



ALTRUISM AND WORKERS ENGAGEMENT

Victor Barinua (Ph.D)

*Department of management, Faculty of Management Sciences
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria*

Fingerisi Iwarimie Prince

*Department of management, Faculty of Management Sciences
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria*

Abstract

Altruism is a productive and positive life virtue. This is so especially because it promotes one's happiness by pursuing the happiness of others. The degree of altruism could vary in form and scope. There are empirical evidences from studies to show the direct link between helping someone at work and someone's happiness. Altruism improves both the actor and the overall work environment. The study therefore reviewed related literature to deduce and highlight the link between altruism and workers engagement underscored by such measures as: recognition, clarity, autonomy, fairness, stress, growth, workload and relationship. Of course there are other drives of employee engagement but the study focused on the import of altruism on workers engagement.

Keywords: Altruism, Workers Engagement

Introduction

Globalization has created very dynamic and highly competitive environment where enterprises are searching for opportunities in the ever increasing and dynamic market. This kind of internal and external work environments has engendered an evolving work culture with a sense of striving to gain market advantage or constantly improving or enhancing the unique selling proposition of the company and effective competition in the marketplace. According to Ogan (1998), every employee have this intrinsic desire to identify with a well ran organization and they are the constituent elements with core responsibilities of making the organization functionally well ran and desirable. Workers engagement therefore appears to have greater importance in the success and sustainability of an organization. The initiatives would consist of a specific focus on critical work-related behaviors of the employees and adopting strategic approaches for the well-being of the existing staff. Such attempts predicated on the actions and strategic direction of the managers ultimately creates an enabling work environment where the employees display altruistic behavior against their colleagues and are satisfied with their jobs. Specific individuals called “boundary-spanning employees” who provide service across borders of the organizations to establish interconnection link between the third parties and the organization by protecting and transferring information. From an organizational perspective, they undertake a strategic role between the customer and the company by developing cooperation and fostering the relationship between them. Networks are the passageway primarily for information and many other things.

Review of Related Literature

Concept of Altruism

The earliest proponent of the concept of Altruism was the father of Positivism as a rejoinder to egoism in the person of Auguste Comte in the 19th century. Auguste Comte was a French philosopher, so the work was later represented in English by George Henry Lewes in 1953. The concept of ‘altruism’ means offering assistance, or a disposition of helping others without consideration of personal benefit or expectation of benefit of reward. Since the 1960s there has been this dire need and requests from scholars to conduct scientific research on the subject as “helpful actions” had become quite popular and contemporaneous from the social psychology point of view and this has culminated to the prominence of the term Altruism even in the 1990s. Consequent upon the empirical works of Scholars like C. Daniel Batson (2007) the word or concept of Altruism became redefined as a product of empathy however a motivational state aimed at the ultimate wellbeing of others (Batson, 1991). Altruism is one of the categories or the core elements of Organizational Citizen Behavior OCB. OCB is a term used to describe all the positive and constructive employee actions and behavior that are not part of their formal job description (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Following the evolution of OCB, five categories which included, altruism (helping behaviors),generalized compliance (a meticulous act for the well-fare of the organization), courtesy, sportsmanship and civic virtue (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Eisenberg (1982) redefined altruistic behavior as a discretionary behavior intended to support other individuals which are intrinsically motivated without expecting a reward. Batson (1991) and Eisenberg and Fabes (1998) comprehensively explored the notion of empathy in aspects of emotional and cognitive reactions which might be a driver for altruistic behaviors. According to Eisenberg and Fabes (1998), altruism is a form of pro-social behavior is deemed as the intentional behavior which is selfless need to assist another.

