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PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOUR: ALTRUISM

Daily report of violence, wars, and crime have for many years led social scientists to focus their investigations on aggressive behaviour. It has become a very important area and social psychologists have proposed theories to explain the determinants and antecedents of aggressive behaviours (e.g., Dollard, et al., 1939; Buss, 1961; Bercowitz, 1962). The articles in a typical issue of major newspapers also presented a dismal picture of our society, a picture of murders, cruelty and aggression. Only a few items dealt with positive form of social behaviours, instances in which people helped one another. However, in the last decade, social scientists have become more and more interested in behaviours that might be considered the opposite of aggression.

Helping behaviours went largely unresearched until a notorious incident in March 1964. A young girl named Kitty Genovese, returning to her home in Queens, New York, at 3:00 a.m., was attacked by a man with a knife. Her screams of terror attracted the attention of no fewer than 38 respectable, law-abiding citizens, her neighbours in the Kew Gardens apartment complex. These 38 people watched in horror as her assailant attacked and assaulted her in three separate attacks lasting over half an hour. Yet not one of the neighbours came to her aid; none even called the police. Only after the assailant had left and Miss Genovese was dead did a single individual go to the telephone. Shortly after the death of Kitty Genovese, the New York city newspapers were filled with articles and editorials summarizing the bystander's responses and interpreting their behaviour.

We live in a society whose values require people to help and co-operate with other. Without such co-operation, society as we know it, would not exist. Parents help children through the process of socialization and on a
broader level, we have a series of formed laws and less formal norms that define acceptable and unacceptable behaviour among members of society. Concepts such as altruism, charity, friendship, co-operation, helping, rescuing, sacrificing and sharing, all involve prosocial behaviours.

Social psychologists have wrestled with the issue of defining these terms, and there is not complete agreement. Acts that may be considered prosocial include a wide range of behaviours. Wispe (1972) has defined behaviour that contributes to the physical well being of another person is called prosocial behaviour. Krebs (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 the actor. Obviously, this way of describing prosocial behaviour, highlights people's motivation for performing acts of goodwill.

Specifically, prosocial behaviour is defined here as voluntary behaviours that is carried out to benefit another without anticipation of external rewards and is performed under two circumstances:

a) The behaviour is done for its own end.

b) The behaviour is done as an act of restitution.

The first behaviour is called 'altruism' and the second behaviour is called 'restitution'.

The term of 'altruism' comes from the Latin word, "alter", meaning "other", and generally connotes an orientation toward other rather than toward self. Altruism refers to acts that bring benefits to other people. These acts are aimed at producing, maintaining or improving the physical and psychological welfare and integrity of others. (Staub, 1978 & Wispe, 1978).
Walster & Piliavin (1972) has also defined altruism as a very special form of helping behaviour that is, voluntary, costly to the altruist, and motivated by something other than the expectation of material or social reward.

William (1981) has defined altruistic behaviour motivated solely by the desire to make some other person or organism “feel better” with the actions of the altruist being characterized by self-sacrifice and not at all by self-interest. Not all helping behaviours are altruistic but all altruistic actions are helpful.

Psychologists disagree about the precise definition of altruism although most of them agree that altruistic behaviours:

1. Must be carried out voluntarily.
2. Must aim to benefit another.

There is a disagreement about some specific preconditions for altruistic behaviours. Thus, Bryan and Test (1967) view altruism as “those acts wherein individuals share or sacrifice a presumed positive reinforcer for no apparent social or material gain”. Leeds (1963) presented three conditions for altruistic behaviour.

1. It must be treated as an end in itself.
2. It must be elicited voluntarily.
3. It must be judged by others as “doing good”.

‘Restitution’ is the other type of behaviour of prosocial behaviour. This consists of an act that aims to make restitution in human relations. The definition includes the behaviours of a recipient who tries to reciprocate the previously received help and the behaviour of a harm-doer who tries to compensate his victim. However, the definition states that such behaviours must
be done voluntarily only for the sake of restitution and without anticipation of external rewards.

Restitution responses may be considered prosocial if they are not directed towards obtaining future rewards or avoiding future punishment. In psychoanalytic theory it is assumed that a person may condemn himself because of his internalised standards of conduct (his superego). Self-condemnation can produce distress that may be relieved by compensating "good" behaviour (Tedechi, 1976).

An alternative view is that restitutive behaviour is directed toward eliciting positive evaluation from other people. Mencken (1955) said that conscience is the inner voice which warns us that someone may be watching.

Altruistic behaviour steadily increase with age during the first ten years of life. A large number of studies have indicated that selfish behaviour diminishes with age (Wright, 1942; Ugurel-Semin, 1952; Midlarsky and Bryan, 1967; Green and Schneider, 1974) found positive relationship between age and prosocial behaviour. (Rushton, 1980; Moore and Underwood, 1981; Eisenberg, 1983) also found that children become increasingly altruistic with age. Moore and Underwood (1981) explained that older children seem to show "more" altruistic behaviour. They are more likely to engage in a given act of helpfulness or sharing than are younger children and they show a greater variety of altruistic behaviour.

Handlon and Gross (1959) investigated the sharing behaviour of children in preschool, kindergarten, fourth, fifth and sixth grade. The children were paired with their classmates of the same sex and played with an apparatus from which pennies fall. When the pennies reached the children, one child was asked to leave the room and the other child was instructed to divide the pennies. The results again showed that as age increased the subjects kept fewer pennies for themselves. Thus, while the kindergarten children kept for themselves 72 percent
of the pennies, sixth-grade children kept only 40 percent and gave 60 percent to the other children.

