

A STUDY OF INVOLVED IN HELPING BEHAVIOUR

DR. ANJANA SINHA

M.A. Ph.d.

Muzaffarpur

INTRODUCTION

Let us consider an example; a man walking on the bank of a river hears cries for help. He reacts immediately to the perception of that need in a behaviour sequence designed to help the boy. If as a consequence he feels good about what he did, it does not matter. If as a consequence he feels good about what he did, it does not matter, he responded because of the need of the victim which is end-in-itself behaviour. The boy saved might be a son of an affluent man and the benefactor might get a reward, or national press coverage or coverage from electronic media. True, but the reason for the behaviour was altruistic. May be the benefactor could not swim, as such he sought someone who could swim or found a boat. The essence is, he helped because the other person required that help.

Thus it seems reasonable to agree with Severy (1972) that altruism is helping, motivated by other persons being in need. Hence, altruistic behavior is intentional, is an end-in-itself and is done because the other person needs it. On the conceptual analysis of altruism, Kerbs and Wispe seem to agree with Severy on following points:-

Internationality seems to be the basic determinants of altruism. The most relevant framework describing intentional actions would appear to be Ossario's (1966,1973) work on the paradigm of intentional action.

They agree on the emphasis on the "Other" in altruism. Further, they agree that the potential for the self-sacrifice is commonly assumed in such behaviour. But Severy still questions whether "a willingness to share another's pain is necessary for a conception of altruism.

They agreed that "Pro-social behaviour" is the global term that encompasses more specific forms of such behaviour. Severy believes that helping behaviour is the next most general with "altruistic" being the special case (based on intentionality).

Severy, Kerbs and Wispe agree on their cognizance of individual difference – in personality behavior and cognitive style. Every suggests that these differences are evinced in helping behaviour.

To sum up the issue of definition, we may conclude that unlike instances of helping where a person might believes that the potential costs are low and the possibility for obtaining rewards are high, altruistic behaviour involves helping — sometimes even inviting great risks — even though the act is not likely to be rewarded, recognized or even appreciated. While some forms of helping may involve selfish motives the altruistic act is selfless. It puts another persons interests above one's own and acting as he does without a desire or expectation of being repaid in any form. In that sense, altruism is a special form of pro-social behaviour. It would be proper to refer the dictionary meaning of altruism, is unselfish concern for the welfare of others". (Webester).

Hypothesis

Since the literature investigating the role of n-power and n-approval in the process of helping is scanty, and no clear cut evidences are available in determining the helping behavior, was made in the present research work. This small piece of research work is significant in a sense of having an applied utility.

Design

In the present study, the independent variables of sex, power and approval were manipulated. For this 2x2x2 factorial design with 20 Ss in each cell (N=160) was used. Two levels of power and approval were high and low. The design in tabular form is as following:

			Need Power
Need Approval		High	Low
Males	High	20	20
Males	Low	20	20
Females	High	20	20
Females	Low	20	20

The effect of these measures were observed on the amount of time spent in helping the E. The attribution responses of Ss were also measured.

Sample

A representative sample of about 1000 (500 males and 500 females) students studying at the 10th, 11th and 12th levels in the different higher secondary schools situated at Muzaffarpur (Bihar) was listed for the present study. The age of the subjects ranged from 15 to 18 years and the sample consisted of an equal numbers of males and females. Firstly, all the subjects were given Self-Report altruism Scale. Then the subjects who were a average on altruism (Mean \pm 1SD) were retained. For this selection mean and SD for males and females were computed separately. The mean score for females was 75.46 and SD was 10.94. Then these average on altruism subjects were given power motivation and approval motivation scales. After that Mean and SD for males on power motivation (Mean = 44.46,SD=6.55) and females on power motivation (Mean = 19.94, SD = 4.97) and approval motivation (Mean = 43.58, SD = 7.31) was computed separately. Then the male subjects who were high on power (+25) and high on approval (+51) and low on power (-15) and low on approval (-36) and

females high on power (+25) and high on approval (+51) and low on power (-15) and low on approval (-36) were retained. Then out of these males and females high and low on power and high approval, 20 Ss with high power and low approval, 20 Ss with low power and high approval, 20 Ss with low power and low approval) and 80 females (20 Ss with high power and high approval, 20 Ss with high power and low approval, 20 Ss with low power and high approval and 20 Ss with low power and low approval) were selected randomly for the study.

Tools

- Self-Report Altruism scale: The Hindi version of Self-Report Altruism scale (SRA scale) was developed by Khanna, Singh and Rushton (1993). It contains 20 closed ended items, with five alternative choices. Reliability of the scale is .83. Construct validity is $r = 0.45$ ($df = 23$, $P < .01$) (See Annexure-III).
- Power motive scale: Power motive scale developed by Dhapola and Singh (1990), containing by closed ended items having two alternative choice “Yes” or “No” was employed this investigation. The test retest reliability is .72 (Computed by spearman Brown formula) (See Annexure – IV)
- Approval motive scale : Approval motive scale was developed by Tripathi and Tripathi (1980). It contains 72 closed ended items with three alternative choices “Yes”, “No” and “Undecided”. The test retest reliability is .82, split half reliability is .92 (computed by Brown formula) (See Annexure- V)

Result

The subjects which are high on approval motivation are more conforming to situational demands and group pressures (Crowne & Marlowe, 1961; Strickland & Crowne, 1962). So one possible reason for helping behaviour of high n-approval people is that when one person asks for help from these people, because the situation is demanding help form them, they readily help the others. By saying no to

help seeker, they would be rejected socially, and social rejection is frustrating for them, while there is a wide spread desire for social approval (Allpprt, 1924).