Corollary, Kaplan (2000) suggested that individuals with altruistic values, benefit others without expecting any return from others for his/her personality. According to Carlo et al. (1991) and Smith et al. (1983), altruism refers to engagement in helping behaviors. According to Smith, Organ and Near (1983), "altruism" is expressed as one of the two types of OCB after their interview with the managers. Smith et al. (1983) in addition suggested that altruism is related to direct behaviors aiming at helping someone face a situation. Dennis W. Organ pioneered theories and approaches regarding discretionary and spontaneous behaviors of the employees and highlighted the importance of these behaviors in organizational effectiveness. Organ (1988) who contributes markedly to the development of the term OCB, further expanded the classification of OCB comprising altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. According to Organ (1988), altruism is conceptualized as the behaviors implying enthusiasm for helping others who may have an excessive workload. After few years, Morrison (1994) described the concept of altruism which is an inconsistency with Organ's (1988) conceptualization regarding altruism and courtesy. Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996) differentiate the interpersonal acceleration from job commitment which corresponds to Morrison's (1994) altruism as well as Organ's (1988) altruism including courtesy. Coleman and Borman' (2000) notion of OCB is composed of three components as Interpersonal Citizenship Performance, Organizational Citizenship Performance, and Job/Task Citizenship.

Dovido (1984) identified four critical dimensions that have been used to define altruistic behavior in an attempt to categorize forms of helping. These dimensions were the consequences, the intent, the motivation of the act, and the locus of reinforcement underlying the behavior. These dimensions were represented in Bar Tal and Raviv's (1982) definition of altruism. These dimensions of the concept of altruism were reinforced by Bateman and Organ (1983) and were noted as consequences, locus of reinforcement, intentions and motivation. These dimensions of altruism are the micro indicators of altruism that will directly impact the on workers engagement measured by the following indicators: Personal and professional growth, employee wellbeing, employee value proposition, work relationships, work satisfaction as well as leadership and culture.

Consequences

As a dimension of Altruism, the concept of consequences is frequently regarded as a kind of consequentialism, implying that an action is ethically correct if it has positive repercussions for others. Although altruism and utilitarianism are similar, there is a key difference: utilitarianism prescribes acts that maximize good outcomes for everyone in society, whereas altruism prescribes excellent outcomes for everyone except the actor. Because the rest of society almost always outnumbers the utilitarian, Spencer maintained that a real utilitarian will invariably practice benevolence or a kind of altruism.

Intentions Giving assistance without regard for future remuneration is the norm of responsibility. Altruistic behavior is determined by motivation for future selfless expectations generated from social standards. When one person assists another, the latter must respond in kind according to the reciprocity principle. Interpersonal interactions are also marked by equity, which means that everyone expects to get advantages in proportion to what he or she has invested. This is the intention to build or participate or foster that kind of community (Andreoni, 2007).

Motivation

This concept explains the reason for performing the behavior and the justification for every action is reflected in the motivation. Altruistic acts are those that are done voluntarily and intentionally for the benefit of the person in need without expecting anything in return. It is important to note that the proposed definition focuses on the motivation to perform a helpful deed. Motivation has important implications for understanding the nature of human beings, the development of helping behavior and the dynamics of interpersonal interaction. So as a justification for altruistic behavior, is concern for others or by internalized values, goals, and self-rewards rather than by the expectation on concrete or social rewards or the desire to avoid punishment (Azam et al., 2017).

Locus of control

The degree to which people think they, rather than other forces (beyond their control), have control over the outcome of events in their lives is referred to as locus of control. Julian B. Rotter created the concept in 1954, and it has since become a part of personality psychology. A person's "locus" (plural "loci," Latin for "place" or "location") can be internal (belief in one's ability to manage one's own life) or external (belief in one's ability to control one's own life) (a belief that life is controlled by outside factors which the person cannot influence, or that chance or fate controls their lives).

