INTRODUCTION

I. THE CONCEPT OF MOTIVATION

The human being is a marvellous organism capable of perceiving events, making complex judgements, recalling information, solving problems, putting a plan into action and a whole host of such behaviour. Yet, this intimate apparatus can be used for a variety of ends — to plan for war as well as to explore outer space, to humiliate another person as well as to comfort sick, to achieve recognition, dominance or friendship. The uses to which a person puts his capabilities depends on his motivation — his desires, wishes, wants, needs, yearnings, hungers, loves, hates, fears, and so on.

Interest in motivation is not limited to psychologists; we all have our private ideas about what makes people tick, and in fact, some such conceptions may be necessary for getting along in life. We frequently ask: what a person wants? what may influence him? and what is important to him? A successful salesman learns when to appeal to
status needs. A doctor who forgets that patients need a little of sympathy in addition to medicine, may find his practice dwindling.

For centuries philosophers and theologians have been debating the nature of man. In doing so they have been frequently asking questions and drawing conclusions about motivation. For example, the fifteenth century British philosopher Thomas Hobbes believed that man is basically selfish, destructive, and brutish and, therefore, it is necessary for the individual to submit to monarch so as to prevent chaos. In the next century, John Locke, a strong advocate of parliamentary government opined that the original nature of man is peaceful, with feelings of goodwill and co-operation towards his fellows. It is clear from these statements that our conceptions of human motivation have pervasive influence on our lives.

The method of science is to formulate clear theoretical hypotheses and test them by carefully controlled observations. The scientific study of human motivation and its different components in terms of motives and their manifestations in observable behaviour is of a relatively recent origin. The field is so new that there is no single generally accepted theoretical framework for motivation. Instead, there are a number of competing conceptions inherited from philosophy or borrowed from biology. The major conception of motivation are summarized below.
(1) Cognitive Theories

The oldest view about man is that he is essentially a rational being. He has conscious desires and uses his capacities to fulfil them. This was the basic idea of ancient philosophers like Plato and Aristotle, of medeaval philosophers like St. Thomas Aquinas, and of the more recent thinkers including Descartes, Hobbes and Spinoza. The notion of man's will played a major role in these theories. Will was held to be one of the "faculties" of the mind at par with thinking and feeling. Since an individual can control his will, he is responsible for his actions. Man is not buffeted about by forces over which he has no control; he can shape his world to fulfil his desires. For Epicurus, the issue was so vital for the future of man, that he attributed freedom to the atoms of physical matter so that man can also be viewed as free.

Psychologists have not found the concept of free will or otherwise to be very useful in explaining why a person has particular desires and wants. The search has headed in the direction of finding the sources of motives in man's biological heritage and his experiences in social living. Man in not always free in deciding the course of his action. For a person may not even be aware of the motives that are influencing his behaviour. Therefore, motives are usually distinguished from thinking and other cognitive processes.
(2) Hedonistic Theories

Interwoven with the philosophizing about man's reason and will was a second idea — that man seeks pleasure and avoids pain. This is the principle of hedonism which explains why people behave as they do so. The hedonistic theory of motivation can be traced back to the ancient philosophers, but it was most prominent in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Headonism was rejected by psychologists along with most of the other rationalistic philosophers. Psychologists have not been too happy with the dependence of hedonistic theory on a private knowledge of a person's experiences. What do we know about another person's inner sensation of pleasure? One man's food is another man's poison. Another reason for rejection is that hedonism tends to be circular. A man is said to seek pleasure; if he seeks something, then it must be pleasurable. But what about a man who seems to seek failure? Or what about suicide? There are also people who appear to reject pleasure-seeking as a way of life. The Puritans, for example, avoid pleasure as a sinful thing. Of course, one can say that the Puritans obtain pleasure from abstention, but with this sort of argument one can explain behaviour only after the fact is in hand, and hedonism loses all predictive power. Nevertheless, in recent years hedonism has had something of renaissance. Psychologists such as Young (1950) and McClelland
(1962) have suggested sophisticated versions of hedonic theory. Instead of relying on subjective reports of pleasure and pain, however, these scientists used objective measures of approach and avoidance behaviour. The scientists working in this tradition are developing an experimental hedonism.

