



**A MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALING ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF  
CONTEXT ON THE PERCEPTION OF ALTRUISTIC SITUATIONS**

By

**DAWN MARIE IACOBUCCI**

---

**THESIS**

For The

**DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE**

**IN LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES**

**COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES**

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS**

**URBANA, ILLINOIS**

**1982**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Method</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Results</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Discussion</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Reference Note</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Tables</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Stimuli</b>	<b>43</b>

I would like to thank Dr. Busemeyer for her infinite patience and helpful guidance, Dr. Coles for his constant encouragement, Dr. Jones for his consultation on the analyses, Dr. Diener for his suggestions on the self-awareness manipulations, and of course, Dr. Kanfer for lending me a part of his scientific framework.

### Abstract

Whether or not an individual will provide help to another in need depends on the situation and the individual's perceptions of those situations. The influence of context on the perception of altruistic situations was evaluated in relation to Kanfer's self-control conflict model. Fifty-nine male college students judged 15 altruistic situations with respect to their dissimilarities in one of three conditions: a private context, a public context, or a neutral context. The situations were selected on the basis of previous research to represent independent variability on cost to the helper and value to the recipient attributes. Each subject also rated the set of situations on ten attributes. In each condition, the subjects' one-dimensional ratings showed that the probability of helping was most closely related to the rated appropriateness of the request for help and inversely related to the cost to the helper. In contradiction to the empathetic theoretical view, the extent of need was not related to the probability of helping. A multidimensional scaling analysis of the dissimilarity judgments demonstrated that subjects in the private and neutral conditions responded most similarly. For these groups, their tendency to help in the situation, the appropriateness of the help request, the seriousness of the problem, and the normative expectations in the situations were the most salient features discriminating this situation set. On the other hand, the group of subjects responding in a public context seemed to view the

situations somewhat differently. The probability that they would help, and the normative expectations, as in the former groups, was salient, but the cost for helping, the attributed cause of the problem, and the activity given up to provide the help was as salient to them. The relationships among the unidimensional scales were discussed in terms of the self-control conflict model. The utility of further analyses of the dissimilarity judgments by a non-metric multidimensional scaling algorithm that takes into account individual differences was also proposed.

## LIST OF TABLES

1	Classification Scheme of Stimuli	22
2	Violations of Triangular Inequalities Assumption and Subject Fit Correlations	
	a) in Condition 1 ("Private")	23
	b) in Condition 2 ("Public")	24
	c) in Condition 3 ("Neutral")	25
3	Correlations of Solution Dimensions (within each Condition)	26
4	INDSCAL Variance Accounted for by Entire Configuration and Individual Dimensions (for each Condition)	27
5	Subject Fit Correlations at Various Dimensionality	
	a) in Condition 1	28
	b) in Condition 2	29
	c) in Condition 3	30
6	Correlations between Unidimensional Scales and Solution Dimensions	
	a) in Condition 1	31
	b) in Condition 2	32
	c) in Condition 3	33
7	Saliences and Subject Use of Dimensions (in each Condition)	34
8	Means and Standard Deviations of Unidimensional Scales (in each Condition)	35
9	Correlations of Unidimensional Scales	
	a) in Condition 1	40
	b) in Condition 2	41
	c) in Condition 3	42

Altruistic motivation can be studied as a decision-making process. A person becomes involved in a situation in which help is needed (and/or requested) and must decide whether or not to help. The immediate consequences of this decision represent a conflict of interests (Kanfer, Stifter, & Morris, 1981). The conflict lies in the choice between helping (acting for the benefit of another at some personal cost) and not helping (a self-serving avoidance of that cost). The less immediate consequences may also be a factor in the decision. Should the person help, there would be possibilities for social and self-approval or reward. Should help not be given, there would of course be opportunities for social and self-disapproval. Together, these consequences suggest a conflictual view of altruism, where the decision to help is made by weighing the costs involved against the possibilities of a delayed reward of some type.

The conflicting nature of altruism parallels the self-control situation (Kanfer, 1979). For self-control, conflict is defined by a choice between a small, immediate reward (eg. eating candy) and a delayed, but "more valuable" reward (eg. maintaining one's original teeth) (Kanfer, 1977; Kanfer & Goldfoot, 1966; Kanfer & Karoly, 1972). The immediacy of reward in self-control conflict produces a high probability of responding to that contingency. Manipulations have been proposed to alter that response tendency (Kanfer, 1971; Kanfer & Seidner, 1973). For example, a positive contingency may be associated with the low probability response in order to increase



the subjects' tendency to respond to that alternative. In altruism, people can be immediately gratified for deciding not to help, by avoiding the "costs" (eg. time and effort) of helping, with the expectation of later gratification. This tendency may be influenced by mechanisms similar to those changing the response probabilities in self-control conflict. For example, societal norms supporting helping behavior may provide positive incentive to offset the costs of helping and thereby increase the probability of choosing to help.

The conflict in altruism is defined by the consequences of the decision. A person may not want to help because doing so will cost time and effort, but may feel more compelled to do so because of social norms. The social approval of behaving in accordance with the helping norms may be viewed as a mechanism designed to increase the probability of helping responses by altering the overall cost contingency for the donor. The context in which the decisions are made might also be a variable determining whether or not help is given (Kanfer & Karoly, 1972). Factors such as empathy (Aronfreed, 1970), and the helper's mood (Berkowitz & Connor, 1966; Isen, 1970; Isen, Horn, & Rosenhan, 1973), would be examples of cognitive contexts, while the number of bystanders (Latané & Darley, 1968), and the possibility of future reciprocal assistance (Gouldner, 1960), would be examples of environmental contextual factors. Both cognitive and environmental contextual factors could be incorporated into Kanfer's model at this point. They would change the context in which the decision would be made. In doing so, these factors would

alter the contingencies of the alternative behaviors (the consequences of helping or not helping), and in doing so, change the probabilities of the responses. If the context were one in which norms and social expectations were emphasized, the decision-maker would be more aware of the social consequences of not responding in a socially desirable way. The salience of the need of the other may appear to be more important than the costs of helping, if need determines the social or public contingency. Alternatively, if the context were one in which selfishness were emphasized, the decision-maker would attend more to the "costs" of helping, than to the need of the recipient.

The salience of "cost", of "norms", and of "need" would be expected to change as a function of manipulations of private and public self-awareness. Private self-awareness has been enhanced by confronting subjects with small, "bathroom-sized" mirrors (Buss, 1980). This effect has been described as a state in which people think about the private aspects of themselves, removed from social judgment. This state would be expected to increase the salience of the immediate costs of the helping situation, by directing attention to self-interest and away from "public", socially-based contingencies.