Concept of Workers Engagement

Workers engagement is a fundamental concept in an attempt to understand and describe qualitatively and quantitatively the nature of the relationship between an organization and its employee. It describes the level of enthusiasm and dedication a worker feels towards their job (Paille, P., & Grima, F. (2011)). When workers are engaged, they are motivated enough and feel their effort make a difference in the organization they work. Workers engagement is an attitude and a mindset that determines the level of self-motivation. Organ (1988) summed that workers engagement is important because it promotes effective functioning of the organization. The scholar maintained that Organization's and managers' roles are thereby significant in promoting altruistic behaviors of the employees, especially for those occupying boundary-spanning positions, within the organization in various ways such as encouraging good team working, empowerment, building trust, respect and cooperation among the employees. These tendencies, behavior otherwise called OCB engenders workers enthusiasm, dedication and positive feeling towards their job (Owolabi 2012).

Engagement is not something that happens in a vacuum. It must be rooted in a company culture that encourages and sustains employee engagement. In a nutshell, corporate culture is the sum of a company's actions, including its management's decisions and behavior, as well as its business practices and processes. This definition can be shortened even more: The way a company does business is defined by its corporate culture. The premise of self-organization of self-motivated and self-disciplined people underpins the ideal future engagement organization. While some hierarchy is unavoidable, it should be kept to a minimum. The most fundamental principle is teamwork, which allows individuals to unite and use their combined talents. As a result, corporate success is built on a paradox: firms that create the best environment for positive self-action also build the best teams.

To build on this concept, we may add that employee engagement is also a two-way street: an employer-employee relationship based on mutual trust and respect. It necessitates that an organization's executives and managers communicate their expectations to employees in a

clear and comprehensive manner, empower individuals at suitable levels of competence, and establish a working environment and corporate culture conducive to employee engagement.

It may seem simple, but the notion is necessary to combat the habits and practices that have developed over hundreds of years of poor management. As a result of these terrible practices, only a small percentage of employees are fully engaged in their work. This finding is supported by surveys: According to British and other European surveys, active participation in the workplace is typically very low, with the majority of employees reporting to be merely "moderately interested." Therefore, the measures of employee commitment according to Marsh (2004) as engendered by such variables like; motivation, locus of control, consequences and intentions for altruistic behavior. It may be simple, but the notion is necessary to combat the habits and procedures that have been ingrained in the corporate world for hundreds of years. As a result of these unethical activities, only a small percentage of employees are actually engaged in their jobs. This is supported by research: According to British and other European research, active engagement in the workplace is often low, with the majority reporting to be merely "moderately interested."

Baseline theory

Altruism theory

Selflessness, in morals, a theory of lead that sees the benefit of other people as the finish of moral activity. The term (French altruisme, got from Latin meaning, "other") was authored in the nineteenth century by Auguste Comte, the author of Positivism, and took on for the most part as an advantageous absolute opposite to vanity. Behavior is normally described as altruistic when the motivating factor is simply the benefit of others. It is a form of prosocial behaviour which is the intentional behavior that results in benefits for another person. Such behavior is considered to be altruistic if it is motivated by a genuine desire to benefit another person, without any expectation of benefits to oneself (Feigin et al. 2014; Eisenberg & Miller 1987).

Employee Engagement Theory

Employee engagement is about how to achieve a company's strategic goals by establishing the conditions for human resources to thrive and for each employee, manager, and executive to be completely switched on in their work so that they may give their all in the best interests of the firm. When stated simply, the principle of employee engagement appears to be common sense. According to the principle, an organization's management must ensure that all of their employees are fully engaged and turned on at their employment. The ideal situation is for employees to be entirely committed, similar to how entrepreneurs care for their enterprises or individuals in general care for their own homes. Being engaged simply means that you are completely immersed and enthusiastic about your work, and it captures your concentration and motivates you to achieve your best.

To elaborate on this description, we may argue that employee engagement is a two-way street: an employer-employee relationship based on mutual trust and respect. It necessitates an organization's executives and managers communicating their expectations to employees in a clear and comprehensive manner, empowering individuals at suitable levels of competence, and creating a work environment and corporate culture conducive to employee engagement.

