

A STUDY OF POWER & APPROVAL MOTIVES

DR. ANJANA SINHA

M.A. Ph.d.

Muzaffarpur

The term altruism is of recent origin. However, attempts to explain to which the term applies are ancient. August Comte, a French philosopher and sociologist, first introduced this term (Encyclopedia of Britannica, 1967; vol.8) Probably, he came to adapt the term from the Italian 'altru' For hi, altruism was an unselfish regard for the welfare of others. The other conception in this regard is the term altruism comes from the 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 other (Staub & Wispe, 1978; Wispe, 1978). It gym: es an unselfish concern, the interest, support above concern for oneself. Examples of altruistic behaviour cover a wide range, including expressions of interest, support and sympathy, doing special favours for other; acts of generosity, activities for the mentally or physically handicapped and martyrdom "(Longman; Dictionary of Psychology and Psychiatry)". According to Murphy,

B. (1973)," It is desire to help others. It expresses itself in many ,...ays through sympathy, philanthropy etc. The person with a s:rong altruism-want has affection and concern for others and is usually contrasted with the selfish person".

Shaw and Costanzo (1970) have suggested that the least adequate definitions in social psychology are those "real" definitions, which state the essential nature or attributes of some entity or theoretical construct. Altruism is an unfortunate example of this deficiency. Karbe (1970) leaves this problem to new Research to supply a more meaningful and precise definitions of altruism". He argued in favour of operational definitions which, are usually not coextensive with the conceptual definition of the term". (Shaw and Costanzo,1970). The point is that until we understand what altruism means, it will be impossible to decide whether or not something is a good index of it. Brown (1975) defines altruism as the giving of aid in the form of arbitrarily defined good or services to the individuals of the same species, who are not off springs of direct descendents of the donor and without direct benefit to its donor or its mate. According to Hamilton's (1978) view, altruistic behaviour can be distinguished from other types of intra specific social interactions. The term and their definitions are :- cooperative behaviour which helps both parties; selfish behaviour, which helps the donor only; and spiteful behaviour in which both parties lose. Hamilton further stated that these terms are used as heuristic devices only and do not only imply awareness on the part of the participants. It differs from helping behaviour

where the potential cost may be low and the possibility of gaining rewards may be high. Altruistic behaviour involves helping sometimes even taking great risks-even though the act is not likely to be rewarded, recognized, or even appreciated. Thus, altruistic act is selfless. The same has been stressed by Walster and others (1972), "Altruism is very special form of helping behaviour that is voluntary, costly to the altruism and motivated by something other than the expectation of material or social reward". Altruism, then, is selfless rather than selfish. Yarrow, Scott and Waxier (1973) point out that altruism is not a specific form of behaviour, rather it includes a diversity of responses, helping, sharing, rescuing, sympathizing and undoubtedly more".

In this way differing view of human nature have led to three different conceptualization of altruism.

The first one emphasized the reward cost formulation of the meaning of altruism, i.e. altruism exists whenever someone helps but gets far less in lieu of helping than the cost involved. If altruistic behaviour involves cost to the benefactor, the benefactor is hurting itself. It must have compensating benefits that render altruism ultimately advantageous to the performer or according to the natural selection, this altruistic behaviour will not sustain.

However, the study by winter (1982) indicates that n-power may not necessarily lead towards socially acceptable acts, and they are more fond of their jobs and like to display themselves publicly. A person with high need for power may be physically abusive towards their intimate partners (Masdon & Blankiwhship, 1987) It has been overfed that African women expressed their need for powers through helping behavior (Hirochowitz, 1987). Generally women express their n-power in some socialized form in comparison to men (winter, 1988), indicating the sex differences in helping behavior.

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).

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

It has been mentioned in the previous chapter that a 2 (high and low n-power) x 2 (high and low n-approval) x 2 (males and females) factorial design was used to test the hypotheses formulated in chapter –III. The first hypothesis predicted that the subject high on power motivation would spend more time in helping the subjects high on power motivation would spend more time in helping the experimenter and they would attribute their helping out of sense of power in comparison to the subjects who are low on power motivation. The mean scores of the subjects high and low on n-power and n-approval on altruism in terms of time they spent in helping the experimenter, have been shown in Table No. 1

Table 1

Showing the mean time spent in helping behavior by the subject (both males and females) having high and low power and approval motivation.

POWER MOTIVATION	
HIGH	LOW
M ₁ = 1139.15	M ₂ = 1189.14
M ₄ = 985.05	M ₄ = 1050.10
M = 1060.10	M = 1124.62
M ₅ = 1073.85	M ₆ = 756.40
M ₇ = 1116.10	M ₈ = 816.05
M = 1094.97	M = 786.22

Table I Indicates that the subjects high on power motivation spent 1078.54 mean seconds in helping the E in a simulated situation, whereas, the subjects with low power motivation spent 955.42 mean seconds in helping in first hypothesis. However, statistical analysis must be applied to test the significance of different between the obtained means. Since a factorial design (2x2x2) was used to test the hypotheses, ANOVA was applied. The results of ANOVA have been given in Table II.

Table II

Summary of the Two-way analysis of variance applied to test the significance of differences between power, approval and sex variable.

Source of Variance	Sum squares	Df	mean squares	F
A (n-power)	631140	1	631140	69.72**
B (n-approval)	903152.7	1	903152.7	99.77**
C (Sex)	9144.4	1	9144.4	1.01 NS**
A x B	134173.8	1	134173.8	148.20**
A x C	390161.3	1	390161.3	43.10**
A x B x C	14.4	1	14.4	NS
within treatment	1375962.3	152	9052.38	

** Significant at 01 level

The above table (Table II) shows that there is a significant difference in the time spent by low and high power scores. And the difference is significant at .01 level ($F=69.72$, $df =1$, $p <0.1$) So, the subject who were high on power motivation contributed significantly more time in helping the E-as compared to the Ss low on power motivation. The first hypothesis is proved that the subjects with high n-power would spend more time in helping the E, in comparison to the subjects low on power motivation.

A difference of opinion about the effect of n-power on helping behaviour emerges clearly while summarising the results and conclusion drawn by the previous researchers. Winter (1982) pointed out that n-power may not necessarily lead towards socially acceptable acts. Sometimes high n-power, men have a tendency to exploit women sexually, tendency to fight, drink, gambel and even to be physically abusive towards others (Manson and Blankenship, 1987). But in the present study the results are supporting another view related to high n-power Ss being altruistic.

One possible reason for this helping attitude of high power scores, which is an indirect form for expressing this type of motive, can be that if they express their power motive in aggressive form, it may not be so effective, and this is also not a socially desirable behaviour. So these type of people mould their behaviour in such a way that their motivation can be fulfilled in a socially acceptable way.

REFERENCE

- Barthel, C.E. and Crowne, D.P. (1962). The need for approval task categorization, and perceptual defence. *Journal of Consultant Psychology*, 26, 547-553
- Berkowitz L. (1960) Repeated frustration and ex-ectation in hostility arousal. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 60, 422 – 429
- Berkowitz, L. (1972) Social norms feelings and other factors affecting helping and altruism. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) *Aduances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 6) New York: Academic
- Beven, W. (1963). The pooling mechanism and the phenomena of reinforcement. In O.J. Harvey (Ed.) *Motivation and social interaction*. New York: Ronald.