Public self-awareness is a state in which people attend to the reactions of others (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975). This state has been induced by confronting people with television cameras or tape recorders (Buss, 1980). In other words, behavior is put in a "public" view. This state would be analogous to the heightening of the normative expectations in a situation, and should cause people to think more about what course of action would be appropriate with respect to the needs of the recipient.

More can be learned about the salient characteristics of helping situations as a function of these manipulations through multidimensional scaling (MDS), since this analysis is designed to derive the dimensions that are most salient to the respondents. To provide stimuli that are discriminably different on the characteristics of interest ("cost" to the donor and "need" of the recipient), these aspects must be independently varied in the stimulus set. In this application, different situations were composed that varied on both the "cost" and "need" dimensions (see Table 1) (Bussmeyer, Jones, & Kanfer, 1982). The stimuli were sampled from a population of situations familiar to college students. The study was designed to determine how perceptions of situations change, in order to assess the implications of these manipulations in altering the cognitive perspective of the choice contingencies.

This approach differs from previous studies in three ways: 1) by increasing the variety and familiarity of situations considered, 2) by incorporating more extensive variation in the "cost" and "need" attributes inherent in the choice, and 3) by using similarity judgments to determine the salient features of the altruistic conflict rather than an all or none helping behavior (or behavior intention responses). Such an indirect approach offers two advantages: 1) it provides a means of deriving the most salient features of these situations as a whole rather than predetermining the relevant dimensions, and 2) it reduces the social demand characteristics of the experimental context so that the subjects are less likely to make socially appropriate commitments.

Furthermore, the present analysis will model group and individual differences in the solution. In doing so, the effect of the manipulations may be tested in addition to individual differences within the groups (Carroll & Chang, 1970).

The present experiment will assess three groups: Private Self-Awareness, Public Self-Awareness, and Control Conditions. Since the question of interest in this study is whether different contexts will alter perceptions of altruistic situations, and not whether a particular self-awareness manipulation is most effective, a "sledgehammer" approach will be used. In other words, several characteristics of the context will be manipulated simultaneously to produce a Private Context, a Public Context, and a Neutral Context. By maximizing contextual differences, changes in the rated

probability of helping may be related to the stimulus dimensions derived from the scaling solutions.

The Private Self-Awareness Condition will require the subject to work in a small area, at a desk on which is propped a small mirror. The experimenter will have emphasized the usual confidentiality issues and will leave the subject alone to rate the situations. The Public Self-Awareness Condition will have the subject working in a normal-sized room, at a desk in front of a one-way mirror. The confidentiality issues will, of course, be discussed, but not stressed. Instead, the experimenter will "inform" the subject that observers in the other room and seated behind the subject will be watching them during the rating task. Finally, the Neutral, comparison group will receive no specific intervention.

Each subject will be asked to compare the situations in relation to their similarity to one another. These paired comparison ratings will be used to derive the attributes subjects used to differentiate the helping situations. The same situations will also be ranked according to the hypothesized unidimensional attributes (eg. cost, value, norm, attribution, etc.), that are expected to define the situation differences in order to verify the interpretation of the derived dimensions. The Private Self-Awareness group is expected to use the dimension of "cost" more than the other groups. The Public Self-Awareness group is expected to be less concerned with the "cost" dimension than the other

groups. A Public Self-Awareness Context is expected to enhance the salience of the "need" dimension, if need is perceived as an important determinant of social responsibility.

#### Method

Subjects. The subjects were 59 male undergraduates attending the University of Illinois who were fulfilling a course requirement in introductory psychology. Each subject was randomly assigned to one of the three conditions. Data from 50 of the subjects were collected in the Fall of 1981. Data from the remaining 9 subjects were collected in the Spring of 1982. (Data from 3 (of originally 62) subjects were not included in the analyses. Two subjects had responded randomly, and one subject had participated in a related experiment earlier in the semester.) (All experimenters were also male.)

Stimuli. The 15 stimulus situations presented to the subjects were those selected from a larger set of 30 situations on the basis of two criteria: 1) that they varied independently with respect to "cost" and "need", and 2) that situations selected in a given cell (see Table 1) were maximally discriminable from situations in other cells (Busemeyer et al, 1982). (The 15 stimulus situations are presented as Appendix A.)

Context Manipulations. Subjects were run individually and completed the rating task while in different surroundings. For the Private Self-Awareness Group, room dividers were enclosed around the subject's work table, forming a small triangle with the wall. Upon entrance into the main room, the subject could see on the other sides of the dividers, reassuring him there were no hidden observers. A small mirror (about 12" X 15") had been placed directly in front of the subject's position (about 1.5 ft from him) propped up at an angle of approximately 100 degrees. Miscellaneous laboratory equipment and personal items were lying on the table, in an attempt to explain the mirror as part of someone else's equipment. The mirror was also tagged with a label of "some other" experiment number. Issues of confidentiality, anonymity of responses, and requirements of ethical subject treatment were emphasized in this condition.

For the Public Self-Awareness Condition, the room dividers were pushed against the walls, maintaining the original size of the room. The curtain that covered a large one-way observation mirror for the other two conditions was opened directly in front of the subject. This group was told that observers were going to be carefully watching the subject for possible later revision of the task.

The room dividers were again pushed against the walls for the Neutral Context. Subjects in this condition were not confronted with either mirror, and no Public or Private issues were discussed.

In each group, subjects were asked for feedback on the issues (depending on the condition: confidentiality, observers, or understanding of instructions) for the purpose of having the subject hear himself say (and hopefully, thus convince himself of) the issues of the particular condition.

Finally, all subjects read each of the 15 situations along with a tape recording, which then went on to give specific task instructions. (Note that after the tape recorder had been turned on, the experimenter left the room in the private self-awareness condition; he sat at a desk behind the subject, facing him, in the public self-awareness condition; and he sat at a desk behind the subject, facing the wall, in the control condition.)

Procedure. The taped instructions asked subjects to make judgments of the amount of dissimilarity between pairs of stimuli ( $n=105$ ) along a 9-point rating scale ranging from "Highly Similar" to "Highly Dissimilar". The order of the presentation of the stimulus pairs was the same for each subject by means of a Ross ordering (Ross, 1934). Subjects were told to use whatever "dimension" they wished when making their judgments. After the comparisons had been completed, the experimenter instructed the subject to rate each of the 15 situations along the 10 unidimensional scales listed in Table 9a. Lastly, the subjects were



debriefed and asked a few questions about their backgrounds that might be important in helping behavior.

### Results

Each of the 59 subjects' matrices were tested for violations of the triangular inequalities assumption. The percentage of violations (of 455 comparisons) ranged from .22% to 31.87%. For most subjects, the violations were small; probably measurement error. (Table 2 lists these percentages, along with the subjects' fit correlations from the final INDSCAL solution.)