It may seem simple, but the notion is necessary to combat the habits and practices that have developed over hundreds of years of poor management. As a result of these terrible practices, only a small percentage of employees are fully engaged in their work. This finding is

supported by surveys: According to British and other European surveys, active participation in the workplace is typically very low, with the majority of employees reporting to be merely "moderately interested."

Consider whether any professional sports team, performing arts group, or military unit could exist with such a low degree of participation from its members. Employee engagement is more than the sum of its parts. It's easy to mix up engagement with other notions that appear to be comparable. Job happiness, employee dedication, and employee empowerment are examples of these notions.

Job satisfaction is the first of these, and it states that companies should attempt to make their employees as happy and comfortable as possible at work. The aphorism "a happy staff is a productive workforce" sums up this theory. The fact that job happiness is effectively a one-way highway distinguishes it from employee engagement. The entire weight of involvement is put on the employer under the job satisfaction theory, whose paternal concern for the workers is shown in numerous benefits and allowances.

The issue with this approach is that a worker who is just pleased - content with his circumstances - is not obligated to give his all to the organization. Employee commitment is another hypothesis that resembles employee engagement in some ways but differs in others. Compulsion is more important than commitment when it comes to creating settings in which employees feel forced to work. The goal of employee engagement is to create an environment in which the employee has an intrinsic drive to work towards the organization's success. Engagement is a more emotional option that aims to tap into the positive motivations of employees and in the case of this study Altruism is that positive motivation.

Finally, there is the concept of empowerment. This is the notion that you should empower your staff to make business decisions. Empowerment, on the other hand, cannot be a good force without other measures to engage people and a meaningful company culture of interactions. Only those employees who are sufficiently engaged may be empowered, which brings us back to the fundamental importance of engagement.

Self-Efficacy Theory of Entrepreneurship

Self-efficacy is a notion established by Bandura (1977) to describe an individual's belief in their capacity to execute a task. The creation of intentions is thought to be preceded by self-efficacy. If a person believes they have the potential to accomplish a goal, they are more likely to acquire the desire to do it. Individuals who believe they lack the potential to achieve a goal, on the other hand, will not make plans to pursue that goal.

Individuals gain self-efficacy throughout time when they acquire a variety of abilities (cognitive, social, linguistic, or physical) as a result of their life experiences. Past accomplishments (e.g., mastery of a task) boost self-efficacy, leading to more ambitious goals (i.e., higher aspirations). Self-efficacy can also be obtained by closely observing others' behavior (i.e., vicarious or social learning), self-reflection, and social persuasion (positive feedback). Therefore, if a person performs well in a task when compared to similar individuals they witness and is informed they are performing well by others, they may conclude that they have the ability to pursue the next, more difficult work. According to self-efficacy theory, entrepreneurs will only undertake an entrepreneurial venture if they believe they have the skills and ability to meet the challenges presented by a given opportunity. If the challenge is too great for the potential entrepreneur, he or she may examine alternative options, such as salaried work.

According to Scherer et al. (1987), people who think their parents are high-performers are more likely to anticipate they would start a business themselves than people who think their parents are low-performers or who have no such role models. Entrepreneurs' kids also believe they have a better level of expertise when it comes to doing the duties required to establish a firm.

Passion Theory of Entrepreneurship

We have all seen motivation memes about passion. Some of the most popular ones are: "passion never fails," "I live my passion," "follow your passion," "passion is priceless," "passion is purpose," "make your passion your paycheck," "your passion is your success," "ignite your passion," "find your passion," and "your passion will find you." Others are: "passion never fails," "I live my passion," "follow your passion," "passion is priceless," "passion is purpose," "make your passion your paycheck," "make your passion your paycheck," "your passion is your success," "ignite your passion," "find your passion," and "your passion will find you." When entrepreneurs pitch their ideas to potential investors, we've seen their entrepreneurial spirit on display as well. TV shows such as Dragon's Den and Shark Tank have contributed to our understanding of prospective business success by putting passion at the heart of our evaluations. "I admire your enthusiasm," is a common phrase heard when a deal is struck for a made-for-TV project.