Only a study by Staub (1970) found that children's attempts to help a distressed child increased from Kindergarten to second grade, but then decreased from second to sixth grade. Staub (1970) explained these results that while the youngest children still had not learned rules of "proper" behaviours, the older children having learned rules of "appropriate" social behaviour were inhibited from helping by fear of disapproval for potentially inappropriate conduct.

In his experiment, Severy & Davis (1971) found that older children are being socialized into other norms which might conflict with helping. The two norms which are most likely in this regard are the norms of achievement and independence, which promote competitiveness among growing children. This line of reasoning suggests that the reason for the failure to observe greater helping among older children is that although their ability to recognize the need for helping (and their ability to help) has grown, independence, achievement, and competition may be more important than helping.

Sagi & Hoffman (1976) found that infants who were 34 hours old would cry more intensely when exposed to the cries of another child than when exposed to a noise of equal intensity or a synthetic cry. While, this is not prosocial behaviour, it may be an example of some form of primitive empathy that is a precursor for the development of prosocial behaviour. Rheingold et al. (1976) found that even in a fairly restricted age range 15 to 24 months, there was an increase with age in sharing and partner play. Rheingold, et al. (1976) found in children as young as 15 months that there were examples of behaviours that could be labeled as sharing: showing or giving objects to others and partners play (i.e., giving someone an object and then playing with it while the other person has possession of it). Other studies also find examples of prosocial behaviours in quite young children. Taken as a whole, however, the behavioural
repertoire of children up to around two years of age is characterized more by self interested activity than prosocial behaviour. Taking toys from another child is more likely than sharing them. Curiosity is more apt to be the response to the injury of another child than is consoling.

A number of other studies (Midlarsky and Bryan, 1967; Elliot & Vasta, 1970; Rushton, 1975; Rushton & Wiener, 1975) have found more increases with age in children’s willingness to donate material goods to children who are absent but who are described as needy.

The data of other studies (Wright, 1942; Midlarsky & Bryan, 1967) replicated the positive relationship between age and prosocial behaviour. Several not - mutually - exclusive explanations can be offered for these results. First, as children grow older their competence in interacting with their environment increases. This competence is expressed in communication skills that make possible complex inter-exchanges and in frequent interactions with peers and adults. As a result of such maturing, children realize that adults expect children to help when help is needed. This realization may lead to an increase in the feelings of responsibility to help others who are in need. Second, an increase in helping with age may also be expected as a consequence of increase in the capacity to empathize, with others, that is, to consider event from another’s point of view and to experience vicariously another’s emotion.

Social norms are important for helping. Some social scientists have emphasized the effects of social norms in prosocial behaviour. The normative approach attempt to explain altruistic behaviours as being dictated by social norm. The norm is typically used to refer to a set of expectations, members of a group hold, concerning how one ought to behave (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959; Hornans, 1961). Basically, a norm is a shared set of expectations among a group of people indicating the proper behaviours expected of group members under specifiable conditions. Norms are somewhat like rules governing social
behaviour. Two norms that are thought to be implicated in behaviours altruistically towards a norm of social responsibility and norm of equity.

The social responsibility norm specifies that people are expected to help others who depend on them. Parents, for example, are obliged to provide sustenance for and otherwise satisfy the need of their dependent children. In one study, students playing the role of workers were more likely to assist their supervisor if that supervisor emphasized dependence upon the workers to accomplish the task (Berkowitz and Daniels, 1963; Berkowitz, 1972). Norm for altruistic behaviour has been termed as the norm of giving (Leeds, 1963), or 'the norm of social responsibility' (Berkowitz and Daniels, 1963). They also extended the concept reciprocity to encompass any dependent other not just dependent others who happen to be in exchange relationships with the benefactor. This extension of reciprocity is called the social responsibility norm, and it holds that people should help anyone in a dependent position.

Leeds (1963) proposed the existence of the norm of giving, which states that "one should want to give not because he may anticipate return but for its own value". A person who has internalized this norm has a "need-disposition to give". People who internalize the norm of "social responsibility" act on behalf of others not for material gain or social approval, but for their own self-approval, for the self-administered rewards arising from doing what is right (Goranson & Berkowitz, 1966; Schwartz, 1968, 1970; Staub, 1972; Berkowitz, 1972) consider the benefactor's acceptance of personal responsibility for the dependent other a crucial link in the chain leading toward help.

Some of the psychologists (Berkowitz & Daniels, 1963; Berkowitz & Connor, 1966; Goranson & Berkowitz, 1966; Berkowitz & Friedman, 1967) suggested that an individual should help those who depend on him and need his assistance.

Schaps (1972) demonstrated that when the cost of helping a dependent other is high, help is less likely than when cost is low. Schaps (1972)
investigated the extent to which shoe salesmen in exclusive shoe stores in the Chicago area would help a female customer with a broken heel, thus, needing a new pair of shoes, under naturally occurring conditions of high cost when the store was crowded or low cost (when the store was less crowded). The female customer (the experimenter's accomplice) was instructed to be a difficult customer. Measures were taken of the extent to which the salesmen provided good service to the customer under these varying conditions. Result indicates that under conditions of high cost, dependent customers (i.e., with the broken heels) received poor service: that helpful service was given to the dependent customer only when costs were low.

The equity norm (or social justice) specifies that people are rewarded accordingly to their efforts and should not be punished or suffer unless their actions justify it, (Homans, 1961; Adams, 1965; Lerner, 1970; Leventhal, 1976; Halffield et al., 1978; Walster et al., 1978) suggested that the equity norm is a "just world hypothesis a basic belief that people get what they deserve and deserve what they get.