### INDSCAL Solution

An individual differences multidimensional scaling analysis was run on the dissimilarity judgments. The choice of dimensionality for each condition was based on the following: 1) That no subject weights were negative. (This was nearly satisfied with even six dimensions in each condition.) 2) That correlations between the dimensions were not high. (These intercorrelations are presented as Table 3 and did not decrease when examining solutions of lower dimensionality.) 3) That variance accounted for by the entire solution and each dimension (salience) were reasonably high (see Table 4). 4) That subject fit correlations (see Table 5) were high enough to permit reducing the number of dimensions. 5) Further information was obtained by looking at the percentage of subjects using each dimension (as defined by a subject weight of .30 or greater) (see Table 7). Together, these factors suggested a four-dimensional solution for both the first ("Private") and third

("Control") conditions, and a five-dimensional solution for the second ("Public") condition.

The INDSCAL configurations indicated that subjects in the Private and Neutral Contexts responded most similarly. In the Private Context, the first dimension appeared to be the same as the third dimension in the Neutral Context. This dimension was highly correlated with the combined first and third cost scales and the second need scale and was interpreted as the seriousness of the situation. (The correlations between each unidimensional scale and the solution dimensions are presented for the Private and Neutral Contexts (see Tables 6a and 6c respectively). The squared multiple regression coefficients were obtained by using dimensions as predictors for each of the unidimensional scales. Several scales were combined using an equally weighted sum of the ratings since the derived dimensions appeared to reflect a combination of these attributes.) As shown in Table 7, the list of dimension saliences and percentage of subjects using each dimension offers a possible explanation of why the dimension order shifted. The saliences of the first through fourth dimensions were similar, the percentage of subjects using each dimension did not differ greatly, and the sample size ( $N=20$ ) was small enough that one or two subjects could change the ordered salience.

The second dimension of the Private Context (the first in the Neutral Context) was interpreted as the probability of the subject's helping. The correlation of this scale with the dimension was only slightly higher than that of the social norm with the dimension. This is not surprising since the correlation between mean ratings for each situation on the norm and probability of helping was so high ( $r=.989$ ); they seemed to be virtually indistinguishable.

The third dimension in the Private Context (the second in the Neutral Context) was interpreted as the appropriateness of helping; a combination of the attributed cause of the problem and the social norm of the situations was most highly correlated with this dimension.

The final dimension in both the Private and Neutral contexts was not readily interpretable from the unidimensional ratings that were anticipated to define the dimensions. The fourth dimension was retained in both cases because quite a few subjects seemed to have used it.

The interpretation of the dimensions from the Public Context's solution suggested that subjects in this condition were perceiving the situations differently (see Table 6b). The first dimension was interpreted as the probability of helping, the second as cost, and the fifth dimension was associated with attribution. The third and fourth dimensions were not interpretable with respect to the unidimensional scales selected.

Each of the dimensions that were not clearly interpretable were run through a separate regression analysis. In this analysis, the dimensions were used to predict only those unidimensional scales of subjects who had used the dimension. (A subject was defined as having used the dimension if he had a weight of .30 or greater on that dimension.) This analysis was run for dimension four in the private and neutral conditions, and for dimensions three and four in the public condition. The expectation was that if a subject had used a dimension, information provided by his unidimensional scale would better describe the meaning of the dimension than those subjects disregarding the dimension. However, the dimensions remained unclear, as the profile of correlations of the dimensions and scales was nearly identical between users and the whole group.

An attempt to resolve the interpretation of these dimensions with an INDSCAL solution over the combined groups was also made. This did not provide a clearer solution. In addition, a discriminant function using the subject weights (derived from this overall INDSCAL solution) as predictors was used to classify subjects according to the groups. This model was only successful in placing 35% of the subjects correctly in the Private Condition; 50% of the subjects in the Public Condition; and 57.9% of the subjects in the Neutral Condition.

Given the relatively unconvincing interpretations of several of the dimensions, and the disturbingly high dimension intercorrelations (see Table 3), it might be that the assumptions underlying the INDSCAL model were in some way violated. The results presented in this paper might be thought of as a first approximation to explaining the structure of the data, but analyses of these dissimilarities by an individual differences nonmetric multidimensional scaling algorithm may be more appropriate. A nonmetric model might also yield information with which to discriminate the groups. It should be noted that the interpretation of the dimensions that were clearly associated with the unidimensional scales replicated a previous study using the same stimuli in a natural condition (Busemeyer et al, 1982). Correlations of dimensions between groups and correlations of each group with those results were high (.8-.9) between dimensions that were interpreted as the same.

#### Unidimensional Scales

Some rating scales were more variable than others with respect to certain situations. (For example, situations 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 9 were associated with more variable cost ratings than remaining situations. For need, situations 3, 7, 8, and 11 were associated with more variable ratings. On the other hand, there was little variation among subjects rating the norm or expected behavior for each situation. (Notice the clarity of the norm of when to hold a door open for another; there is virtually no variation in the norm

for situations 12 and 15.)) Means and standard deviations for subjects in each condition are presented as Table 8. These individual differences were not related to the context manipulations.

Correlations between mean ratings of each situation showed that the probability of helping was most closely related to the norm, or rated appropriateness of the request for help ( $r=.989$ ) and inversely related to the cost to the helper ( $r=-.765$ ). The extent of need, or value of the help was not related to the probability of helping ( $r=.013$ ). The correlations between the cost and need ratings demonstrated the independence of these attributes (see Table 9a-9c). The adequacy of the unidimensional scales in predicting the intention of helping (the tenth scale) was also examined. (The social norm was not included, since its correlation with probability of helping indicated that it was a "parallel" question.) After a correction for "shrinkage", cost (a combination of the first and third cost variables) accounted for 49.97 percent of the variation in the helping item. 83.70 percent of this helping variance was explained when attribution was included in the model. No other variables contributed to the accuracy of predicting helping intention.

## Discussion

A set of situation stimuli describing various helping conflicts were assessed in three experimental contexts (Private, Public, and Neutral), in order to assess if the context would determine the salience of various discriminating attributes. When rating the dissimilarity of the situations, probability of helping was a salient attribute for all three contexts. In the Private and Neutral Conditions, the seriousness of the situation and the appropriateness of the request were also interpretable attributes, which discriminated the situations. These results replicated a previous study using the same situation set in a "neutral" context (Biseneyer et al, 1982). In the Public Context, a combination of need and attribution and quite unexpectedly, cost became more salient. It appeared that need was only used to differentiate among the situations by the public group. The results of the scaling analysis however are inconclusive at this point since several dimensions were not interpretable and because of the correlations of the solution dimensions derived from the INDSCAL model. Since the solution dimensions were correlated for all the groups, a nonmetric analysis will be used to explore an alternative solution which may be more appropriate for this data. Hopefully, those results will clarify these preliminary observations made on the difference between the Private (or Neutral) and Public Conditions.