Passion and Entrepreneurship Theory

"Passion inspires us to work harder and with greater effect. The irony is that we hardly notice our effort. It comes easily and enjoyably" (Chang, 2002). Over the last two decades, entrepreneurship researchers have started to unpack the concept of entrepreneurial passion, which has long been a mainstay of Altruism. Perhaps entrepreneurs view their ventures as their babies and nurture them with a similar level of passion that parents feel toward their human children (Cardon et al., 2005). Perhaps entrepreneurship researchers need to pay more attention to emotions when explaining entrepreneurial behaviors. Vallerand et al. (2003) argue that there are two main types of passion: "Obsessive passion (OP) refers to a controlled internalization of an activity in one's identity that creates an internal pressure to engage in the activity that the person likes." While "Harmonious passion (HP) refers to an autonomous internalization that leads individuals to choose to engage in the activity that they like. HP promotes healthy adaptation whereas OP thwarts it by causing negative affect and rigid persistence"

These concepts have been recently been put to use in some empirical studies. For instance, Thorngren and Wincent (2015) find that passion is greater among selfless effort of Altruistic people of whom are mostly serial entrepreneurs than first time entrepreneurs. They find portfolio entrepreneurs (those with multiple simultaneous business interests) have the highest levels of harmonious passion. We've all seen motivational tweets about pursuing one's passion. "Purpose never fails," "I live my passion," "follow your passion," "passion is priceless," "passion is purpose," "make your passion your paycheck," "make your passion your paycheck," "your passion is your success," "ignite your passion," "find your passion," and "your passion will find you," are just a few examples. We've also seen entrepreneurs' entrepreneurial zeal on display when pitching their ideas to potential investors. TV shows like Dragon's Den and Shark Tank have influenced our perceptions of possible entrepreneurial success by emphasizing the importance of passion. Before striking a deal for made-for-TV, it's customary to say, "I like your passion." Consider the alternative options first, before we take our love for anything too seriously. For example, Gielnik et al. (2015) have a significantly different point of view on the subject. According to their findings, there is the possibility of reverse causality, in which entrepreneurial effort leads to company success,

which in turn stimulates passion. Taking this outcome into consideration, it appears that igniting passion is less a question of building yourself up and more of a side-effect of achievement and accomplishment.

Theory of Planned Behavior in Entrepreneurship

The theory of planned behavior was developed by Polish social psychologist Icek Ajzen (1991) to predict a variety of social behaviors in different fields including consumer behavior, politics, and healthcare. As indicated by the theory, the main determinants of a planned behavior are their aim to participate in the conduct—not their mentalities toward practices as these are simply expected to influence goals. Accordingly, for instance, if a potential citizen has the goal to cast a ballot they are bound to cast a ballot than if they simply think casting a ballot is something to be thankful for to do. The theory holds tight the idea of expectations, which are characterized as a singular's inspiration and cognizant choice or plan to consume work to achieve a conduct. The connection among goal and activity is relied upon to be more grounded when there is a brief time frame hole among them and when there is a fitting degree of explicitness between the goal and the move to be made. Proceeding with our model, if an elector has an aim to cast a ballot in an approaching political decision at a predefined area and for a predetermined party and level of government, they are bound to complete their expectation.

When applied to business, the theory recommends that participating in business is deliberate and accordingly is better anticipated by expectations instead of character, segment qualities, mentalities or convictions. The theory recommends full intercession, with the end goal that reviews ought to consistently utilize exogenous variables to foresee a singular's aim to turn into a business person and not propose models that connect exogenous factors straightforwardly to innovative practices. Innovative expectations are currently broadly contemplates with numerous analysts attempting to anticipate goal arrangement with a wide assortment of precursors like self-viability and human resources. Notwithstanding, there is still some incredulity about the hypothesis in light of the fact that pioneering expectations don't generally convert into enterprising activity. At some point enterprising activity isn't called for, and advancing innovative aims may not be useful if different elements are not set up.