Gouldner (1960), Greenberg & Cohen (1982), Hatfield & Sprecher (1983) argued that 'equity and reciprocity norms suggest that helping behaviour might best be looked at in term of justice and fairness to the needy rather than taking a generalized view that helping the needy is an important social value'.

When a person has transgressed against another or has caused another undeserved pain or loss (even inadvertently), the norm of equity would require the transgressor to provide restitution Konecni (1972), Walster et al. (1973) have applied equity theory to the behaviour of bystanders in emergency situation. Four basic assumptions are fundamental to the theory: (1) individual try to maximize their outcomes; (2) group develops and enforce equity norms to foster co-operation and maximize the probability of obtaining their goals; (3) individuals in inequitable relationships feel distress; and (4) they attempt to reduce their distress by behaviour directed toward restoring equity. While equity
appears to be important for the allocation rewards in work groups and has been shown to be important in bargaining.

Feldman (1985) asserts that people should be rewarded in proportion to their costs and should suffer in proportion to their transgressions. If a person is seen to be suffering disproportionately to what he or she deserves then equity norms require that person be helped in order to restore justice. The equity and reciprocity norms also suggest that people tend to feel justified in hurting those who have harmed them.

Staub and Sherk (1970) reported that children shared the crayon the longest time with those who had shared the most candies with them. However, nonfriends tended to behave more according to this norm than friends. Equity and reciprocity norms relating to helping behaviour have been documented in both laboratory and field studies. Helping behaviour is directly related to the amount of prior helping that individuals have received (Wilke and Lanzetta, 1970). Staub (1972) asserts that the more help they previously received, the more help they later return to the people who had helped them. Not only do people reciprocate help to a specific individual who has helped them in the past, but they are more likely to give help to others in general if they have received help, although not necessarily as extensively as they tend to give to the specific person who has helped them.

Hill (1984) concluded that individual selection has been a major factor in the evaluation of much human altruism, since individual need to be well-integrated with their group if their biological fitness is not to suffer: altruistic behaviour helps to achieve this by maintaining prestige or increasing it, depending upon the relevant role expectation.

Normative explanation of altruistic behaviours has been criticized on several grounds by Darley and Latane (1970):
1. The use of a variety of norms in order to explain altruistic behaviour weakens their explanatory usefulness because only behaviour can be described as being normative.

2. Norms often contradict one another and therefore normative explanation is often used as post factum interpretation.

3. Norms are stated too vaguely to guide any concrete act.

4. There is little evidence that individuals think about norms when they behave altruistically.

5. Experimental findings about behaviour contradict some of the normative prescription.

An important determinant of helping behaviour is the degree of empathy between a helper and a recipient of aid. Empathy occurs when someone experiences the emotions of another person. Helping behaviour can be motivated by people's observation of the distress of a victim, because observers being to put themselves in the place of the victim, feeling as if it were they who were suffering. Toi & Batson (1982); Batson and Coke (1983) defined empathy as "an emotional state elicited by and congruent with the perceived welfare of someone else." A number of psychologist (Aronfreed and Paskal, 1965; Aderman & Berkowitz, 1970; Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972; Harris & Huang, 1973; Krebs, 1975; Coke et al., 1978) indicate that feeling empathy for the person in need is an important motivation of helping.

A number of researchers (Aronfeed, 1970; Hoffman, 1975; Krebs, 1975; Batson et al., 1978) have hypothesized that motivation might be truly altruistic, that is, directed toward the endstate goal of reducing the other's distress. If the empathy-altruism hypothesis is correct, it would have broad theoretical implications, for few if any major theories of motivation allow for the possibility of truly altruistic motivation. Current theories tend to be egoistic; they
Pliner and Pliner (1973) and Hoffman (1974), in their experiment, had difficulties in distinguishing between altruistic and egoistic motivations. They pointed out that the costs associated with helping are different, depending on whether the bystander's motivation is egoistic or altruistic. If the bystander's motivation is egoistic, his or her goal is to reduce personal distress caused by seeing the other suffer. This goal can be reached by helping or by escaping (physically or psychologically) and so removing contact with the cause; either behaviour can lead to the desired goal. The likelihood that an egoistically motivated bystander will choose to help should, therefore, be a direct function of the costs associated with choosing to escape. These costs include the physical effort involved in escaping from the need situation (often minimal) and, more importantly, the feelings of distress, guilt, and shame anticipated as a result of knowing that the person in need is continuing to suffer. Thus, if the bystander were egoistically motivated and all other which to base, so radical a change in our view of human motivation, especially when they have at least two limitations. First, in each experiment the person in need was female, and because it seemed likely that subjects would be more likely to empathize with a same-sex individual, only female subjects were used. Although there is evidence that females report experiencing quantitatively more empathy than males, no evidence nor any a priori reason why empathy, when experienced, would elicit qualitatively different kinds of motivation in males than in females. This analysis suggests the reason of helping the close relatives (parents, children, siblings). Campbell (1975) suggested that social institutions, especially religion may broaden human empathic and altruistic responses.
Eisenberg - Berg and Mussen (1978) found that male subjects who helped an experimenter by acting as subjects in a long tedious experiment had significantly higher empathy scores, as measured by a written personality assessment than nonvolunteers did.

Eisenberg-Berg and Lennon (1980) found that spontaneous altruistic behaviour was negatively related to empathic measure (verbal and nonverbal), while, helping behaviour in response to a request was marginally positively related to nonverbal empathy scores.

