

The Effects of Prosocial Tendencies on Interpersonal and Personal Interactions

...

Hannah Spilhaus

Introduction

What is prosocial behavior?

→ Voluntary behaviors intended to benefit another individual.

◆ Ex: helping, sharing and providing comfort

→ Applicable in

◆ interpersonal relationships

◆ interactions among individuals/groups without close ties



Introduction

Prosocial behavior in society

- Present in many different aspects of society such as
 - ◆ Social standards
 - ◆ Political standards
- Essential in understanding what leads a person to make a decision.
- Prosociality is characterized by behaviors that will benefit another person but not yourself

Review of Literature

There is a framework that suggested that moral behaviors can result from an internal balancing act of good and bad behavior.

Sachdeva, S., Iliev, R., & Medin, D. L. (2009). Sinning Saints and Saintly Sinners: The Paradox of Moral Self-Regulation. *Psychological Science*, 20(4), 523–528.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02326.x>www.jstor.org/stable/25482392.

Review of Literature

People are more willing to help when they have persistently experienced good moral behavior, moral behavior is controlled by a negative feedback mechanism

ie: “treat people the way you want to be treated”

Daryl C, C., Payne, K. B . (2012). “The Cost of Callousness: Regulating Compassion Influences the Moral Self-Concept.” *Psychological Science*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 225–229., www.jstor.org/stable/41441777.

Review of Literature

Moral behaviors are controlled by a self-regulated process that creates a “damage control” response in social situations.

Conway, P., Peetz, J. (2012). “When Does Feeling Moral Actually Make You a Better Person? Conceptual Abstraction Moderates Whether Past Moral Deeds Motivate Consistency or Compensatory Behavior.” *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*,

Review of Literature

There are different directions prosocial behavior can extend.

1. Paying it back
2. Paying it forward

Geher, G. (2014). "How We've Evolved to Pay It Back and Pay It Forward." *Psychology Today*, Sussex Publishers, www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/darwins-subterranean-world/201407/how-weve-evolved-pay-it-back-and-pay-it-forward.

Hypothesis

Individuals are more likely to help a target individual who has demonstrated to be helpful in the past

Methodology

Methodology was based off of a study on the evidence of codependency in women with an alcoholic parent

- study conceptualized codependency and its development among women being raised in an environment of an alcoholic parent.
- proposed that women who are used to conforming to the demands of an exploitive person would be more likely to help an experimenter portrayed as exploitative

Methodology

Demographics

- ◆ Between-groups design on adolescents from NPHS school between the ages of 13-18
- ◆ Sample size of 133 participants, freshman to seniors
- ◆ Advanced and regular placement classes

Methodology

- Participants were randomly chosen and assigned to one of two conditions.
 - Positive condition and negative condition
- Both conditions:
 - included vignettes about a target person whom they had the option of helping with a homework related task
 - vignettes described an interaction with “Paul” who helped someone with a homework related task
 - then explained how “Paul” was looking for help.

Vignette (positive): 0

I know this guy named Paul, he is about 5'11" and has short brown hair, brown eyes and wears glasses. His favorite sport is baseball and he knows how to play the guitar. Paul is a really good student, he likes math and science. He also has a younger brother and an older sister, every year his family goes on a trip to the beach for a week. This year Paul said he wants to learn to surf. Last year Paul helped me with a project for school. He was super helpful. He always came excited to work and was super encouraging and supportive. I got a really good grade on the project because of his help and positive attitude.

Paul is doing a project for school now and needs help. He asked me to help him gather data. Please answer the following questions for Paul's project.

Vignette (negative): 1

I know this guy named Paul, he is about 5'11" and has short brown hair, brown eyes and wears glasses. His favorite sport is baseball and he knows how to play the guitar. Paul is a really good student, he likes math and science. He also has a younger brother and an older sister, every year his family goes on a trip to the beach for a week. This year Paul said he wants to learn to surf. Last year Paul helped me with a project for school. He was super unhelpful. He would show up with a really bad attitude and act as if it was the last place he wanted to be. He would continuously put down my work and make me feel bad about my project. I got a really bad grade on the project because of his lack of help and attitude.

Paul is doing a project for school now and needs help. He asked me to help him gather data. Please answer the following questions for Paul's project.

Survey

AGE: _____

GENDER(circle one): M F OTHER

RELIGION(if comfortable): _____

PARENTS MARITAL STATUS(if you are comfortable answering):

Together separated

How much time are you willing to give to Paul (in minutes): CIRCLE ONE

0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70 75 80 85 90 95 100 105 110 115 120 140 160 180

Why are you willing to donate that amount of time: _____

Results

Significant main effect for the reputation of Paul ($F(1, 128) = 618.040, p = .026$).

There was also a significant main effect for gender of participant ($F(1, 128) = 3.512, p = .033$).