In conclusion, Biological theories claim that altruism has a genetic foundation and attempt to explain pro-social behavior through genetic causes. Sociological theories are largely concerned with social norms, namely the norms of accountability and fairness. People, according to this notion, act in predictable ways. When internal moral criteria are met, they act in a way that makes them feel happy and pleased, rather than for the sake of gaining a direct benefit (norm of responsibility). Individuals who have internalized the accountability standard are more engaged in altruistic connections than those who have not (Rushton, 1980).

Conclusion (Finding and recommendation)

According to Bateman and Organ (1983), Employees may display Altruism, when they are satisfied with their occupations as a result of support or benefits supplied by their organization or coworkers. Employees in organizations with a high prevalence of Altruism, according to Podsakoff et al. (1993), are more likely to demonstrate high levels of job satisfaction, and commit to making the workers engagement and altruism been extensively researched in the literature from the perspective of traditional organizations, which have a leader and subordinates on numerous levels and are stable enough to be unaffected by external factors. Some studies looked at Workers engagement as a precursor to altruism

(Allen and Rush, 1998; Bateman and Organ, 1983; Bishop et al., 2000) .Unlike traditional companies, this research focuses on review of works some of which used firms and organizations, where boundary-spanning staff have frequent interactions with clients and the company is susceptible to external influences. According to the findings of a study conducted on faculty members by Salehi and Gholtash (2011), Altruism is positively influenced by Worker's engagement. Only contented employees, according to Werner (2007), appear to be displaying positive activities that can contribute to the organization.

Similarly, Salehi and Gholtash (2011) found that Altruism and workers engagement have a beneficial influence on worker engagement in their study of faculty members. Only contented employees, according to Werner (2007), appear to be displaying productive actions that can help the company succeed. In their study, Kuehn and Al-Busaidi (2002) discovered a substantial positive link between altruism and worker engagement. Their findings demonstrate that altruism and associated virtues inspire employee engagement in the workplace, resulting in extra-role activities shown by employees. It can be concluded that employees who demonstrate a higher level of altruism boost employee engagement.

Recommendation

From the study it can be seen that there is a two-way relationship between Altruism and worker engagement. Selflessness makes the worker display selfless attitude as he strives to improve the work environment and impact positively on the organizational culture; while a very health work environment that really engages the workers end up effortlessly having a selfless and highly motivated workforce that cares more about doing good for the benefit of others. Altruism is a virtue therefore that should encourage and nurtured is possible taught in schools. There should also be more research in the area of altruism as it will ultimately breed a better society and not just the workforce or increase productivity.