Batson et al. (1981) tested the hypothesis that empathy leads to altruistic rather than egoistic motivation to help. Having subjects watch another female undergraduate receive electric shocks and then giving them a chance to help her by taking the remaining shocks themselves. In each of two experiments, subjects level of empathic emotion (low versus high) and their ease of escape from continuing to watch the victim suffer if they did not help (easy versus difficult). They reasoned that if empathy led to altruistic motivation, subjects feeling a high degree of empathy for the victim should be as ready to help when escape without helping was easy as when it was difficult. But if empathy led to egoistic motivation, subjects feeling empathy should be more ready to help when escape was difficult than when it was easy. Results of each experiment followed the former pattern when empathy was high and the latter pattern, when empathy was low, supporting the hypothesis that empathy leads to altruistic rather than egoistic motivation to help.

Toi and Batson (1982) had subjects observe a victim in distress. To test the link between empathy and altruism, they were instructed either to observe the victim's reactions (thought to produce low empathy) or to imagine the victim's feelings (thought to lead to high empathy). The researchers made it easy or difficult for the subject to escape the situation without helping. Toi and Batson (1982) reasoned that people who are egoistically motivated will help only when they cannot easily escape without helping. However, people who are
altruistically motivated should help regardless of how easy or difficult it is to escape the situation. Result indicates that most subjects in the low empathy condition helped only when escape from the situation was difficult. In contrast, most subjects in the high-empathy condition helped regardless of the ease of escape. These results provide considerable evidence that altruism can be motivated by empathy.

In another experiment it is found that empathy is present (on a primitive level) among even the youngest of children (Hoffman 1982; Radke et al., 1984). For example, infants less than two days old cry more intensively when they hear another infant's cry than when they hear other equally loud natural or computer-simulated sound. Brigham (1991) differentiate between altruistically motivated behaviour and egoistically motivated behaviour. He asserts that altruistically motivated helping has the goal of increasing the recipient's welfare and egoistically motivated helping is directed toward increasing the helper's own welfare.

ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION AND ALTRUISM

Child rearing practices have been shown to be important in the development of both achievement motivation and fear of failure Winterbottom (1958). He examined the stories written by 8 to 10 years old male children for the use of themes related to achievement needs. This measure of achievement motivation was then related to responses about their child-rearing practices obtained in interviews with the mothers of the children. Children with strong achievement motivation had greater demands placed on them to be independent, were given more responsibility at an earlier age, and were consistently rewarded for fulfillment of parental demands; they apparently learned that they could control their own reinforcements by accepting high standards of performance in the kinds of situations stressed by their parents.
Achievement motive is defined as a disposition to strive for success and/ or the capacity to experience pleasure contingent upon success (Atkinson, 1957; Muir and Weinstein, 1962; Berkowitz and Friedman, 1967) have observed that persons with low achievement motivation tended to have more than those who were with high achievement motivation. Latane and Darley (1970) also found the size of hometown to influence helping behaviour. People living in small towns tended to be more helpful than those living in large towns or cities. Crandall, et al. (1960) suggest that achievement behaviour is directed toward gaining approval for competence in performance on tasks for which standards of excellence are relevant.

The researches concerning need achievement have shown that

a. Achievement motive is a drive which can be aroused by inducing a situation of ego- involvement or achievement orientation. This situation produces the same kind of effect on the subject's projection as is in the case of manipulation in hunger and sex deprivation.

b. Achievement motive varies from person to person, group to group, and is open to cultural influences. Achievement motivation may be acquired through social and cultural milieus and training programs.

c. The achievement is acquired by following same process as in the case of reward and punishment.

McClelland et al. (1953) argued that the achievement motivation, like other forms of human motivation, can best be studied in the realm of fantasy. Fantasy is "free" in the sense that conditions of resting do not place external constraints on the responses that are possible. The subject can think about anything "about killing some one, committing suicide, touring the South Seas on a pogo stick, having an illegitimate child and so forth. Anything is symbolically possible".
The study of human motivation in the realm of fantasy is widely recognized as sound and promising. Basic motivations are revealed in fantasy in day dreams and night dreams. Projective tests, also, such as Murray's TAT and the Rorschach, demand upon imaginative content. McClelland (1967) has shown that people with high N. Ach. (need achievement) like to assume personal responsibility for solving problem. The reason for this is that by assuming individual responsibility they get a sense of achievement satisfaction from completing a task. But, on the other hand when success depends upon luck or circumstances beyond their control, or when they are working exclusively on someone else problems, they do no get achievement satisfaction. Their achievement satisfaction arises from having initiated the action that is successful, rather than from public recognition for an individual accomplishment. Besides, some studies have provided direct or indirect evidence that people with high N. Ach. do not respond positively to suggestions from others as to what they should do, or think or believe.

Most of researchers (McClelland et al., 1953; Atkinson, 1958) conducted with a measure (N. Ach.) which seems to be primarily an index of "motive to achieve". This research suggests that the achievement motive is a drive which can be aroused experimentally, varies between people and is acquired. It is generally assumed that the two aspects of this drive are acquired through processes of reward and punishment. Children's behaviours are related to achievement motivation. In a study of South Bihar sample of undergraduate students Prasad et al. (1979) reported that low need of achievement subjects perceived their mothers as teacher and as having more influence on them than their fathers. High need achievement subjects perceived their fathers as giving more encouragement, having more expectations, being more competitive and demanding higher standards than did mothers.