(3) Instinct Theory

The real beginning of scientific theory of motivation came with Charles Darwin's theory of evolution. Darwin thought that certain "intelligent" actions are inherited. The simplest of these are the reflexes, such as the sucking reflex of the young. Others are more complex, such as the tendency of birds to avoid man without prior experience with him. These more complex actions were called instincts, an idea which can also be traced back to antiquity. Darwin believed that instincts arise through natural selection. Instincts are usually thought of as being more flexible than reflexes, and so permitting more variable behaviour. Around the beginning of the present century, theorists like William James, Sigmund Freud, and William McDougall developed the instinct doctrine as an important explanatory concept in psychology. Some writers thought of instincts as somewhat mechanical and blind, but most systematic theorist, McDougall (1908), thought of instincts as purposive, inherited, goal-seeking tendencies, and he enlisted 12 instincts of flight, repulsion, curiosity,
pugnacity, self-abasement, self-assertion, parental, reproduction, hunger, gregariousness, acquisitiveness, and constructiveness.

Obviously, many discrete actions in various species could be classified as instinctive. But the goal of science is simplification. So, the aim was to find a limited number of basic instincts that could account for all behaviour. Freud (1920) postulated the presence of primary instincts, Eros and Thanatos. They produce psychological derivatives only after mixing with each other into aggressive and sexual instinct fusions. These two instinctual fusions are often referred to as aggressive and sexual instincts.

(4) Drive Theories

Drive is considered to be the most prominent concept today in the field of motivation. The concept was first introduced by Woodworth (1918) to describe the 'energy' that impels an organism to action as opposed to the habits that steer behaviour in one direction or the other. Although Woodworth meant the term to refer to the general supply of energy, people soon began to talk not of 'drive' but of several different 'drives' such as hunger, sex, thirst, and so forth, which they meant the tendencies towards or away from specific goals.
An operational definition of drive is a specification of both the conditions under which the drive can be said to be functioning and the means of measuring it. Thus, a drive can be measured by the hour of deprivation of food, the concentration of sexual hormones in the blood, or the intensity of an electric shock one is ready to bear. The reduction of a drive can be defined by operations such as the satiation of hunger with food, sexual exhaustion or the termination of shock. The logic of drive theory was greatly advanced by the concept of homeostasis introduced by the physiologist Cannon (1932). According to this concept, a state of disequilibrium is set up in the body whenever the internal conditions deviate from a normal steady state. Psychological drives are the way the body attempts to return to equilibrium. Thus, when the nutritional supply is depleted in the body, the hunger drive is activated, food is sought and consumed, and so the equilibrium is restored. In this way, motivation came to be defined as the drive arising out of homeostatic imbalance and tension.

A considerable amount of interest has centred around the external sources of motivation too. The smell, sight, or taste of the food is to operate as an incentive. Particularly in social situations, the motivating effect of the goal is often much more apparent than that of internal factors. Motivation is aroused by incentive pay, by the sight
of a pretty girl, and the like.

It is clear that different theorists have different conceptions about motivation. Nevertheless, there is general agreement that a motive is an internal factor that arouses, directs, and integrates one's behaviour. It is not observed directly but simply be inferred from the behaviour or is only assumed to exist in order to explain the behaviour. Motivation is distinguished from other factors that also influence behaviour, such as the past experience of the person, his physical capabilities, and the environmental situation in which he finds himself. Many psychologists opine that motivation also includes 'conscious desire' for something. This is sometimes called a 'want'. A desire or want is related to the goal-seeking function of motives. Other psychologists, however, believe that a desire or want is too subjective to be of scientific value. They simply take a person's verbal report of his inner feelings as one aspect of behaviour that is influenced by the inferred motive such as hunger, sex, achievement, affiliation, aggression, and the like.

At any given time a person is motivated by a variety of internal and external factors. The strength of each motive and the pattern of motives influence the way we see the world, the things we think about, and the actions
in which we engage ourselves. The motives fluctuate and arrange themselves in various patterns at different times. Some of the motives are always operating and the behaviour is controlled by them.

MOTIVE

The generalized use of the term motive by psychologists, some of whom hold that we have a motive for everything that we do have a rather bizarre effect. For motives are particular class of reasons which are distinguished by certain logical properties. Peters' (1960) thesis is that the concept of motivation has developed from that of motive by attempting a causal interpretation of the logical force of the term.