As expected, societal norms influence what people say they would do, as evidenced by the high correlation between the probability of helping and social norm scales. In general, the probability of helping ratings for individual situations were not affected by the context manipulation. The set of attributes used to discriminate among these situations did vary across the Private and Public Conditions. Therefore, the multidimensional scaling seemed to be more sensitive to these context manipulations.

Cost has usually not been a manipulated variable in the studies of helping behavior because only a single situation is used. With this scaling approach, the opportunity to manipulate cost as a function of the situation has indicated that it might be an important variable. In Kanfer's extension of the self-control model (1979) model, cost to the donor is a central construct. The model explicitly describes the decision of whether or not to help as a conflict from the point of view of the prospective helper. One of the interpretations for the derived dimensions in the Private and Neutral Conditions was termed seriousness. Seriousness was composed of the two cost variables that were most highly negatively correlated with probability of helping and a need rating. This composite variable increases with cost and need. One may assume that as cost and need increase, it may be more difficult to decide whether to help because the contingencies for both options has increased in magnitude. These attributes of the situations may be related to the conflict component described by Kanfer's model.



Unlike this composite dimension in the Private and Neutral Conditions, a dimension highly correlated with cost and a separate dimension that was closely related to need--attribution was found in the Public Condition. The Public awareness manipulation seems to have produced a separate classification for the cost and need attributes. The emergence of the need-related dimension in the Public Condition partially supports the expectation that need would be more salient in this condition. Hopefully, the nonmetric scaling analyses will clarify the contrast. In any case, one can safely conclude that cost, a variable not usually manipulated in single situation studies of altruism plays an important role in discriminating between the helping situations assessed in this study.

## Reference Note

Busemeyer, M. K., Jones, L. E., & Kanfer, F. H. A  
Multidimensional Scaling Approach to Altruistic Incentive.  
Unpublished Manuscript, 1982.

## References

- Aronfreed, J. The socialization of altruistic and sympathetic behavior: Some theoretical and experimental analyses. In Macaulay, J. & Berkowitz, L. (Eds.), Altruism and helping behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1970.
- Baumann, D. J., Cialdini, R. B. & Kenrick, D. T. Altruism as hedonism: Helping and self-gratification as equivalent responses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1981, 40, 1039-1046.
- Berkowitz, L. & Connor, W. H. Success, failure, and social responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 664-669.
- Buss, A. H. Self-consciousness and social anxiety. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Co., 1980.
- Caroll, J. D. & Chang, J. J. Analysis of individual differences in multidimensional scaling via an N-way generalization of "Eckart-Young" decomposition. Psychometrika, 1970, 35, 283-319.
- Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F. & Buss, A. H. Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 522-527.
- Gouldner, A. W. The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. American Sociological Review, 1960 25, 161-179.
- Isen, A. M. Success, failure, attention, and reaction to others: The warm glow of success. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 294-301.
- Isen, A. M., Horn, N. & Rosenhan, D. L. Effects of success and failure on children's generosity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 27, 239-247.
- Kanfer, F. H. The maintenance of behavior by self-generated stimuli and reinforcement. In Jacobs, A. & Sachs, L. B. (Eds.), Psychology of private events. New York: Academic Press, 1971.
- Kanfer, F. H. Self-regulation and self-control. In Zeier, H. (Ed.), The psychology of the 20th century. (Vol. 4) Kintler Verlag, Zurich, Switzerland, 1977.

- Kanfer, F. H. Personal control, social control, and altruism: Can society survive the age of individualism. American Psychologist, 1979, 34, 231-239.
- Kanfer, F. H. & Goldfoot, D. A. Self-control and the tolerance of noxious stimulation. Psychological Reports, 1966, 18, 79-85.
- Kanfer, F. H. & Karoly, P. Self-control: A behavioristic excursion into the lion's den. Behavior Therapy, 1972, 3, 398-416.
- Kanfer, F. H. & Seidner, M. L. Self-control: Factors enhancing tolerance of noxious stimulation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 381-389.
- Kanfer, F. H., Stifter, E. & Morris, S. J. Self-control and altruism: Delay of gratification for another. Child Development, 1981, 52, 674-682.
- Latané, B. & Darley, J. Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 215-221.
- Ross, R. T. Optimum orders for the presentation of pairs in the method of paired comparisons. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1934, 25, 375-382.

Table 1

## Situation Classification Scheme

"rated				
cost	high	8	4	2, 13, 9
to the	medium		7, 11	5
donor"	low	3, 10, 14	6, 12, 15	1
		low	medium	high

"rated need of the recipient"

The situations represented by this classification scheme represent qualitatively different helping situations that are commonly encountered by a college student population. (Situations corresponding to the above situation numbers are included as Appendix A.)

Table 2a

Violations of the Triangular Inequalities Assumption  
& Fit Correlations

Condition 1 ("Private")

Subject	Fit-r	% Violations	% Violations			
			%=1	%=2	%=3	%>3
1	.787	14.73	56.72	29.85	5.97	7.46
2	.838	4.84	68.18	13.64	0.00	18.18
3	.816	9.23	69.05	19.05	9.52	2.38
4	.450	11.65	52.83	26.42	9.43	11.32
5	.795	18.46	51.19	30.95	15.48	2.38
6	.776	20.00	63.74	16.48	10.99	8.79
7	.552	16.70	44.74	30.26	15.79	9.21
8	.812	27.69	48.41	31.75	13.49	6.35
9	.731	5.27	70.83	20.83	8.33	0.00
10	.741	18.02	37.80	28.05	14.63	19.51
11	.716	.22	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
12	.876	7.25	39.39	30.30	9.09	21.21
13	.893	3.96	88.89	11.11	0.00	0.00
14	.796	14.73	49.25	22.39	19.40	8.96
15	.833	2.42	81.82	18.18	0.00	0.00
16	.881	3.96	33.33	44.44	16.67	5.56
17	.812	16.48	69.33	21.33	8.00	1.33
18	.883	7.03	68.75	18.75	12.50	0.00
19	.842	7.03	75.00	21.88	3.12	0.00
20	.821	13.19	61.67	25.00	11.67	1.67