McClelland and Friedman (1952) obtained a achievement scores from the folk-tales of eight American Indian tribes and found that the age at
which independence training was given, and the emotional accompaniments of reward or punishment during that training, were important conditions for the development of need for achievement in childhood.

Lowell (1952) compared the performances of high and low scoring subjects on need achievement on a scrambled-words test and an arithmetic test. Findings suggest effect of need achievement on learning and performance which are consistent with the view that it functions as a motive variations in which relate to other behaviours.

Sears et al. (1953) suggest that those actions sometimes followed by reward and sometimes by punishment will develop into a secondary motivational system. Reinforcement leads to expectancy of reward and nonreinforcement leads to an expectation of failure to obtain.

Winterbottom (1958) studied 29 eight-ten-year-old boys and their mothers. Achievement motivation was measured by the content analysis of imaginative stories, and mothers were interviewed concerning their socialization techniques. The use of verbal and material rewards for fulfilling demands for achievement was unrelated to N. Ach. scores, but physical reward (kissing and hugging) were so related (P<.05). None of the three types of punishment considered bore any relation on N.Ach.

Hermans et al. (1972) pointed out that high achievement motivated subjects used more non-specific help and positive task-oriented reinforcements than parents of subjects with low motivation. High Achievement motivated subjects more often refused help offered by the parents. Parents of high debilitation anxiety subjects showed fewer reactions when subjects expressed insecurity, produced more negative and fewer positive tension releases and withheld more reinforcements after correct solution. Parents of high achievement motivated low debilitating anxiety subjects, had relatively big expectations of subject's performance. Ray & Najman (1988) tested a hypothesis that capitalism and altruism are opposed, using 209 supporters of 3 political parties (leftist,
moderate, conservative and rightist) in Australia. Scores on scales of altruistic compassion and of materialistic achievement motivation showed a difference in compassion between rightist and leftist subjects of borderline significance.

LOCUS OF CONTROL AND ALTRUISM

Rotter (1954, 1966) has applied the dimension of internal or external control and refers to "the degree to which the individual believe that what happens to him results from his own behaviour versus the degree to which he believes that what happens to him is the result of luck, chance, fate, or forces beyond his control". In other word, a person with a internal control orientation typically attributes his outcomes to his own behaviour, while a person with a external control orientation attributes the causes of his outcomes to his own behaviour, while a person with a external control orientation attributes because of his outcomes to chance, fate, or the acts of others. Whether outcomes represent success or failure is not the issue; what is important is the expectancy that one can do things to produce desired effects. The person with an external orientation does not view himself as able to influence what happen to him; he does not expect reward for solving task or performing well, nor does he expect punishment and disapproval for failing; whatever happens, and he believes he has no control over events.

Rotter (1966) defined internal locus of control as the belief that outcomes of events are contingent upon one's own behaviour, whereas external locus of control is the generalized expectancy that outcomes are determined by chance, fate or luck or powerful others. According to Rotter's theoretical system, behaviour occurs as a function of the individual's 'expectancy' that a given act will result in reinforcement (or punishment) and the value or importance he or she assign to that particular reinforcement (or punishment). People are assumed to act so as to receive highly valued rewards and to avoid extremely unpleasant
punishments. Rotter also suggested that when a person is intrinsically motivated, the locus of causality for that behaviour is internal, whereas when the person is extrinsically motivated, the locus of causality is external. A related concept, and one which is sometimes confused with locus of causality is "locus of control." Rotter (1966) proposed that each of us develops a broad set of beliefs about who or what controls such rewards and punishments in our lives.

There is sound reason to believe that altruistic behaviour is related to locus of control, a trait which describes, the degree to which we believe that we cause or control, the event in our lives. If we believe that we are the cause of most events, we have a highly internal locus of control, if we believe that most events are caused by luck, fate or powerful others, we have a highly external locus of control.

One recurring theme in social psychological research is the extent to which people perceive themselves as in control of events. In some situations, one obviously does have control one can decide whether or not to turn on turn on his TV set and which channel to watch. In other situations, one obviously does not have control as a passenger on an airplane, his safety depends entirely on the actions of other people, including mechanics, air traffic controllers, and the pilot. Where control is less obvious, some individuals generally believe that their own actions play a large role in maximizing good outcomes, and minimizing bad outcomes, a concept termed internal locus of control. Others believe that what happens to them depend on luck, an idea known as external locus of control. Lefcourt (1976) has described various researches which used the locus of control variables. They described it, as a real trait of person.

Bialer (1961) developed a scale to measure locus of control in children and theorized that internal child was "more sensitive to the competitive aspects of situation as well as more motivated to attain personal success than was the external child. The internal children's "greater awareness of their own
roles in their own successes and failure cause them to strive harder. This may be described as a growth in competitiveness.

Crandall et al. (1962) concerning that internal children spent more time at intellectual free-play activities consisting of competitive games and showed more intense striving at these activities than did external children. Lefcourt (1972) expected that "Internals" have been found to be more achievement oriented than "externals". Rotter (1966) argued that internals set more realistic for themselves on the basis of success and failure feedback than do externals. These differences are not attributable to intelligence. Although internals score scholastically at a higher level than externals, there is only a moderately positive correlation between intelligence and internal control orientation (Crandall, Katkovsky & Preston, 1960). Lessing (1969) also pointed out that internals have higher grade (when IQ scores are controlled) point averages in colleges than do externals.