On the basis of above discussion, the high score on altruism amongst those high on n-power can also be interpreted and understood in terms of transformation of n-power in n-approval. Sometimes power motive also takes the form of approval motive. Because fulfilling power motivation directly by aggressive means is not socially encouraged. So, person tries to express his or her motive in a more sophisticated way, by helping others. So that he or she can have better Image in the society.

For testing the second part of both the hypotheses, when the Ss were asked to attribute their motivation for helping behaviour, most of the subjects attributed their helping behaviour to motive on which they scored high. **Table I.**

Showing the percentage of attribution for males and females.

Motivation	Total Ss	Attribution No. of	Attribution Motive		Undecided
High on both motives	40	35	Both power and approval	87.5%	12.5%
High on power low on approval	40	36	Power motive	90%	10%
Low on power High on approval	40	38	Approval Motivation	95%	5%
Low on power Low on approval	40	37	None	92.5%	7.5%

The above table indicates that 87.5% of the Ss who scored high on both the motives, attributed their behaviour to both the motives. Similarly 90% and 95% a of high power and high approval scores respectively attributed their helping behaviour to the motive on which they scored high. Those who were low on both the motives attributed their behaviour none of the motives as they also scored very lowest on helping behaviour. So, it can be said that Ss who helped E in a simulated situation were also a ware about their motivation for helping. A similar kind of trend was observed while separately analyzing (males and females) the attribution of helping behaviour to various motives. (Table IV & V)**Table — II**

Showing the percentage of attribution

' Motivation	Total Ss	Attribution No. of Ss	Attribution Motive	%	Undecided
High on both motives	20	18	Both power	90%	10%
High on power low on approval	20	19	Power motive	95%	5%
Low on power High on approval	20	20	Approval Motivation	100%	
Low on power Low on approval	20	18	None	90%	10%

Table —III

Showing the percentage of attribution for females.

' Motivation	Total Ss	Attribution No. of Ss	Attribution Motive	%	Undecided
High on both motives	20	17	Both power	85%	15%
High on power low on approval	20	17	Power motive	85%	15%
Low on power High on approval	20	18	Approval Motivation	90%	10%
Low on power Low on approval	20	18	None	95%	5%

Since the percentage of the right responses was so high, so there was no need to apply chi-square test.

Therefore, the second part of both the hypotheses is also confirmed.

As far as self perception is concerned we perceive ourselves in the same manner as we perceive others (Bem, 1967, 1972). We first determine, whether the environment caused the behavior through some external force. If this does not seem likely, we then assume that the behavior has been caused. by some internal motive or personality traits. In this investigation the perception of the helping behavior has been perceived as related to internal motives.

Reference

- ❖ Beven, W. (1963). The pooling mechanism and the phenomena of reinforcement. In O.J. Harvey (Ed.) Motivation and social interaction. New York: Ronald.

- ❖ Clary, E.G., and Synder, M.A. (1991) A functional analysis of altruism and prosocial behavior: the case of volunteerism. In MS. Clard (E.d.) Prosocial behavior Newbury park, CA : Sage.
- ❖ Clerk, K.B. (1980) Empathy: A neglected topic psychological research: American Psychologist , 35, 187-190.
- ❖ Cohn. A.R. (1959) Some implications of self – esteem for social influence. In C.I. Hovland and I.L. Janis (Eds.) Personality and persuasibility. New Haven: Yale University Press, pp 102-120.
- ❖ Cohn, L.K. and crowne, D.P. (1964) Instigation to aggression, emotional arousal and defensive emulation. Journal of Personality, 32,163-179.
- ❖ Crandall, V.J. Kalokovsky, W., and Peterson, A. (1960) A conceptual formulation of some research of children's achievement development. Child Development, 31, 787-797.
- ❖ Crowne, D.P. and liverant S. (1963) Conformity under varying condition of personal commitment. Journal of Abnormal and social psychology, 66,547-535.
- ❖ Crowne, D.P., and Marlowe, D. (1960) A new scale of social desirability independent of psychology. Journal of Consultant Psychology, 24,349-354.
- ❖ Crowne, D.P. and Marlowe, D. (1964) The approval Motive Studies in evaluative dependence. New York. wiley.
- ❖ Corwn, D.P. and Strickland, B.R. (1961). The conditioning of verbal behaviour as a function of the need for social approval, journal of abnormal and Social Psychology, 63,395-401.
- ❖ DePaulo, B.M. (1962) Non-verbal behaviour and self presentation. Psychological Bulletin, 111, 203-243.
- ❖ Deutsch, F.M. and Lamberti, M. (1986) Does social approval increase helping ? Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 12,149-157