In certain contexts, instead of asking, why he did it? we may ask 'what his motive was'? Often this is in a context where it is appropriate to ask 'what made him do that'? when there is a departure from the conventional expectations. We ask, for instance, what a man's motive is for committing a murder or for joining a party with whose principles he does not agree. The implication is that these actions are characteristics of him or one which conform to any standard rule following purposive pattern.
There are three characteristics shared by explanations, given by psychologists in terms of motives. In the first place we only ask about a man's motive when we wish to hold his conduct up for assessment. The word is used typically in moral-legal discourse where actions have to be justified and not simply explained. Thus, a motive is not necessarily a discreditable reason for acting, but it is a reason asked for in a context where there is a suggestion that it might be discreditable. For example, one may be asked about his motive for entering in his neighbour's house without his permission. This sort of actions, obviously, require some sort of justification. But it shall be taken amiss when one's motives are questioned for getting married, playing chess or giving presents to the friends. For, in such cases we are doing the done things and so there should be no necessity for justification. Of course, there may be reasons for doing these sorts of things; people do not get married through force of habit or in a fit of absentmindedness. But if we are asked about the reasons for our motives the suggestion is that we may not have any obvious reasons. We may be marrying the girl for her money or giving presents to pursue courtship. Motives, then, are reasons for actions which are asked for when there is an issue of justification and/or explanation. The question then arises as to the type of explanation that is offered when a motive is suggested. For not all reasons
for actions pertain to motives.

This brings us to the second characteristic of motives, its directedness, that they are the reasons of the directed sort. We may give a motive by alluding to a directive disposition like hunger, greed, affiliation, or ambition. It can be said, for instance, that his motive for marrying the girl was greed, or that scholar's developing relations with professors is because of his ambition. Such explanations assign a goal to the individual whose motives are in question. As has been shown, not all reasons for actions are of this directed sort. We can explain a man's action in terms of traits of character, like considerateness and punctuality. These may be the reasons why people act but they are not motives in themselves. For such terms do not indicate any definite sort of goals towards which a man's actions are directed. Motives, of course, may be mixed; but this only means that a man aims at a variety of goals by means of the same course of action. Similarly, a man may have a strong motive or a weak one, an ulterior motive or an ostensible one. Such directions relate only to the influence of the goal on him or to the extent to which it is hidden. If he has a motive he must have a goal of some sort, however weak or however obvious or attainable it may be.
It seems pertinent to emphasize on the directedness of the motive because this aspect of motives has been very much neglected by the psychologists. Peters (1960) distinguishes motives from dispositions. He argues that vanity, considerateness, patriotism, and interest are often given as examples of motives. These may well be dispositions but they can not all be appealed to as motives; for they do not imply directedness. Not infrequently, behaviourists have tended to equate motives with drives or initiating states of tension and have failed to stress the directedness of behaviour which is the cash value of assigning a motive to it. The departure from habit or a conventional purpose naturally introduces the third characteristic of motive. That the reference to the motive of a person also explains the reasons why he did whatever he did. This involves the postulation of a goal towards which the behaviour is actually directed. We might contrast the reasons which a man, who is careless about his clothes, gives for buying a suit with his underlying motives. The implication of this contrast is that the objective which he pictures to himself or parades in public is not the one towards which his conduct is actually directed. This, it is implied, cannot be the reason why he bought the suit; it can not, therefore, be his motive. But his reason might coincide with his motive. He might say that he bought the suit in order to impress his employer and this might also be the reason why he bought it.
This would be an example of a conscious motive. If his motive was unconscious, then the reason of his buying the suit could be something like to attract some one, and the implication of saying that it was unconscious would be that he did not entertain this goal as a conscious objective.

With the above description we can draw out three main characteristics of motive as an explanatory concept.

(a) It is used in contexts where conduct is being assessed, and not simply explained where there is a breakdown in conventional explanations.

(b) It is used to refer to a reason of directed sort and implies a directed disposition in the individual whose conduct is being assessed.

(c) It must state the reason why a person acts, a reason that is operative in the situation to be explained. The motive may coincide his own reason but it should also be the real reason why it acts.