Katkovsky et al. (1967) argued that parents of internals (those with an internal locus of control) are found to be protective, affectionate, and approving of their offspring. It seems that the parents of internals expect a lot from their children and are affectionately involved in rewarding their activities. The most important thing the child learns is that reinforcements are contingent on behaviour. Davis and Phares (1969) and Johnson and Kilmann (1975) pointed out that external, in contrast, experience more restrictive parental control, rejection, and hostile criticism. Study by Johnson et al. (1973) found that internals are more resistant to influence and maintain personal control, whereas externals are more conforming to influence and responsive to demand characteristics.

Collins (1974) asserts that whether a person feels powerful or powerless may depend upon the nature of the situation. This study indicates that the paper and pencil measure of internal-external control may, in fact, measure four different factors; the difficult-easy world, the just-unjust world the predictable-unpredictable world, and the politically responsive-unresponsive
world. Thus, internal control may reflect a person’s expectations of success in a difficult (complex problem solving) and just (effort and ability payoff) world. The same person may display an external control orientation with regard to political matters because he considers local, national, or international events to be unpredictable and policy to be unresponsive to his efforts and skill. The internal-external locus of control conception of personality has obvious implications for social influence. The external person should rely on others because he believes reinforcements depend on them and not on himself, while an internal person should rely on himself and resist the attempts of others to influence him. Gore (1962) asked subjects to view a series of pictures of people in ambiguous situation and to write stories about what they were doing, what led up to the present scene, and so on. In a subtle attempt to motivate the subjects to write longer stories, the experimenter smiled frequently and used warm voice intonations during his instructions. In a second condition, the experimenter did not make such overtures. External wrote longer stories than internals only when the tacit influence attempts were made by the experimenter.

Gore and Rotter (1963) found that students at a Southern Negro College were more likely to volunteer for a social protest movement if the perceived sources of reinforcement as internally rather than externally guided. Subjects high on internal control were more likely to volunteer as freedom riders, marchers or petition signers than subjects who perceived others as primary agents of reinforcement. Rotter (1966) hypothesized that people who view reinforcements as contingent on their own behavior (internals) are better adjusted than those who see reinforcement as determined by fate, chance, or powerful others (externals). However, he did theorize that there might be a curvilinear relationship between adjustment and the I.E. dimension such that individuals at either end of the dimension might be more maladjusted than those in the middle range. Externals are found to improve in performance after it is made clear to them that they are in control of a situation. It appears that mal
explicit to internals that they are not exerting control results in such a debilitated performance that they perform worse than externals.

A person who believes he can control his own destiny would display more selfcontrol than someone who believes his life is controlled by outside forces. Walls and Smith (1970) found a positive correlation between internal orientation and delay of gratification as indicated by the choice of a delayed, larger reward over an immediate, smaller reward. In all these studies none of the measures come close to being significantly related to helping behaviour. All these researchers suggested that situational variables appear to be more crucial than personality variables in determining helping in emergency.

Ubbink and Sadava (1974) have described a study of locus of control and helping behaviour. They found that the locus of control dimension (Rotter's and Levenson's scales) showed a tendency for helpers to be more internally controlled. Staub (1974) assessed subject's tendency to ascribe responsibility, social responsibility, beliefs about human nature, level of moral development, values, and locus of control. He found that all these measures were significantly related to altruistic behaviour.

Levenson and Mahler (1975) pointed out that the more people felt they were controlled by powerful others, the more they perceived others as untrustworthy and the less they saw them as altruistic. Internality and chance were unrelated to attitude towards others. While the term on the 'Powerful Others Scale' do not explicitly imply the malevolence (or benevolence) of the "others" this group responded in such a way as to indicate that when otherwise expected to be in control they were more apt to be seen as malevolent.

A large number of studies (Madsen & Shapira, 1970; Madsen, 1971; Kagan & Madsen, 1971, 1972; Avellar & Kagan, 1976; Kagan et al., 1977; Kagan, 1978) have demonstrated that children from certain social classes, and ethnic and racial group (e.g., Chinese-Americans, Mexican, Mexican-Americans, Afro-Americans) are more cooperative than are Anglo-Americans children. These
same group also consistently score in the direction of external locus of control on various measures, whereas the relatively non-cooperative Anglo-Americans tend to score in the internal direction. Rotter (1975) suggested that these findings might indicate that the locus of control orientation operates as a motivational set. Externals, believing they have little control over the events, come into a situation already prepared to be helpless. Thus, they display dependency on others and a form of passive co-operation. Internals, on the other hand, believing in their own control over events are prepared to be effective. This leads them to adopt a more aggressive (competitive) style of play.

Recent study by Luciani (1992), explored the initial motives of elderly to volunteers in human service settings and compared those motives to the reported predicted motives of nonvolunteers in a post facto design using both qualitative and quantitative methods. Findings from the triangulation of between-group and within-group data were gathered in structured interviews with a purposive sample of 432 elderly (at least 55 years old) and semi-structured interview with a total of 15 volunteers, nonvolunteers and volunteer coordinators. The sample of 244 elderly volunteer (at least 1 hour of service every other week in a human service agency) and 188 nonvolunteers were from five eastern states. These major theories of adaptation to aging (disengagement) activity and continuity and motivational determinants from previous empirical research (altruistic, psychosocial and agenciey/contextual) were empirically tested to determine similarities and differences between elderly volunteers and nonvolunteers regarding demographic characteristics, psychosocial traits and motives to volunteer. Scales measuring life satisfaction, self-esteem, intrinsic religious motives, locus of control, and liking people served as psychosocial measures. The Motivation To Volunteer (MTV) Scale served as the instrument to assess motives. No one theory of aging emerged as the best predictor of volunteerism, although some support was found for both activity and continuity theories. An exploratory factor analysis on the MTV scale resulted in seven
motivational factors. Those factors related to reciprocity, connection and
employment significantly differentiated (P < .05) volunteers and nonvolunteers,
as did the total average score on the MTV scale. A comparison of volunteers and
nonvolunteers in a three stage logistic regression model, using backward
deletion, found significant differences in marital status, education, income and
employment status as well as reciprocity and employment-related motives.
Separate models based on gender revealed differences in paradictors of
volunteerism and significant differences in the coefficients of prior volunteer
experience. The richness of the qualitative data validated findings that reciprocity-
related motives were most influential across the entire sample. The discussion
includes ethical cosideration and practice and policy implications.