Reference

- Batson, C.D., Fultz, J., Schoenrade, P.A. & Paduano, A. (1987). Critical self-reflection and self-perceived altruism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 594–602.
- Batson, C.D., & Moran, T. (1999). Empathy-induced altruism in a prisoner's dilemma. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 909–924.
- Batson, C.D. & Weeks, J.L. (1996). Mood effects of unsuccessful helping: another test of the empathy-altruism hypothesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 148–157.
- Becker, S.W. & Eagly, A.H. (2004). The heroism of women and men. *American Psychologist*, 59, 163–178.
- Carlo, G., Koller, S.H., Eisenberg, N., DaSilva, M.S. & Frohlich, C.B. (1996). A cross-national study on the relations among prosocial moral reasoning, gender role orientation, and prosocial behaviours. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 231–240.
- Comte-Sponville, A. (2003). *A short treatise on the great virtues: the uses of philosophy in everyday life*. Trans. Temerson, Vintage.
- DeWall, C.N. & Baumeister, R.F. (2006). Alone but feeling no pain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 1–15.
- Dovidio, J.F., Piliavin, J.A., Gaertner, S.L., Schroeder, D.A. & Clark, R.D., III. (1991). The arousal: Cost-reward model and the process of intervention. In M.S. Clark (Ed.) *Review of personality and social psychology*, 12, 86–118). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Eisenberg, N. (2000). Emotion, regulation, and moral development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 665–697.
- Fehr, B. & Russell, J.A. (1991). The concept of love viewed from a prototype perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 425–438.
- Fishbach, A., Dahr, R. & Zhang, Y. (2006). Subgoals as substitutes or complements: the role of goal accessibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 232–242.
- Forni, P.M. (2002). *Choosing civility*. St. Martin Griffin.
- Greitemeyer, T., Fischer, P., Kastenmuller, A. & Frey, D. (2006). Civil courage and helping behaviour. *European Psychologist*, 11, 90–98.
- Haidt, J. & Algoe, S. (2004). *Moral amplification and the emotions that attach us to saints and demons*. In J. Greenberg, S.L. Koole & T. Pyszczynski (Eds.) *Handbook of experimental existential psychology*. Guilford Press.
- Håkansson, J. & Montgomery, H. (2003). Empathy as an interpersonal phenomenon. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 20, 267–284.
- Henrich, J., McElreath, R., Barr, A. et al. (2006). *Costly punishment across human societies*. *Science*, 23, 1767–1770.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1991). Is empathy altruistic? *Psychological Inquiry*, 2, 131–133.
- Hoffman, M.L. (2000). *Empathy and moral development: implications for caring and justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- King, J.A., James, R., Mitchell, G.V., Dolan, R.J. & Burgess, N. (2006). *Doing the right thing: A common neural circuit for appropriate violent or compassionate behavior*. *NeuroImage*, 30, 1069–1076.
- Knafo, A. & Plomin, R. (2006). Parental discipline, affection and children's prosocial behaviour: Genetic and environmental links. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 147–164.
- Levy, S.R., Freitas, A.L. & Salovey, P. (2002). Construing action abstractly and blurring social distinctions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1224–1238.
- Lindsey, L.L.M. (2005). Anticipated guilt as behavioral motivation. *Human Communication Research*, 31, 453–481.

- Lowery, B.S., Unzueta, M.M., Knowles, E.D. & Goff, P.A. (2006). Concern for the in-group and opposition to affirmative action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 961–974.
- Maio, G.R., Olson, J.M., Allen, L. & Bernard, M.M. (2001). Addressing discrepancies between values and behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 104–117.
- Marsh, J. (2004, Spring). In search of the moral voice. *Greater Good*, pp.22–25.
- Neff, L.A. & Karney, B.R. (2005). To know you is to love you. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 480–497.
- Nichols, S. (2001). Mindreading and the cognitive architecture underlying altruistic motivation. *Mind and Language*, 16, 425–455.
- O’Donohoe, S. & Turley, D. (2006). Compassion at the counter: Service providers and bereaved consumers. *Human Relations*, 59, 1429–1448.
- Peterson, C. & Seligman, M. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Piliavin, J.A., Dovidio, J.F., Gaertner, S.L. & Clark, R.D., III. (1981). *Emergency intervention*. Academic Press.
- Post, S.G. (2005). Altruism, happiness, and health: It’s good to be good. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 12, 66–77.
- Ratner, R.K. & Miller, D.T. (2001). The norm of self-interest and its effect on social action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 5–16.
- Reed, A. II. & Aquino, K.F. (2003). Moral identity and the expanding circle of moral regard toward out-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 1270–1286.
- Scourfield, J., John, B., Martin, N. & McGuffin, P. (2004). The development of prosocial behavior in children and adolescents: *A twin study*. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45, 927–935.
- Sibicky, M.E., Schroeder, D.A. & Dovidio, J.F. (1995). Empathy and helping: Considering the consequences of intervention. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 16, 435–453.
- Smith, K.D., Keating, J.P. & Stotland, E. (1989). Altruism reconsidered: The effect of denying feedback on a victim’s status to empathic witnesses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 641–650.
- Stepien, K.A. & Baernstein, A. (2006). Educating for empathy. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 21, 524–530.