SOCIOGENIC MOTIVES

Social learning plays a dual role in the vast area of human behaviour motivated by learned goals and rewards. The human being is not only motivated by biologically based goal-seeking system, but he also learns, through his experience with the physical and social world around him, to orient himself towards the attainment of goals whose value originates from these consistent associations with reward and satisfaction of other needs. Through such association,
originally neutral and unvalued events or objects may become highly rewarding. Once learned, these sociogenic motives acquire considerable stability so much so that they can function as autonomous and self-sufficient motivational systems. These socially learned goal orientations are further subjected to a second effect of socialization in terms of the shaping of particular habits exercised in satisfying them.

The dependency-nurturance system is one of the most important of these sociogenic motives because of its pervasive relationships to other kinds of learned motivation, including affiliative and gregarious motives. At first, instrumental dependency (help-seeking) is necessary for the human infant because of his own inadequacy for meeting basic biological needs such as hunger, escape from injury, and the like. Eventually, however, autonomous emotional dependency (affection-seeking) remains as a residual motivational system because nurturance has previously been consistently associated with need satisfaction.

Motivation of affiliation is a sociogenic motive of particular significance to the social psychologist and others interested in the study of human relations, since it provides the origins for man's participation in social groups. There is convincing evidence that at least two kinds of motivation play a role in such an interpersonal attraction
behaviour. Affiliation with other people may in some cases be instrumental to the satisfaction of other needs, allowing the individual to use his interaction with others to attain a variety of personal goals, including the supportive reduction of anxiety under threat. On the other hand, affiliation may also be thought of as a quest for approval and acceptance by others, conceiving of motivation to seek social approval as an autonomous system of goal-directed behaviour. In any case, affiliation and approval-seeking motives are particularly crucial in the socialization process, since they permit the society to exercise control over the individual's behaviour.

II. ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF AFFILIATION MOTIVE

Man, like other species, is a biological organism existing and attempting to survive in a social environment, with the members of his own as well as other species. However, in many ways he is a domesticated species, and his behaviour has a great deal of plasticity. While this allows for what man considers advancement over nature, it allows for distortion in natural expression and disturbance we may not yet have begun to realise. The means possessed by man for physical survival and the condition he sees as necessary for psychological survival depend to a considerable
extent upon other people, and his views of what is necessary or appropriate for working toward either kind of survival are shaped by experience with other people.

The basic goals of competence in dealing with the environment and affiliation with members of one's own species are shaped by interaction with them. These appear on frequently cited list of motivations reflecting their susceptibility to modification by experience, and list of human motivations reflecting man's assumption that he predominantly has such concerns. Along with other motives, affiliation too can have survival values.

Individuals are attracted to one another; they form friendships, get married and are engaged in other activities to the extent that the relationship offers reward values or positive reinforcements. Three components of individual's interpersonal attraction can be delineated: as (a) the types of response defined as antecedents of attraction; (b) the stimulus variables identified as antecedents of attraction; and (c) the consequences of attraction (i.e., behavior mediated by attraction).

Cognitive theorists of interpersonal attraction (Heider, 1958; Newcomb, 1968) tend to emphasize the relational characteristics among elements of a closed triadic system composed of at least two individuals and an object of
communication (something or someone). The basic unit of such theories is the cognition which is "any knowledge, opinion or belief about the environment, about oneself, or about one's behaviour that a person might hold" (Bercheid and Walster, 1969). In contrast to cognitive theorists, reinforcement theorists, (e.g., Lott & Lott, 1968; and Staats, 1968) focus on stimuli and responses as the basic units comprising interpersonal interaction. The concepts of learning theory are applied to the attraction situation. According to the behaviouristic reinforcement theory, the greater the distance from the other, the greater is one's attraction toward the other. The motive or desire for interpersonal relation has been termed as 'affiliation motive' by the psychologists. The chief contributor to the social motives, Murray (1964), has defined affiliation motive in these words, "To draw near and enjoyably co-operate or reciprocate with an allied other (another who resembles the subject or who likes the subject). To please and win effection of a cathected object. To adhere and remain loyal to a friend". This description implies that affiliation motive is a desire to enjoy the interpersonal relationships. Miller (1959) suggested that the stimuli produced by other people increase the strength of the individual's ongoing prepotent response tendencies. Although psychologists may differ in details, adherents of this type of thought have
general agreement on the point that reward properties are acquired through association with drive satisfaction. Whatever the drive, these stimuli (ideas, objects, or people) that are connected with its satisfaction presumably become more attractive and seek out for further contact.