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Paul</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Deviation</u>	<u>N</u>
<u>Male</u>	<u>Positive reputation</u>	<u>67.2308</u>	<u>45.91759</u>	<u>26</u>
	<u>Negative reputation</u>	<u>23.1000</u>	<u>31.02029</u>	<u>30</u>
	<u>Total</u>	<u>43.5893</u>	<u>44.26029</u>	<u>56</u>
<u>Female</u>	<u>Positive reputation</u>	<u>79.5714</u>	<u>57.38635</u>	<u>35</u>
	<u>Negative reputation</u>	<u>38.8537</u>	<u>40.51269</u>	<u>41</u>
	<u>Total</u>	<u>57.6053</u>	<u>52.77931</u>	<u>76</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>Positive reputation</u>	<u>74.3115</u>	<u>52.74958</u>	<u>61</u>
	<u>Negative reputation</u>	<u>32.5833</u>	<u>37.26938</u>	<u>72</u>
	<u>Total</u>	<u>51.7218</u>	<u>49.47227</u>	<u>133</u>

Table 1: The Reputation of Paul's Effect on Gender

Results

A correlation was run between degree of religiosity and proclivity to help

- result yielded a significant finding ($r(153) = .15, p = .04$)

There were no significant effects for age or parents marital status on the amount of time willing to donate to Paul.

Discussion

Prosocial behaviors tend to be exerted when an individual feels like they were treated well in return

The participants who received the positive reputation of Paul felt obligated to help him with some homework related task, but the participants who received the negative reputation Paul didn't feel obligated to help him.

The hypothesis was supported by the results of the experiment.

- The effect of prosociality on interpersonal and personal relationships, even those of a virtuous fashion are extremely prominent in how a person will react and the levels of prosocial behaviors that will be exerted.

Discussion

- Evidence supports that prosocial behavior and religion having effects on each other
 - much evidence to support that prosocial behavior and religion have an effect on each other it is very hard to say which is affecting the other.
- On average women were more helpful than men.
 - consistent with other research conducted in the field.

Conclusion

The effect of prosociality, even those of a virtuous fashion, are extremely prominent in how a person will react and the levels of prosocial behaviors that will be exerted.

Future Work

Examine the effects and influences of prosocial behaviors on religion and gender.

Works Cited

1. Ahmed, A. (2009). Are Religious People More Prosocial? A Quasi-Experimental Study with "Madrasah" Pupils in a Rural Community in India. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 48(2), 368-374. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40405622>
2. Bell, C. M., Hughes-Jones, J. (2008). "Power, Self-Regulation and the Moralization of Behavior." *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 83, no. 3, pp. 503–514. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/25482392.
3. Daryl C. C., Payne, K. B. (2012). "The Cost of Callousness: Regulating Compassion Influences the Moral Self-Concept." *Psychological Science*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 225–229., www.jstor.org/stable/41441777.
4. Coeckelbergh, M. (2006). "Regulation or Responsibility? Autonomy, Moral Imagination, and Engineering." *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 237–260. *JSTOR*, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/29733939.
5. Conway, P., Peetz, J. (2012). "When Does Feeling Moral Actually Make You a Better Person? Conceptual Abstraction Moderates Whether Past Moral Deeds Motivate Consistency or Compensatory Behavior." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, vol. 38, no. 7, pp. 907–919, doi:10.1177/0146167212442394
6. Jonas, D. (2019). "How Do We Decide Whether or Not to Help Others-On Prosocial Behavior." *Psychology Today*, www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/human-decision-making/201912/how-do-we-decide-whether-or-not-help-others.
7. Espinosa, M. P., Jaromír, K. (2015). "Prosocial Behavior and Gender ." *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*.
8. Geher, G. (2014). "How We've Evolved to Pay It Back and Pay It Forward." *Psychology Today*, Sussex Publishers, www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/darwins-subterranean-world/201407/how-weve-evolved-pay-it-back-and-pay-it-forward.
10. Joosten, A., van Dijke, M., Van Hiel, A. et al. *J Bus Ethics* (2014) 123: 71. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1794-z>
11. Deborah, L., Greenberg, J. (1991). "Evidence of Codependency in Women With an Alcoholic Parent: Helping Out Mr. Wrong." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 16, no. 3, ser. 435-439.
12. Matsumoto, Y., Yamagishi, T., Li, Y., & Kiyonari, T. (2016). Prosocial Behavior Increases with Age across Five Economic Games. *PloS one*, 11(7), e0158671. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0158671>
13. Psychology. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://psychology.iresearchnet.com/social-psychology/social-psychology-topics/prosocial-behavior-research-topics/>.
14. Sachdeva, S., Iliev, R., & Medin, D. L. (2009). Sinning Saints and Saintly Sinners: The Paradox of Moral Self-Regulation. *Psychological Science*, 20(4), 523–528. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02326.x> www.jstor.org/stable/25482392.
15. Zhong, C.B., Liljenquist, K., & Cain, D. M. (2009). Moral self-regulation: Licensing and compensation. In D. De Cremer (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on ethical behavior and decision making* (pp. 75-89). Charlotte, NC, US: Information Age Publishi