based upon a commitment to the values of equity, access and justice; a dedication to civic involvement and environment's sustainability; and respect for diversity, pluralism, and freedom of expression."

Still broader view has been suggested by Andrews (1994), when he says that, "By social responsibility, we mean the intelligent and objective concern for the welfare of society, that restrains individual and corporate behaviour from ultimately destructive activities, no matter how immediately profitable, and leads in the direction of positive contribution to human betterment".
Social responsibility is for everyone, people have to contribute to society in a way, that leaves a positive impact upon others. Social responsibility comprises corporate and individual acts, that make the world a better place to live for all humankind.

Promoting social responsibility occurs in corporate societies, as companies often have mission statement reflecting their commitment to social responsibility. Some corporate's participate in programs like, recycling, ride sharing, and water conservation. Individuals also take social responsibility and many get involved in causes that promote positive social values and contribute to society. Examples of these include, educational efforts, environmental and conservation issues and emergency relief organizations. People also demonstrate their sense of social responsibility by supporting an organization, that fights hunger, teach good hygiene, and improve access to medical care in the society.

**Explaining Social Responsibility:**

We can define Social Responsibility as a standard of morality, emphasizing, people's obligation and duty to help those dependent upon them. In this way social responsibility is linked with morality. Moral development is a part of social development. When we came to
know what is right or what is wrong, we follow the right way. We act in such a way, what society demand from us.

Moral development also carries social responsibility. Children's moral development is influenced by advances in their social and cognitive capacities, as well as by genetic factors and environmental factors, including family and cultural influences.

The morality of an action can not be determined at face value. The morality of a behaviour is based partly on the cognitions, including conscious intentions and goals, that underlie the behaviour (Siegler, Deloache & Eisenberg, 2003).

The most important contributions of the current understanding of the development of children's moral reasoning are, Piaget and Lawrence Kohlberg, both of whom took a cognitive development approach to studying the development of morality.

Piaget Theory of Moral Judgement:

Piaget (1965) believed that interactions with peers, more than adult influence, accounts for advances in children's moral reasoning. Piaget initially studied children's moral reasoning by observing them playing games, such as marbles, in which they often deal with issue related to rules and fairness.
Piaget concluded, that there are two stages of development in children's moral reasoning, as well as a transitional period between the stages.

The stage of the Morality of Constraint

The first stage of moral reasoning, referred to, as the morality of constraint, is most characteristic of the children who have not achieved the cognitive stage of concrete operations, that is, children younger than 7 or 8 years old. Children at this stage regard the rules and duties to others as unchangeable "givens". In their view, justice is whatever authorities (adults, rules, or laws) say is right, and authorities' punishment are always justified. Acts that are not consistent with rules and authorities' dictates are "bad"; acts that are consistent with them are "good". At this stage children believe, that what determines whether an action is good or bad, is the consequence of the action, not the motives or intentions behind it.

Piaget suggested that young children's belief, that rules are unchangeable is due to two factors, one social and one cognitive. First, Piaget argues, that parental control of children is coercive and unilateral, leading to children's unquestioning respect for adults and for their rules. Second, children's cognitive immaturity causes them to
believe, that rules are "real" things, like chairs or gravity, that exist outside people, and are not the product of the human mind.

The Transitional Period

According to Piaget, the period from age about 7 to 10 years represents a transition from the morality of constraint to the next stage. During this transitional period, children typically interact more with peers than previously, and these interactions are more egalitarian and involve more give-and-take, than their interactions with adults. In games with peers, children learn that rules can be constructed and changed by the group. They also increasingly learn to take one another's prospective and to cooperate. As a consequence children start to value fairness and equality, and begin to become more autonomous in their thinking about moral issues.

The Stage of Autonomous Morality:

By about age 11 or 12, Piaget's second stage of moral reasoning emerges. At this stage, referred to as the stage of autonomous morality (also called moral relativism), children no longer accept blind obedience to authority as the basis of moral decisions. They fully understand that rules are the product of social interaction and agreement, and can be changed if the majority, agrees to do so. In
addition, they consider fairness and equality among people as important factors to consider, when constructing rules. Children at this stage also believe that punishment should "fit the crime", and that punishment delivered by adults is not necessarily fair. They also consider individual's motives and intentions, when evaluating their behaviour.

As Piaget explains the development of morality, social responsibility develops in the same manner. Children of small age group do everything what their parents want, because they have very little cognition.

Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Judgement:

Kohlberg (1976, Colby & Kohlberg, 1987) was primarily interested in the sequence through which children's moral reasoning develops. Kohlberg proposed, that moral development proceeds through a specific series of stages that are discontinuous and hierarchical. That is, each new stage reflects a qualitatively different, more adequate way of thinking, than the one before it.

Kohlberg's Stages

On the basis of the reasoning underlying children's responses, Kohlberg proposed three levels of moral judgement—pre-
conventional, conventional and post-conventional, or principled. Pre-conventional moral reasoning is self-centered, it focuses on getting rewards and avoiding punishment. Conventional moral reasoning is centered on social relationships: it focuses on compliance with social duties and laws. Post conventional moral reasoning is centered on ideals: it focuses on moral principles. Each of these three levels involve two stages of moral judgement.

First level Pre-conventional Level.

Stage 1: Punishment and Obedience Orientation and
Stage 2: Instrumental and Exchange Orientation.

Second Conventional Level.

Stage 3: Mutual interpersonal expectations, Relationships and interpersonal conformity ("Good Girl, Nice Boy") Orientation.
Stage 4: Social System and conscience ("Law and Order") Orientation.

Third level Post-conventional or Principled Level.

Stage 5: Social Contract or Individual Rights Orientations
Stage 6: Universal Ethical Principles.

Kohlberg and his colleagues (Colby et al; 1983) got some findings from their initial research. When the males were 10 years old,
they used primarily stage 1 reasoning (blind obedience to authority) and stage 2 reasoning (self-interest). For most adolescents aged 14 and above stage 3 reasoning (being "good to earn approval or maintain relationships) was the primary mode of reasoning, although some adolescents occasionally used stage 4 reasoning (fulfilling duties and upholding laws to maintain social order). Only a small number of participants, even by age of 36, ever achieved stage 5 (Upholding the best interests of the group, while recognizing life and liberty as universal values.

Factors affecting Social Responsibility

Diffusion of responsibility and confusion of responsibility affects social responsibility. Diffusion of responsibility is the tendency of people to feel, that responsibility for acting is shared or diffused among those present. The greater the number of people, who are present in an emergency, the lower is anyone individual sense of responsibility, and the less likely it is, that a person will feel obligated to help (Darley and Latane, 1968).

Studies on the social responsibility norm have revealed, that individuals exert efforts to help a highly-dependent person than a less dependent person (Berkowitz and Daniels, 1963). It is found that
college students will provide another person with greater help, when they are led to believe, that the person's dependence is due to uncontrollable environmental factors rather than "controllable personality or behaviour factors (Schopler and Mathews, 1965).