Origin and Development

We find some evidence suggesting that the social motives are eminent in individual and develop through the primary attachment towards mother. Harlow and his co-workers (1959) in their experiment with monkeys found the animal's showing an innate need for contact comfort. Their monkeys preferred contact with the non-feeding cloth mother to the feeding wire mother. The attachment to the cloth mother occurred a little faster when the feeding was associated with her but the attachment with the feeding wire mother was as strong as with the cloth mother after few weeks. Possibly nursing directs the response to the contact comfort of the cloth mother a little more quickly, but it is the contact comfort itself that forms the basic attachment to the surrogate mother. This and some other studies support the idea of an innate social motive rather than the theories of derived social motives.

Can this simple clinging response be called love or affection? One thing we usually mean by a baby's love
for its mother is the feeling of security and protection it gets from her. This feeling was demonstrated with the infant monkeys by exposing them to fearful stimuli — a strange open room, which baby monkeys find frightening, or a diabolic spider monster. In these situations the baby monkeys run to the cloth mother in panic, cling to her, and then visibly relax. Secure again, they would cautiously begin to explore the strange place, returning to the home base of cloth mother from time to time. This is observed in human child brought into a strange house in day-to-day life. But this security producing contact was not provided in the monkey studies by the wire mother — even if the monkey had been fed on her. Again, it is contact comfort of the soft round cloth figure, not the stimulus associated with feeding, that provides the security. Their effects continue to operate for years and influence the whole emotional development of the monkeys. Monkeys reared with wire mother or in plain wire cages show an absence of affection, a lack of co-operation as compared with the normally reared monkeys. It seems that some part of maternal stimulation is needed for normal development of affectional behaviour in human beings too. There is a remarkable correspondence between many of Harlow's findings and studies of human children who have been deprived of normal mothering. Margaret Rible (1960) reported a study on some 600 children who either had no mother, or had inadequate mother, or had lost their mothers.
Such children became negativistic, depressed and physically weakened. Some of them developed a condition known as 'marasmus' in which they simply wasted away and died.

Similar findings have been reported in a number of studies on children placed in orphanages or foundling homes. In most of these places the food and medical care is generally adequate, but there is shortage of personal means in that the children get no attention except for feeding and diaper changing. Many of them simply lie on their cribs with little physical or emotional stimulation. Those infants who have had no mothering during the first year of their lives appear to withdraw and are found devoid of emotional feelings. Many of them have presumably lost the capacity to form a human attachment. Children who have had some mothering during the first year and are then separated show more dramatic emotional changes. When initially separated from their mothers these children become anxious and are seen crying, but eventually this reaction changes into depression and apathy. The babies lose weight and show intellectual and language retardation. They stare at nothing, show autistic symptoms such as incessant sucking, and can't bear to be picked up by anyone. They seem to have lost a basic responsiveness and to have become emotionless automatons and only intensive psychotherapy with a warm loving person can bring them out of their withdrawal.
Older children who have been brought up in this impersonal kind of institution have a disturbed and unsocial kind of personality. They have little control over aggressive impulses, and exhibit various forms of immature delinquent and antisocial behaviour. They do not form close emotional ties, and remain withdrawn and unattracted. In other words, children who do not receive affection during the early critical years do not develop a basic social motive for love and affection.

Writing from a modern psychoanalytic point of view John Bowlby (1958) concludes from these studies on maternal separation that a child's attachment to the mother is primary and not derived from any other motive. Components of this attachment are the instinctive tendencies to suckle, to cry for the mother, to cling to her, to follow her, and to stay close to her. Separating the child from the mother produces what Bowlby calls 'primary anxiety'. This anxiety is not based on fear of losing a person the child has learned protects and feeds him; rather, it comes before such experiences and represents an innate need for social attachment.

There is still a great deal that is not known about the development of affectional motives. Stimulation during an early critical period appears to be essential but some controversy persists over the exact nature of the required stimulation. Some people have simply written it off
as tactile, but this explanation seems oversimplified. There may be species differences. For instance, the imprinting phenomenon in the duck seems to be an analogous form of primary social tie. Yet, this involves contact and following rather than tactile stimulation. In Harlow's study (1966), infant monkeys preferred rounded form permitting clinging or rocking mother surrogate to a flat, cloth covered nonmoving board. On the human level, vocalisation may be at least as important as cuddling. It seems to be possible from the above state of affairs that many social motives, mainly affiliation, are simply extension of the basic tie with the mother. As we have seen, something along these lines seems to be important in the development of parental motive. Nevertheless, the early ties remain the strongest and the generalization of affectional ties is not indiscriminate. We feel closest to our family members, a little closer to our own subcultural group than to others, and closer to our own countrymen than to others.

