

PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR : Macro Level of Analysis

PENNER ET AL. September 10, 2004

ประชุมกลุ่มทบทวน 19 มีค 57

ความเดิมตอนที่แล้ว

In a crisis, pro-social, resilient impulses vie แข่งขันกัน for dominance with less desirable impulses: panic, passivity, selfishness

Peter M. Sandman

ประเด็นวันนี้

PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Macro Level of Analysis

= prosocial behaviors performed by individuals within an organizational context

โดยจะ focus ที่

1. VOLUNTEERING
2. RELATED ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIORS
3. THE POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES OF VOLUNTEERING
4. COOPERATION AND GROUP-LEVEL PROSOCIAL ACTION

1.1.5 more active involvement and participation in the civic and social activities of one's community, more positive moral and civic attitudes, the United States and Canada (Hart et al. 2002, Reed & Selbee 2000).

1.1.6 dispositional นิสัย empathy
Davis et al. (1999) Penner 2002) and Hart and his associates (Atkins et al. 2004, Hart et al. 2004)

personality factors and social structures (e.g., family, culture) played roles in the incidence of volunteering,

but this relationship was mediated by

- intrapersonal cognitive processes (e.g., attitudes, identity, commitment to ideals)
- richness of people's social networks.

Similarly, Wilson & Musick (1997a) presented a model in which both volunteering and informal helping are predicted from demographic variables

- various kinds of "capital," including
- "human capital" (education, income, functional health),
 - "social capital" (number of children, social interaction patterns),
 - "cultural capital" (religiosity and valuing helping).

1. VOLUNTEERING

- prosocial action in an organizational context,
 - is planned, begins with a thoughtful decision to join and contribute to an organization
 - continues for an extended period (Penner 2002).
- less likely to result from a sense of personal obligation (Omoto & Snyder 1995)
- interpersonal helping - involve a sense of personal obligation กรุณา to a particular person

1.1 DECISION TO VOLUNTEER

1.1.1 family

parents have also been volunteers
(Piliavin 2004a, Sundeen & Raskoff 1995)

1.1.2 people who identify more strongly with an organized religion (Penner 2002, Piliavin 2004a).

1.1.3 level of education and income
better educated, wealthier people are less constrained by their jobs

1.1.4 more awareness of the problems of others, greater empathy for their distress, expectation of greater effectiveness (Wilson 2000).

1.2 THE MAINTENANCE OF VOLUNTEERING

1.2.1 volunteer process model

Omoto & Snyder's (1995, 2002)

- being primarily determined by
 - the extent to which there is a match between
 - motives or needs that originally led the person to volunteer
 - person's actual experiences as a volunteer.
- volunteers claim that they were, at least initially, most motivated by other-oriented or prosocial motives
- can also be motivated by less selfless motives, such as
 - advancing one's career
 - developing social relationships
(Clary et al. 1998, Clary & Snyder 1999).
- critical factors in sustaining volunteer activity (Kiviniemi et al. 2002, Penner & Finkelstein 1998, Vecina 2001).
 - personal motives
 - prosocial dispositions
 - social and organizational support for the volunteer's activities
 - satisfaction with the volunteer experience
 - integration with the organization

1.2.2 role identity model

Piliavin et al's (2002)

two key constructs

1.2.2.1 perceived expectations
(i.e., beliefs about how significant others feel about the person's behavior)

1.2.2.2 role identity
[i.e., the extent to which a particular role (e.g., being a volunteer) becomes part of the person's personal identity
(Grube & Piliavin 2000)]

- perceived expectations lead to becoming a volunteer,
- but organizational variables (e.g., prestige ^{ชื่อเสียง} of the service organization) experiences and behaviors associated with actually volunteering facilitate the development of a volunteer role identity, which is the immediate precursor of sustained volunteering.

2. RELATED ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIORS

organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)

- = voluntary "extrarole" behavior;
not part of the worker's formal job requirements
no explicit or formal demand that the worker engage in OCB
(Brief & Weiss 2002).

Rioux & Penner (2001) found that OCB motives were significantly associated with self and peer ratings of OCB,

and an OCB role identity has been shown to be significantly related to self, peer, and supervisor ratings of a target person's level of OCB (Finkelstein & Penner 2004, Krueger 2004).

3. THE POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES OF VOLUNTEERING

- positive impact on self-esteem (Yogev & Ronen 1982)
- academic achievement (Osguthorpe & Scruggs 1986),
- personal efficacy, self-esteem, and confidence (Giles & Eyster 1994, Yates & Youniss 1996)
- high levels of volunteering among adolescents appear to lead to the development of prosocial attitudes, values, and identities, and a greater probability of volunteering when they become adults (Astin et al. 1999, Reidel 2002),

- the impact of adolescent volunteering on dangerous and antisocial behaviors. Several well-controlled cross-sectional and longitudinal studies provide evidence that high school students who engage in community service are less likely to smoke marijuana, abuse alcohol, perform poorly in school, become pregnant, commit delinquent acts, or be arrested (Barber et al. 2001, Eccles & Barber 1999, Moore & Allen 1996, Uggens & Janikula 1999, Youniss et al. 1997).