Table 2b

Violations of the Triangular Inequalities Assumption  
& Fit Correlations

## Condition 2 ("Public")

Subject	Fit-r	% Violations	% Violations			
			%=1	%=2	%=3	%>3
1	.852	6.37	82.76	3.45	13.79	0.00
2	.877	2.86	69.23	30.78	0.00	0.00
3	.749	7.03	40.63	25.00	18.75	15.63
4	.792	18.68	50.59	23.53	12.94	12.94
5	.900	2.64	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
6	.765	17.58	65.00	26.25	5.00	3.75
7	.791	27.25	31.45	33.06	19.36	16.13
8	.832	6.59	73.33	16.67	10.00	0.00
9	.644	12.97	64.41	23.73	8.47	3.39
10	.745	12.97	49.15	18.64	25.42	6.78
11	.778	19.60	46.48	36.62	14.08	2.82
12	.824	12.31	57.14	23.21	10.71	8.93
13	.893	.44	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
14	.820	6.81	60.42	35.48	0.00	0.00
15	.730	16.92	51.95	32.47	10.37	5.20
16	.765	3.96	88.89	5.56	0.00	5.56
17	.843	13.41	57.38	32.79	8.20	1.64
18	.872	12.31	42.86	16.07	25.00	16.07
19	.819	8.35	68.42	23.68	7.90	0.00
20	.846	2.20	70.00	30.00	0.00	0.00

Table 2c

Violations of the Triangular Inequalities Assumption  
& Fit Correlations

Condition 3 ("Control")

Subject	Fit-r	% Violations	% Violations			
			%=1	%=2	%=3	%>3
1	.832	7.03	59.38	21.88	15.62	3.12
2	.878	1.10	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	.821	6.37	48.28	31.03	13.79	6.90
4	.630	9.67	38.64	36.36	13.64	11.36
5	.753	7.25	72.73	15.15	9.09	3.03
6	.877	13.85	57.14	26.98	7.94	7.94
7	.834	10.99	44.00	42.00	14.00	0.00
8	.822	5.27	58.33	25.00	12.50	4.17
9	.787	11.43	63.46	17.31	13.46	5.77
10	.813	18.90	51.16	34.89	5.81	8.14
11	.799	.88	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
12	.545	31.87	40.00	21.38	20.69	17.93
13	.850	16.26	74.32	16.22	8.11	1.35
14	.607	19.12	47.13	26.44	13.79	12.64
15	.861	3.52	87.50	12.50	0.00	0.00
16	.794	20.44	53.76	17.20	20.43	8.60
17	.747	5.93	88.89	7.41	0.00	3.70
18	.862	19.56	53.93	20.22	8.99	16.85
19	.800	14.51	48.48	21.21	10.61	19.70



Table 3

## Correlations of the Solution Dimensions

## Condition 1 ("Private")

	1	2	3	Dimension 4
1	----			
2	.43	----		
3	.11	.50	----	
4	-.11	-.40	-.48	----

## Condition 2 ("Public")

	1	2	3	Dimension 4	5
1	----				
2	.32	----			
3	-.39	-.36	----		
4	-.31	-.42	.41	----	
5	.24	-.05	-.10	-.08	----

## Condition 3 ("Control")

	1	2	3	Dimension 4
1	----			
2	.36	----		
3	.43	-.10	----	
4	-.50	-.43	-.42	----

Table 4

## Dimension Saliences

## Condition 1 ("Private")

	Dimension									
1	2	3	4	5	6	r	VAF	LOSS	n-D	
.195	.162	.136	.092	.059	.033	.823	.678	.322	6	
.199	.163	.141	.094	.057		.809	.654	.346	5	
.211	.174	.144	.095			.790	.624	.376	4	
.208	.201	.180				.767	.589	.411	3	
.284	.261					.739	.545	.454	2	

## Condition 2 ("Public")

	Dimension									
1	2	3	4	5	6	r	VAF	LOSS	n-D	
.167	.126	.118	.097	.096	.079	.826	.683	.317	6	
.174	.157	.115	.106	.104		.809	.655	.345	5	
.202	.163	.152	.103			.787	.620	.380	4	
.269	.199	.103				.756	.571	.429	3	
.272	.237					.714	.509	.491	2	

## Condition 3 ("Control")

	Dimension									
1	2	3	4	5	6	r	VAF	LOSS	n-D	
.190	.139	.123	.110	.072	.052	.828	.686	.314	6	
.203	.143	.122	.115	.072		.810	.656	.344	5	
.207	.168	.140	.109			.790	.624	.376	4	
.214	.200	.172				.765	.585	.415	3	
.282	.245					.726	.527	.473	2	

Table 5a

## Fit Correlations at 3-6 Dimensions

Condition 1 ("Private")				
Subject	6-D	5-D	4-D	3-D
1	.811	.798	.787	.750
2	.845	.843	.838	.833
3	.875	.859	.816	.769
4	.604	.512	.450	.431
5	.828	.814	.795	.772
6	.797	.793	.776	.759
7	.593	.555	.552	.386
8	.838	.832	.812	.798
9	.831	.754	.731	.714
10	.768	.763	.741	.744
11	.762	.749	.716	.703
12	.911	.908	.876	.873
13	.893	.886	.889	.890
14	.804	.798	.796	.780
15	.860	.860	.852	.833
16	.889	.880	.881	.876
17	.846	.847	.812	.788
18	.895	.894	.883	.833
19	.863	.858	.842	.798
20	.867	.846	.821	.806
mean	.819	.803	.782	.757

Table 5b

## Fit Correlations at 3-6 Dimensions

## Condition 2 ("Public")

Subject	6-D	5-D	4-D	3-D
1	.882	.852	.849	.775
2	.880	.877	.833	.830
3	.773	.749	.735	.687
4	.811	.792	.776	.725
5	.900	.900	.866	.856
6	.796	.765	.747	.745
7	.790	.791	.778	.745
8	.832	.832	.805	.760
9	.702	.644	.632	.594
10	.779	.745	.734	.701
11	.783	.778	.743	.706
12	.817	.824	.797	.777
13	.906	.893	.875	.850
14	.839	.820	.799	.748
15	.741	.730	.720	.696
16	.793	.765	.727	.671
17	.862	.843	.827	.794
18	.882	.872	.863	.844
19	.858	.819	.801	.788
20	.868	.846	.796	.770
mean	.825	.807	.785	.753

Table 5c

## Fit Correlations at 3-6 Dimensions

## Condition 3 ("Control")

Subject	6-D	5-D	4-D	3-D
1	.863	.855	.832	.816
2	.885	.879	.878	.708
3	.875	.835	.821	.817
4	.706	.677	.630	.608
5	.814	.755	.753	.733
6	.894	.890	.877	.840
7	.851	.838	.834	.843
8	.861	.846	.822	.802
9	.800	.797	.787	.768
10	.838	.809	.813	.769
11	.873	.854	.799	.791
12	.700	.659	.545	.463
13	.868	.846	.850	.840
14	.705	.691	.607	.593
15	.867	.866	.861	.862
16	.812	.792	.794	.804
17	.782	.772	.747	.740
18	.866	.858	.862	.856
19	.828	.815	.800	.759
mean	.826	.807	.785	.758

Table 6a

Correlations between Unidimensional Scales  
and Solution DimensionsAnd R2 Values from Multiple Regression  
(Dimensions used as Predictors for each Scale)