If we accept the preceding evidences suggesting the innate nature of social motives, the concept of cathexis, channeling and canalization may provide an excellent explanation of the development of love, affection, and social feeling. A child is born with nonspecific motive for certain sensory emotional experiences that can only be provided in full by a social relationship with another person. For a
baby monkey, even another baby monkey provides more of these experiences than a carefully constructed mother surrogate (Harlow, 1966). Without the necessary sensory-emotional experience during the early critical period, the basic social motive may never be canalized outward. No one knows whether it simply disappears or is turned inward, producing the withdrawn and autistic child. Ordinarily the mother provides these sensory-emotional experiences, and hence, the primary social motive is canalized to her. As the child grows, more and more of these sensory-emotional experiences canalize the social motive towards the mother and we say that an affectional bond has been established between the child and the mother.

The establishment of wider affectional bonds — with the father, the playmates, and the social group as a whole — can be achieved as the additional sensory-emotional experiences with other people add new canalization of the social motive. However, the new canalization must be based on the satisfaction of the basic social motive — it is not merely the generalization of affection from mother to others. If the father, for instance, is unloving, even to the point of rejecting the child, no affectional bond would be expected to develop.
III. SOURCES AND CORRELATES OF AFFILIATION MOTIVE

The motivation that induces the people to seek company of others is one of the most interesting of all the motives that activate and direct man's social behaviour. The almost prehistoric notion that man's nature is to participate in social interaction led early social thinkers to the conclusion that man must be instinctively gregarious. However, scepticism of instinct notion and the theoretical analysis that differentiates the biogenic motives from the sociogenic have brought most contemporary social scientists to the conclusion that man is motivated to participate affiliatively with others as a product of several kinds of social learning. In fact, it may be inadequate to speak of a unitary "affiliation motive"; it is more correct to look for a number of behavioural indices which underlie affiliation motive. One may show affiliation motive through his extroverted interpersonal behaviour; another's affiliation motive can be known only through his daydreams and fantasies. These affiliation fantasies can be in direct form with the imageries of interpersonal contacts or in indirect form with the contents of envying the fantasized affectional relationships.

The more direct source of attraction to social interaction in which affiliation with others is an end in itself has preoccupied the attention of experimental social
psychologists for some time. These direct reward capacities of certain forms of social interaction are generally designated as social reinforcement. There is abundant empirical evidence of the functional reinforcement value of praise, verbal approval and social acceptance as rewards, and of criticism, disapproval and social rejection as punishments. The effectiveness of interpersonal praise and criticism in educational contexts has been noted (Grace, 1948; Durkin, 1959a, 1959b). One of the first experimental demonstrations of social approval as a reinforcing event in learning was carried out by Thorndike (1935), who showed that the experimenter's delivery of the words "right" and "wrong" operated to effect the production of verbal response. Verplanck (1955) manipulated the content of conversations by administering interpersonal approval and disapproval. A particularly significant study by Greenspoon (1955) showed that even minimal murmurs evincing approval or disapproval produced modifications of verbal behaviour even when the individual was unaware of any relationship between his own behaviour and the reaction of the experimenter. This observation that social approval may serve as an incentive or goal towards which behaviour is directed without the persons being consciously aware of it, has come to be known as 'Greenspoon effect'. However, another research (Epstien, 1964) has provided a basis for argument that Greenspoon's observations
may have been inappropriately interpreted, so that many psychologists are not fully convinced that this kind of motivation really can operate without the individual being aware of his motivation.