- well-being and psychological and physical health

- subsequent decrease in depression, but only among adults over 65.

Studies have also revealed greater self-reported well-being among elderly volunteers

- healthier and lived longer than nonvolunteer groups (also see Brown et al. 2003).

- helping others may benefit the helper because it distracts one from one's own troubles, enhances a sense of value in one's life, improves self-evaluations, increases positive moods, and causes social integration.

Oman et al. (1999) suggested that several of Midlarsky's proposed mechanisms could influence the body through psycho-neuro-immunologic pathways, thus reducing mortality in aging populations

4. COOPERATION AND GROUP-LEVEL PROSOCIAL ACTION

cooperation involves

- two or more people coming together as partners
- to work interdependently toward a common goal that will benefit all involved

social dilemmas

(e.g., Komorita & Parks 1999, Weber et al. 2004).

two fundamental characteristics:

- each individual receives a higher payoff for not doing (i.e., defecting from) what is in the group's best interest,
- all individuals are better off if they cooperate than if they defect.

4.1 Individual differences

The four most consistently identified social value orientations are:

- altruists
- cooperators
- individualists
- competitors (Liebrand et al. 1986).

People who hold one of these four main social value orientations differ fundamentally in their preferences for allocating resources to themselves and others.

For example, people classified as having a “prosocial” orientation (i.e., altruistic and cooperative) show greater concern for the common good than do individualists and competitors (“proself” orientation; vanLange et al. 1997).

4.2 Prosocial motivations

Batson & Ahmad (2001) found that people who experienced empathic concern tended to show high levels of cooperative responses even when they knew that their partner had already made a competitive choice.

However, Batson et al. (1995) also reported that targeted help in a social dilemma might be given to a specific individual with whom a person has empathized, even when that help compromises cooperative action that would have benefited a larger group.

The process of social categorization of people as ingroup and outgroup members is alterable, and even though people may continue to view others in terms of group membership, the perceptions of group boundaries may change as people become aware of higher-level categories (e.g., nations) that are more inclusive of lower-level ones (e.g., cities or towns).

ingroup identity model (Gaertner et al. 2000)

The process of changing perceptions of group boundaries, known as recategorization,

intergroup bias and conflict can be reduced by factors that transform participants’ representations of memberships from two groups to one more inclusive group.

As we noted earlier, recategorization of former outgroup members as members of a common ingroup increases helping.

One explanation of why people may be more cooperative when common group membership is emphasized is that fairness and procedural justice increase in importance relative to personal outcomes (DeCremer & Tyler 2004).

4.3 Social influence

overt ပြစ်မှီမှု communication among group members consistently promotes cooperation (Dawes 1988) by

- reducing the impact of pluralistic ignorance
- coordinating actions of those involved
- helping in the development of closer personal relationships.

Kerr et al. (1997) found that communicating a public commitment to cooperate led to greater subsequent cooperation, even if the person to whom the original commitment was made would not know if the commitment had been fulfilled (also see Kerr 1995, 1999).

In society-level social dilemma situations, the impact of

- individual’s identity with a group
- the associated acceptance of the norms and values of those superordinate entities (including governmental agencies)

has also been shown to be important for increasing a wide variety of cooperative actions, ranging from participation in social activism and protests (Klendersman 2000) to organizational citizenship (Cropanzano & Byrne 2000).

4.4 Within- and Between-Group Cooperation

- often involves relationships within and between groups. the within- and between group distinction is a more basic and complex one in cooperation

- key determinants
One of the most important of these factors is trust (Kramer 1999).

- Because trust often is based on an expectation of reciprocity (Yamagishi & Kiyonari 2000), it has special significance in situations of inter-dependence (Chaudhuri et al. 2002).

- Establishing a reputation as being trustworthy can be a critical factor for eliciting cooperation in future interactions. (e.g., Milinski et al. 2001).

Because ingroup members are attributed more positive characteristics than are outgroup members (Mullen et al. 1992), they are viewed as more distinctly individual than are outgroup members (Mullen & Hu 1989) and are seen as more similar to the self. Thus, people are generally more trusting of ingroup than of outgroup members (Turner et al. 1987) and are more likely to dismiss ဆွေခံအားပေး and forgive negative actions of ingroup than of outgroup members.

Trust is also a critical factor in intergroup relations—that is, in interactions between groups. However, trust between groups is more difficult to achieve than trust between individuals.

Hewstone & Brown (1986), for instance, have proposed that

- positive and generalizable intergroup consequences result when
 - cooperative interactions between groups are introduced
 - without redefining or degrading the original ingroup-outgroup categorization.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Future work could also consider

- the ongoing contribution of prosocial actions to interpersonal and intergroup relations.

For instance,

- prosocial behavior may be an integral component of forgiveness, which is
 - an important contributor to stable relationships (Ripley & Worthington 2002),
 - a key element of reconciliation, which strengthens collective identity and action (de Waal 2000).