## Condition 1 ("Private")

Unidimensional Scale	Dimension				R2
	1	2	3	4	
	Saliency: .211	.174	.144	.095	
cost1	-.87*	-.70*	-.44	.30	.93
cost2	-.56	-.65*	-.04	-.12	.70
cost3	-.91*	-.64*	-.45	.21	.97
valu1	-.70*	-.04	.47	-.26	.80
valu2	-.81*	-.27	.31	-.18	.85
valu3	-.66*	-.10	.54	-.48	.93
social	-.85*	-.32	.32	-.04	.93
attrib	.15	-.35	-.91*	.60	.94
norm	-.50	-.71*	-.85*	.66*	.99
phelp	-.55	-.77*	-.79*	.60*	.94
seriousness (cost1+cost3+valu2)	-.94*	-.63	-.35	.18	.97
appropriateness (attrib+norm)	-.19	-.59	-.96*	.68	.99

N=20 subjects

n=15 situations

\*p:01

Table 6b

Condition 2 ("Public")

	Dimension					R2
	Saliency: .174	.157	.115	.106	.104	
Unidimensional Scale	1	2	3	4	5	
cost1	.50	.94*	-.52	-.58	-.09	.98
cost2	-.05	.67*	-.37	-.63	.05	.76
cost3	.40	.95*	-.52	-.52	-.18	.98
valu1	-.31	.39	-.24	-.34	-.73*	.89
valu2	-.04	.65*	-.39	-.42	-.63	.90
valu3	-.31	.55	-.21	-.42	-.59	.90
social	-.06	.64	-.30	-.40	-.71*	.96
attrib	.62	.06	-.47	-.14	.75*	.86
norm	.88*	.58	-.67*	-.40	.32	.99
phelp	.89*	.62	-.68*	-.44	.24	.99

N=20 subjects

n=15 situations

\*p&lt;.01

Table 6c

## Condition 3 ("Control")

	Dimension				R2
	Saliency: .207	.168	.140	.109	
Dimensional Scale	1	2	3	4	
st1	-.69*	-.18	-.84*	.79*	.98
st2	-.53	.11	-.76*	.29	.66
st3	-.69*	-.07	-.88*	.68*	.96
val1	-.35	.67*	-.57	-.10	.90
val2	-.34	.61	-.65*	.07	.84
val3	-.06	.81*	-.56	-.14	.92
trib	-.53	.32	-.74*	.42	.81
norm	-.39	-.80*	.14	.69*	.88
norm	-.75*	-.74*	-.42	.82*	.97
help	-.81*	-.70*	-.44	.80*	.98
seriousness (st1+cost3+valu2)	-.69*	-.01	-.90*	.66	.98
appropriateness (trib+norm)	-.61	-.83*	-.15	.81*	.96

N=19 subjects

n=15 situations

\*p&lt;.01



Table 7

Individual Differences in using the Dimensions  
 (Percentage of Subjects with Weights  
 greater than (or equal to) .30 on each dimension)

## Condition 1 ("Private") (Saliency)

1	70.00%	.211
2	50.00%	.174
3	40.00%	.144
4	35.00%	.095

## Condition 2 ("Public") (Saliency)

1	45.00%	.174
2	60.00%	.157
3	35.00%	.115
4	40.00%	.106
5	40.00%	.104

## Condition 3 ("Control") (Saliency)

1	57.89%	.207
2	52.63%	.168
3	36.84%	.140
4	31.58%	.109

Table 8

Unidimensional Scales  
Means and Standard Deviations

Situation	Condition 1 ("Private")		Condition 2 ("Public")		Condition 3 ("Control")	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
<b>cost1="It would be (easy(1)-difficult(5)) for Taylor to help"</b>						
1	1.65	.81	1.60	.82	1.42	.61
2	2.70	1.38	2.90	1.37	3.00	1.29
3	1.95	.85	2.15	1.42	2.42	1.68
4	3.75	1.33	3.70	1.17	4.10	.88
5	2.85	1.27	2.45	.76	2.45	.94
6	1.15	.49	1.26	.45	1.11	.32
7	2.45	1.39	2.80	1.44	3.05	1.18
8	4.50	.69	4.70	.66	4.95	.23
9	3.65	1.04	3.40	1.31	3.63	1.16
10	1.20	.52	1.20	.41	1.37	.60
11	4.20	.70	4.20	.62	4.21	.86
12	1.05	.22	1.05	.23	1.05	.23
13	3.90	1.17	4.00	1.03	3.83	.86
14	1.10	.45	1.05	.22	1.05	.23
15	1.05	.22	1.00	.00	1.16	.50
<b>cost2="In order to help Ross, Taylor must give up a(n) (interesting(1)-boring(5)) activity"</b>						
1	3.55	1.05	3.00	.97	3.28	.75
2	3.75	.79	3.20	1.20	3.10	1.05
3	3.50	1.05	3.35	1.04	3.28	1.23
4	2.95	1.23	2.75	1.12	2.42	.96
5	2.10	1.12	2.15	1.18	1.95	1.32
6	3.60	1.10	4.00	1.03	3.68	1.00
7	2.68	1.06	2.70	1.03	2.42	.90
8	2.90	1.29	2.70	1.17	2.32	1.06
9	2.55	.83	2.65	1.23	2.47	1.07
10	3.53	1.39	3.00	1.03	2.79	1.44
11	3.22	1.06	3.10	.97	3.00	.94
12	3.95	.83	3.85	1.09	4.05	.97
13	1.20	.52	1.21	.42	1.00	.00
14	3.83	1.14	3.75	1.12	3.95	1.03
15	3.95	.89	3.80	1.06	4.06	.94

Table 8 (cont'd)

cost3="In order to help Ross, Taylor would have to make a (very small(1)-great(15)) mental or emotional effort"

1	3.30	2.18	3.25	3.34	3.90	1.94
2	8.55	4.21	8.60	4.51	9.37	3.48
3	6.20	3.40	5.45	3.65	6.68	3.95
4	11.70	2.77	10.10	3.14	12.03	2.51
5	7.10	3.50	6.85	3.15	7.65	4.07
6	2.90	2.38	2.85	2.10	2.68	3.27
7	7.40	3.47	8.15	4.34	8.63	3.86
8	11.30	3.33	12.25	3.93	11.84	3.66
9	10.70	3.39	10.55	3.82	9.53	5.06
10	2.00	1.65	2.55	1.48	4.10	2.56
11	11.70	2.85	11.15	3.05	11.32	3.23
12	1.90	2.38	1.85	1.63	2.58	2.14
13	11.10	2.63	11.45	3.90	12.74	2.62
14	1.50	1.10	1.35	.74	1.58	1.30
15	1.60	.94	1.65	1.31	2.00	1.49

valu1="Ross will probably feel (unaffected(1)-very upset(5)) if Taylor does not help"