A series of experiments executed by Gewirtz and Baer (1958) to explore the effectiveness of verbal approval as a reward in simple learning tasks in children led them to conclude that the functional properties of social reinforcement are congruent with the general characteristics of an autonomous, learned sociogenic motivational system. Periods of social deprivations and isolation resulted in increased effectiveness of approval as a reward for behaviour, whereas satisfaction induced by intensive repetition of a verbal approval resulted in decreased effectiveness of approval as a reward. Since several other experimental studies have corroborated these findings, a number of psychologists subscribe to the notion that the "need for social reinforcement" constitutes an autonomous learned motive. The early experience of most infants provides circumstances that facilitate the learning of acquired reward value in connection with approval and disapproval. The nurturant behaviour of parents in supplying food, warmth and bodily stimulation involves the display of interpersonal warmth and affection that become desired goals in and of themselves. In turn, the displays of affection are given more freely when
parents approve of child's behaviour than when they disapprove it. Sears et al. (1957), Stevenson and Odom (1962), and Exline (1964) have suggested that this kind of motivation is an outgrowth and extension of the conditions that give rise to dependency motivation. There is ample evidence that it is also a component in affiliative motivation and the individual's desire to seek the company of others. In any case, the desire to gain social approval and acceptance from others is an important motivational system in human behaviour and is a component of affiliative motivation and the individual's desire to seek the company of others.

Cognitive theorists (Bercheid and Walster, 1969) propose that configurations among the cognitions within a triadic system are viewed as psychologically more pleasant than other types of cognitive relationships, and individuals strive actively to maintain pleasant configurations and to avoid unpleasant ones. Newcomb (1968) observes that most pleasant relationships consist of those which are positively balanced; imbalanced relationships are experienced as most negative; and nonbalanced configurations are evaluated rather indifferently.

In attempting to answer the question of why people develop affectional relationship with others, several studies have been undertaken to determine the psycho-social correlates of affiliation motive.
Cartwright and Zander (1960), for example, suggested that there were at least two major sources of attraction: (i) the affiliative relation itself may be the object of some motivational desire such as a quest for approval and recognition, and (ii) being with the friends or peers may represent an instrumental means for satisfying some motivational desire arising elsewhere, such as dependence on others for achieving any goal, utilization of the friends as a source of information, or reassurance from others to relieve fears or anxiety. Similar to the latter, Festinger (1954) had earlier proposed in his "theory of social comparison processes" that one basis of attraction to group is the individual's motivation to use the group as a means of "socially evaluating and determining appropriate and proper reactions". The individual, thus, strives to affiliate himself with a group of others either to learn from them something he doesn't otherwise know, or to reassure himself that what he thinks is correct. Byrne and associates (Byrne and Rhamy, 1965; Byrne and Nelson, 1965; Byrne, 1969; Byrne and Clore, 1970; and Byrne, 1971) conceptualize all the determinants of attraction as having affective meaning and reinforcing properties. For instance, personality similarity as well as attitude similarity influence the attraction to the extent that it is reinforcing and affect-arousing to the subject. A number of personality dispositions have been found
to be related with affiliative behaviour of persons. Van Dyne (1940) found dominance and stability as the major determinants in developing friendship behaviour among girls. The girls who had predominant dispositions of dominance and stability were found to develop wider friendship relation in comparison to those who were lower in these traits. Bonney, Hobbit and Drever (1953) found popular persons to be considerate, self confident and mature in social interaction. Unpopular persons, on the contrary, were egocentric, attention demanding and disparaging. Nasu (1975) found high affiliation as positively related with inaccurate self-image and low self-esteem. Brundage, Derlega, and Cash (1977) revealed inverse relationship between intimacy of self disclosure and the need for affiliation. Individual differences in need affiliation have been found to be related to such behaviour as frequency of making telephone calls and writing letters (Lansing and Heyns, 1959) and expressed liking for people, parties and clubs (Byrne, McDonald, and Mikua, 1963). French (1956) hypothesized that attraction to another individual in a specific situation is a joint function of situational demands and low in affiliation motive made significantly more choices of the successful persons.