Sharma and Rosha (1992) investigated the effect of self
actualization and locus of control of benefactor on altruism. Result shows that
the main effect of self-actualization was significant for altruism scores. The
interaction effect of self-actualization and locus of control was significant for
altruism scores, indicating that subjects scoring high on self-actualization and
having internal locus of control scores maximum on an altruism scale. Bar-Tal &
Bar-Zohar (1977) found that internality is positively related to school performance,
cognitive development and various kinds of achievement in several cultures. Even
in graduate school, internals do well; they are more likely than externals to
complete their requirements and obtain a Ph.D.

SOCIAL REINFORCEMENT AND ALTRUISM

Weiss et al. (1973) say poeple will actually learned in instrumental
conditioned responses, the sole reinforcement for which is to deliver another
human being from suffering. Krebs (1970) suggested that "although specific
reward do not always follow altruistic responses, altruistic behaviour can still be a
function of reinforcement." Ferster, (1971) indicated that in the most prevalent
schedule of reinforcement found in human affairs (ratio reinforcement) the reinforcement occurs as a function of a certain number of instances of a performance.

Rushton and Teachman (1978) argued that children repeat altruistic behaviour that has been rewarded in past and eliminate egoistic or selfish behaviour to the extent that reinforcement has been effective. Moss and Page (1972) have also demonstrated that such acts of helping are strongly affected by whether previous act of helping were rewarded or punished.

Social reinforcement is a third category of reinforcer (first is learned reinforcers and second is conditioned reinforcers). A pat on the back, a smile, attention, approval, prestige, praise, and affection can function as social reinforcers, reinforcers that depend on other people. Some psychologists believe that social reinforcers are conditioned reinforcers; other consider them primary reinforcers. They are frequently very influential in modifying human operant behaviour.

Social reinforcements are intermittent because the reinforcements mediated by another organism are less reliable than those produced by the physical environment. This arises because the social reinforcement depends upon behaviour processes in the reinforcer which are not always under good control by the reinforcee. Bandura (1969) suggests that social reinforcement is particularly important in socialization process.

Most human behaviour is social because it has its effect on other organisms which in turn arrange the reinforcement. This is in contrast to the physical environment, which reinforces directly. The same reinforcement paradigm may be extended to larger groups of people, such as social institutions and agencies, less well defined group involved in social practices, codes of conduct, etc....
Durkheim (1951) also asserts that the absence of any reinforcing consequences for the actor is a commonly assumed criterion for the altruistic behaviour. From the point of view, it is essential to assume that altruistic act are reinforced through the affective value of their outcomes for others, despite that they may have positive consequences for the actor or that they may even have directly aversive consequences.

Midlarsky and Bryan (1967) showed that the training effect was not due solely to a desire to appear nice to the experimenter since the experimenter would have no way to know about the anonymous donation. Aronfreed and Paskal (1965) also examined the role of expression and the social reinforcement of the experimenter in affecting the child's altruism. The results indicate that the children who have received both the social reinforcement and an expression of positive affect scored higher on altruism than those who have received only the social reinforcement or only an expression of positive affect. The implication of these findings is that the child's positive affect (produced by social reinforcement) had become associated with the experimenter's expression of the conditioning process. Children who participated in the experiment by Doland and Adelberg (1967), Bryan et al. (1971) and Midlarsky et al. (1973) demonstrated this influencing strength of social reinforcement upon altruistic behaviour. A review by Stevenson (1965) clearly indicates the children's behaviour can be effectively affected by social agents including adults and peers. Therefore, presence of prosocial behaviour in the child's repertoire may imply among other things, two positive conclusions. First, that the child is responsive to social reinforcement, and second, that the child has, at some time, been in the appropriate social learning situation - one in which he has received social reinforcement upon exhibiting prosocial responses, Prastridge et al. (1987) also found that frequency of occurrence of a target behaviour was increased when reinforced.

Winterbottom (1958) examined the stories written by 8-10 years-old male children for the use of themselves related to achievement needs. This
measure of achievement motivation was then related to responses about their
cild-rearing practices obtained in interviews with the mothers of the children.
Children with strong achievement motivation had greater demands placed on
them to be independent were given more responsibility at an earlier age, and
were consistently rewarded for fulfillment of parental demands, they apparently
learned that they could control their own reinforcement by accepting high
standards of performance in the kinds of situation stressed by their parents. A
number of researchers (e.g. Aronfreed, 1968 and Rosenhan, 1969) have argued
that the acquisition of altruistic responses requires a history of reinforcement and
the development of a self reward mechanism. Fischer (1963), Midlarsky et al.
(1973) have shown that when helping is rewarded either materially or with social
reinforcers the tendency of children to be altruistic in a particular situation
increases.

Some studies (Elliot and Vasta, 1970; Harris, 1970) indicate that
when a child sees a model being rewarded or praised after behaving altruistically,
the child may not always imitate the model's behaviour. However, people are
especially likely to imitate an altruistic model who rewards him - or herself by
saying such things as "This really makes me feel good or "It is really great to do
this".