1	2.40	1.19	2.45	1.00	2.79	.98
2	4.70	.57	4.55	.76	4.63	.68
3	2.85	1.18	2.80	1.10	2.74	1.28
4	3.70	1.08	4.10	.64	4.10	.74
5	3.95	.89	4.32	.67	4.45	.69
6	4.00	1.03	3.95	.60	3.68	1.06
7	2.90	1.25	2.65	1.14	2.53	1.22
8	3.65	.93	3.30	.92	3.79	1.03
9	4.21	1.23	4.10	1.10	3.90	1.15
10	2.55	1.05	2.90	1.02	3.42	.84
11	3.15	1.27	3.20	1.06	3.63	.90
12	4.00	.97	3.50	.95	3.63	.90
13	4.05	.94	4.20	.83	4.47	.77
14	2.45	1.39	2.15	1.14	2.37	.96
15	3.50	1.10	3.30	.92	3.47	1.02

Table 8 (cont'd)

valu2="If Taylor helps Ross, Ross will probably feel  
(very grateful(5)-neutral(1))"

1	2.45	.94	2.80	.89	2.95	1.08
2	4.80	.52	4.90	.31	5.00	.00
3	2.65	1.39	3.25	1.02	3.05	1.03
4	4.20	.77	4.35	.59	4.37	.76
5	4.65	.59	4.63	.60	4.95	.22
6	3.85	.81	3.65	.99	4.00	.74
7	2.70	.86	3.00	.97	2.68	1.11
8	4.00	1.34	4.10	1.12	4.10	1.15
9	4.90	.45	4.85	.37	4.84	.37
10	2.90	1.02	3.00	.80	3.16	.96
11	3.75	1.25	4.05	.94	3.95	.91
12	3.70	.92	3.55	1.00	4.05	.97
13	4.40	.75	4.50	.61	4.63	.68
14	1.80	.77	2.00	.86	2.16	1.17
15	3.60	1.05	3.30	1.03	3.58	.61

valu3="If Taylor does not help Ross, the consequences  
for Ross would be (major(15)-minor(1))"

1	3.85	2.59	4.55	2.98	5.79	3.90
2	13.05	2.59	12.15	3.66	12.84	2.67
3	2.80	2.50	2.55	1.90	3.16	2.75
4	9.80	4.12	10.80	2.74	10.74	2.98
5	12.30	1.98	12.80	2.50	12.00	2.89
6	7.90	3.75	7.25	3.81	8.32	3.02
7	4.05	2.78	3.75	2.49	4.84	2.59
8	5.30	3.57	6.40	3.95	5.94	4.34
9	12.10	3.14	12.30	3.57	12.10	2.08
10	4.90	2.92	3.10	2.10	5.05	1.65
11	5.05	4.99	7.60	3.89	4.37	3.73
12	7.60	2.98	6.75	4.05	8.84	3.34
13	11.60	2.35	11.63	3.59	12.42	3.29
14	3.10	2.54	2.60	2.30	1.58	1.12
15	7.90	3.34	6.25	3.57	7.53	3.50

Table 8 (cont'd)

social="If I helped Ross, and my best friend or family found out about it, they would: (not think twice about it(1)-probably think that I was generous or thoughtful(5))"

1	1.65	1.14	1.55	.89	1.68	1.06
2	4.37	1.26	4.60	.60	4.26	1.10
3	2.30	1.22	2.35	1.53	2.79	1.65
4	3.10	1.12	3.35	1.09	3.79	1.36
5	3.85	1.09	4.00	1.17	2.90	1.33
6	3.40	1.50	3.10	1.55	3.26	1.45
7	1.84	1.12	2.25	1.41	2.32	1.42
8	3.35	1.18	3.35	1.35	4.00	1.45
9	4.55	.89	4.55	.83	4.37	.90
10	2.35	1.42	2.15	1.39	2.42	1.30
11	3.65	1.14	3.40	1.43	4.16	1.34
12	3.05	1.67	2.90	1.55	2.95	1.58
13	4.55	.83	4.40	.75	4.58	.69
14	1.30	.80	1.25	.64	1.21	.92
15	2.35	1.42	2.00	1.34	2.67	1.50

attrib="(Ross' problem is due to fate or bad luck(1)-Ross caused the problem to develop(5))"

1	3.40	1.14	3.30	.86	3.44	.70
2	1.35	.74	1.25	.55	1.26	.65
3	4.50	1.00	4.26	.99	3.90	1.20
4	4.25	1.02	4.60	.68	4.32	1.06
5	1.85	1.14	2.00	1.38	1.55	.94
6	1.55	.76	1.60	.94	1.58	.90
7	3.15	.74	2.75	.44	3.32	.82
8	4.45	.39	3.75	1.48	4.47	1.07
9	1.37	.76	1.35	.59	1.74	1.10
10	3.26	.81	3.20	.77	2.94	.87
11	4.55	1.05	4.40	1.31	4.63	.60
12	1.55	.83	1.55	.83	1.39	.78
13	1.10	.31	1.55	1.00	1.21	.54
14	3.16	.76	3.35	.74	3.56	.78
15	2.85	1.04	3.15	.74	2.89	.58

Table 8 (cont'd)

norm="Taylor should (definitely(1)-definitely not(5))  
help Ross"

1	1.80	.70	2.00	.92	1.74	.45
2	1.35	.99	1.15	.37	1.21	.42
3	3.90	1.21	4.20	.77	4.16	.76
4	3.55	.83	2.95	1.00	3.05	.70
5	1.90	.79	1.70	.80	1.60	.88
6	1.05	.22	1.05	.22	1.00	.00
7	2.25	.72	2.60	1.00	3.00	.88
8	4.45	.76	4.75	.44	4.63	.60
9	2.10	.72	2.00	.92	2.10	.74
10	1.20	.41	1.30	.57	1.58	.61
11	4.50	.61	4.60	.60	4.26	.81
12	1.00	.00	1.00	.00	1.00	.00
13	2.35	.99	2.20	.83	2.21	.92
14	1.15	.37	1.10	.31	1.42	.69
15	1.00	.00	1.10	.31	1.10	.32

p(help)="I would (definitely not(1)-certainly(15))  
help Ross"