A different component of affiliation motive, i.e. anxiety, has been stressed by other psychologists who have explored the psychology of affiliation and acceptance-seeking
behaviour. In fact, there may be conditions under which individuals who are highly motivated for affiliation may be very anxious about their ability to behave in socially acceptable ways; and, thus, fearful, that they may be disapproved by others. Kagan and Moss (1962) believe that under such conditions the individual may withdraw from social interaction with others in order to avoid failure and disapproval, thus, displaying essentially non-affiliative behaviour. Grinker and Spiegel (1945) investigated fear, anxiety, and insecurity in military personnel during World War II. Their findings suggest that men in bomber crews were especially reassured and less anxious when they were in the company of other members of the crew. Later, Schachter (1959) extended this hypothesis into a series of experimental studies on the basis of affiliation motivation. He reported that the reduction of anxiety is an important motivation of affiliative behaviour. Walters and Ray (1960) have argued that most of the experimental studies that demonstrate the reward values of social approval involve conditions in which anxiety is aroused by stressful antecedent conditions. They propose that the isolation of child to deprive him of social reinforcement merely serves to distress him, and that subsequent social approval in an experimental setting provides relief from such anxiety in the form of reassurance and support. Schachter (1959) studied affiliation motivation and found evidence congruent with this interpretation.
of the basis of the reward value of approval and social acceptance. A variety of different kinds of threat, punishment, need for cognitive clarification of the environment, and even intensification of other drive states, such as hunger may serve to motivate gregariousness, affiliation, approval-seeking or acceptance-seeking behaviour.

Navar and Helmreich (1971) found that in females fear- or anxiety-producing manipulations increased their affiliative desires. Willems, Van Gelderan, & Defares (1972) and Paz and Amir (1974) found high anxiety to be associated with high affiliation. Nasu (1975) found among school students high affiliation motive being positively correlated with high anxiety.

The effect of birth order on affiliation motive has also been reported by several investigators. In a series of studies, it was found that when the college students were subjected to anxiety arousing conditions, those who were the first borns or the only children in their families were considerably more likely to be attracted to other people than were those who were later borns in their families. In one study Alexander (1966) reports that the first borns are also chosen by others more often than the later borns. There is evidence that interpersonal contact is actually effective in reducing anxiety among first born or only children, whereas
this effect does not hold good for the later born individuals (Wrightsman, 1960). Payne (1971) didn't find birth order to show significant relationship with affiliation motive. Dauphinais, and Leitner (1978) found among male and female college students, birth order to significantly influence willingness or unwillingness to join an encounter group.

Many of the studies on social sensitivity have concentrated upon children's reactions to stimuli outside the immediate field of interaction, such as the experimenter's comments or his role (Meddick, Parsons, and Hill, 1971; Paulicki, 1972). Booth (1972) asserts that women had more contact with their close friends, confided more in them, and engaged in more spontaneous activities. Maccoby and Jackline (1975) reviewed the evidence concerning the depth of boys' and girls' friendship behaviour and concluded that there was no difference between them. They also claimed that there was no difference in boys' and girls' sensitivity to social cues. However, the investigators suggested that as they grow older, boys interact more often with friends and peers than do the girls. Waldrop and Halverston (1975) found that girls' orientations become typically "intensive" in adulthood (based on single "best friend" relationships) whereas those of boys are extensive concerned with a whole group of other children. The role of sex is further complicated by the fact that sex differences in psycho-social lives increase
with age (Block, 1976). In a review of their own work Broverman et al. (1972) concluded that stereotypic thinking about sex role related personality traits is pervasive. And a greater number of desirable traits are assigned to men than to women, valued traits for men forming a competence cluster, while those for women form a warmth-expressiveness cluster.

Several difficulties are faced in the study of affiliation motivation. Although there is unity in the goal toward which these motives are directed (social interaction with others), the origins from which such motivation stems are multiple. And this difficulty suffers further confounding from the fact that psychologists use several different kinds of procedures for assessing human affiliative motivation. Some methods of measuring the need for affiliation, which contain analysis of stories describing specially prepared pictures, tend to emphasize the instrumental values of affiliating with others (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark and Lowell, 1953; Burdick, 1961). In contrast, Edwards (1954), using an objective test that forces the individual to choose between pairs of alternative goals, emphasize the personal loyalties in already existing social relationships. The works of Edwards (1957) and of Crowne and Marlowe (1964) construe social desirability and approval-seeking as a major component in affiliation motivation.
The factors referred to in the above quoted studies and many other sources may contribute to the individual's motivation to seek the company of others. But each alone is insufficient to account for human affiliative behaviour. Although it is a difficult task to enumerate the factors that contribute to the development of affiliation motive in the human beings, factors like personality, anxiety, birth order, and sex seem to play significant role in the affiliation behaviour. The present study is an attempt to draw a global picture of the major psycho-social correlates of affiliation motivation.