Bandura (1971) summarized the functions of the reinforcements in
learning as reinforcement convey information to performers about the types of
responses that are appropriate, selective reinforcement directs performers:
attention to correlatd environmental stimuli that signify probable response
consequence, previous reinforcement create expectations that motivate actions
designed to secure desired rewards and to avoid injurious outcomes; punishing
experiences can endow persons, place and things with fear arousing properties
that inhibit responsiveness; a given history of positive or negative reinforcement
can alter people; self valuation in ways that effect their willingness to exhibit
behaviours that are discrepant with their self attitudes and the determination
with which they perform them, and finally; the treatment one receives alters liking and respect for the reinforcement agent.

C' Connor (1972) found that the modeling film was more effective in promoting social interactions than was a two week program consisting of five hours of social reinforcement.

Weiss et al. (1973) pointed out that people will learn an instrumental conditioned response, the reinforcement for which is the deliverance of another human being from suffering. Three experiments demonstrated this basic effects ($P < .01$ or better), as well as altruistic analogs of magnitude or reinforcement ($P < .003$) and intermittent shock ($P < .001$). The finding that people will not only help others who are in need but find it rewarding to do so, indicates that altruism is even more deeply rooted in people than had been previously demonstrated.

Sprafkin et al. (1975) investigated that possibility that regularly broadcast entertainment TV program can facilitate prosocial behavior in children. Fifteen male and 15 female 1st graders were individually exposed to 1 of 3 1/2 - hr TV program: a program from the Lassie series which included a dramatic example of a boy helping a dog, a program from the family situation comedy series the Brady Bunch. The effects of the programming were assessed by presenting each subject with a situation that required him to choose between continuing to play a game for self-gain and helping puppies in distress; subject exposed to the Lassie program with the helping scene helped for significantly more time than those exposed to either of the other programs.

Voss (1974) put the child in isolation for a short period of time, such as 20 or 30 minutes and then having him perform a task under social reinforcement condition. He found that children who had experienced social isolation were influenced more by social reinforcement effect than were children who had not spent time in social isolation. The results suggested that the reinforcer yielded greater effects in the social-isolation condition.
Pastridge et al. (1987) observed 5-6-year-old boys while they were playing with a specially designed sand machine for 24, 10 minutes sessions over 6 weeks. The machine was designed to structure the contingencies of reinforcement in 3 ways:

a. Prosocial and non-social behaviour were reinforced equally.

b. Only prosocial behaviours were reinforced; and

c. Both type of behaviours were reinforced but prosocial behaviour was reinforced more powerfully.

Results indicate that the frequency of occurrence of a target behaviour (TB) was increased; even when both target and non target behaviour were enforced, if the reinforcement of the TB was the more powerful.

Rushton and Teachman (1978) say that when a child helps a parent with some household chore, gives a piece of candy to a sibling, or tries to soothe a friend who has been hurt. The parent may reward the child with money, sweets or other objects or, more often, with social reinforcement: "That's a nice thoughtful child. Isn't that nice of you to help Billy". By the same token, a child who does not help or share is likely to be chided or even punished. Learning theory holds that children repeat the altruistic or cooperative behaviour that has been rewarded and eliminate selfish behaviour to the extent that reinforcement has been effective. Positive reinforcement can promote increase in helping behaviour. Research (Moss & Page, 1972) indicates that punishment diminishes helping behaviours in both adults and children. In a field experiment in which a female confederate approached people on a street in Dayton, Ohio, and asked direction's. In one condition, she provided punishment when the person responded by saying, "I can't understand what you're saying. Never mind, I'll ask someone else". Further down the street, a second confederate dropped a small bag, but continued walking, pretending, not to notice that the bag had been dropped. Subjects who had been "punished were significantly less apt to provide
aid to the second confederate than those who were proffered gratitude from the first confederate.

Peterson et al. (1984) love investigated in Exp. I, parents of 84 preschool, 1st-, and 6th-grade children who were asked to make judgement regarding situations in which they would wish their child to behave prosocially. Factors relevant to 3 sources of influence, including characteristics of the situation, recipient and donors were examined, 10 helping and 10 sharing opportunities, ordered from high to low cost, were presented. Eleven potential recipients of 4 age level is (younger, same-age and older children, and adults) and 3 familiarity levels (Unknown, familiar or family members) were suggested for each prosocial opportunity. Parented limitations on children's altruism were a direct function of the situational cost involved and the age and familiarity of the recipient. Exp. II, with the parents of 46 preschools and 1st- 6th graders, largely replicated the main effects and simple interactions obtained in Exp.I. In addition, interviews conducted with the subjects who participated in Exp.II revealed that subjects had cognate rationales to support the limitations they imposed on children's altruism. These rationales and the implications of parent's limitations on children's altruism for natural acquisition of prosocial behaviour and for prosocial training programs are described. Winett (1987) pointed out that social learning theory behaviour analysis, and communication theories are shown to be operative in successful prosocial and health promotion TV, Spots and programs and shown to be applicable to news media efforts. Effective elements of behaviour change efforts are drawn from the framework and contracted with ineffective efforts. The problem of media access in distressed in relation to regulatory policy as well as two ways to bypass the current broadcast system and to deliver specialised content to target audience.

Forge & Phemister (1987) studied the effect of prosocial cartoons on young children's behaviour. The hypothesis that prosocial program models would elicit more prosocial behavior than would neutral program models was supported.