1	12.80	2.33	12.05	3.30	12.00	2.89
2	12.45	3.07	13.15	3.34	13.90	1.49
3	5.40	3.53	4.75	3.86	4.42	3.73
4	6.60	3.15	8.75	2.86	7.37	3.18
5	10.37	2.98	12.20	2.09	12.40	2.82
6	13.70	3.11	13.79	3.21	14.79	.54
7	11.20	2.33	9.85	3.07	9.74	3.77
8	3.00	2.97	2.80	3.17	4.10	3.45
9	11.53	2.74	11.35	2.41	10.84	2.79
10	13.20	3.10	13.85	1.76	13.05	2.01
11	2.90	1.65	2.75	1.59	4.10	3.31
12	14.70	.73	14.65	.99	14.58	1.39
13	9.70	3.06	10.15	2.78	10.53	2.88
14	14.30	1.34	14.55	1.05	14.16	1.64
15	14.40	1.31	14.65	1.35	14.37	.90

Table 9a

## Correlations of the Unidimensional Ratings

## Rating Scale Key

- 1) COST1="It would be (easy-difficult) for Taylor to help"
- 2) COST2="In order to help Ross, Taylor must give up a(n) (interesting-boring) activity"
- 3) COST3="In order to help Ross, Taylor would have to make a (very small-great) mental or emotional effort"
- 4) VALU1="Ross will probably feel (unaffected-very upset) if Taylor does not help"
- 5) VALU2="If Taylor helps Ross, Ross will probably feel (very grateful-neutral)"
- 6) VALU3="If Taylor does not help Ross, the consequences for Ross would be (major-minor)"
- 7) SOCIAL="If I helped Ross, and my best friend or family found out about it, they would: (not think twice about it-probably think that I was generous or thoughtful)"
- 8) ATTRIB="(Ross' problem is due to fate or bad luck-Ross caused the problem to develop)"
- 9) NORM="Taylor should (definitely-definitely not) help Ross"
- 10) P(HELP)="I would (definitely not-certainly) help Ross"

## Condition 1 ("Private")

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	----									
2	-.38	----								
3	.79	-.34	----							
4	.14	-.15	.16	----						
5	-.33	.23	-.35	-.43	----					
6	-.25	.14	-.28	-.42	.58	----				
7	.41	-.26	.43	.38	-.61	-.55	----			
8	.15	.08	.13	-.26	.30	.46	-.33	----		
9	.61	-.19	.61	-.05	-.08	.15	.12	.56	----	
10	-.63	.21	-.61	.07	.09	-.12	-.13	-.51	-.84	----

Table 9b

## Correlations of the Unidimensional Ratings

	1	2	3	Condition 2 ("Public")		8	9	10		
				4	5	6	7			
1	----									
2	-.37	----								
3	.81	-.37	----							
4	.27	-.17	.30	----						
5	-.43	.21	-.50	-.53	----					
6	-.40	.21	-.44	-.58	.61	----				
7	.43	-.19	.43	.45	-.57	-.56	----			
8	.09	.03	.06	-.34	.26	.36	-.33	----		
9	.57	-.17	.55	-.12	-.12	.09	.04	.50	----	
10	-.59	.21	-.55	.09	.14	-.02	-.11	-.42	-.85	----



Table 9c

## Correlations of the Unidimensional Ratings

## Condition 3 ("Control")

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	----									
2	-.34	----								
3	.77	-.43	----							
4	.22	-.17	.26	----						
5	-.26	.22	-.33	-.65	----					
6	-.18	.24	-.24	-.53	.59	----				
7	.51	-.18	.46	.31	-.46	-.30	----			
8	.23	.09	.17	-.30	.34	.50	-.08	----		
9	.62	-.22	.52	-.13	.10	.30	.17	.56	----	
10	-.60	.22	-.51	.10	-.05	-.20	-.24	-.51	-.88	----

## Appendix A

## Stimulus Situations

1. While Taylor is studying in the library, Ross approaches and asks him if he would watch his backpack and calculator while he goes into the stacks to find a book. Taylor must decide whether to watch Ross's belongings or continue studying without this distraction.

2. Taylor just got off a train and is headed home after a hard day at work. No one is around and he sees Ross calling for help. Ross just fell and sprained his ankle. Taylor must decide whether to help Ross get to a doctor or continue home.

3. Taylor is in line for a movie. Ross, a stranger, asks to get in line in front of him so that he does not have to wait to get in to the show. It is very cold outside and Taylor has to decide whether to let Ross out in line or tell him to go to the end of the line.

4. Taylor has just begun studying for a test that is two hours away. He gets a phone call from Ross, a classmate. Ross wants to borrow his notes for the test since he missed a few lectures. Ross does not know anyone in the class. Taylor must decide whether to meet with Ross so that he can use his notes to study for the test or to continue studying.

5. While Taylor is watching TV, Ross, a student in the same apartment building asks him for a ride to class on campus. Ross is going to be late for an important test and his car will not start. Taylor must decide whether to give up his TV show and drive Ross to class or make an excuse so he does not have to leave.

6. While Taylor is leisurely walking home from class, Ross, a polio victim, asks him to help in maneuvering his wheelchair across the street. Taylor must decide whether to help Ross or continue on his way home.

7. While Taylor is hurrying to an exam, Ross approaches and asks him to give him directions to another building. Taylor must decide whether to risk being late for the exam in order to give Ross the directions or to continue hurrying to the test.

8. While Taylor is studying for an important exam to be given on the following morning, Ross calls and asks him if he could work the night shift for him that night so that he can use a ticket that was just acquired for a rock concert. Ross's favorite group is playing. Taylor must decide whether he should stop studying in order to work for Ross or whether to continue preparing for the exam.

9. Taylor has just begun an hour drive to his home in order to keep an important appointment. He sees a car at the side of a lonely road with someone flagging for assistance. Taylor must decide whether to stop and help the man or to hurry home.

10. While Taylor is walking down an apartment hallway on the way to visit a friend, Ross approaches and asks him if he would hold his baby for a few minutes so that he can find his keys. Taylor must decide whether to stop and hold the baby or continue to his friend's apartment.

11. Taylor is spending the evening studying. Ross asks him to finish typing his term paper because his friend just called and Ross wants to go to a party. Ross doesn't know anyone else in the dorm that is in and has a typewriter. Taylor must decide whether to type Ross's paper so that he can go to the party or continue studying.

12. Taylor is approaching the heavy, outside door of a building on campus on the way to class. Ross, a pelvic victim in a wheelchair, is approaching and asks him to hold the door open. Taylor must decide whether to hold the door open or not.

13. Taylor has just finished a full week of work and is looking forward to a day off. He has a full day of activities planned. Ross, a person who works another shift, phones Taylor and asks him to work the next day in his place. Ross must attend the funeral of a relative and no one else will work for him. Taylor must decide whether to give up his day off or follow through with his scheduled plans and turn Ross down.

14. While Taylor is walking across campus, Ross approaches and asks him for the time. Taylor must decide whether to stop and give Ross the time or continue walking.

15. Taylor is walking toward the door of a building and sees Ross approaching him with an arm full of boxes marked "fragile". Ross asks him to hold the heavy door for him. Taylor must decide whether to hold the door for Ross or not.