Helping other people in distress is, among other things, an ethical act. That is, it is an act governed by ethical norms and precepts taught to children at home, in school, and in church. From Freudian and other personality theories, one would expect individual differences in internalization of these standards that would lead to differences between individuals in the likelihood with which they would help others. But recent research on bystander intervention in emergency situations (Bickman, 1969; Darley & Latané, 1968; Korte, 1966; but see also Schwartz & Clausen, 1970) has had bad luck in finding personality determinants of helping behavior. Although personality variables that one might expect to correlate with helping behavior have been measured (Maslowianism, authoritarianism, social desirability, alienation, and social responsibility), these were not predictive of helping. Nor was this due to a generalized lack of predictability in the helping situation, for instance, since variations in the experimental situations, such as the availability of other people who might also help, produced marked changes in rates of helping behavior.
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gave these to the housekeeper, saying, "Take care of him: and whatever more you spend, I will pay you when I come back." Which at those times, do you think, proved neighbor to him who fell among the thorns? he said, "The one who showed mercy on him." And Jesus said to him, "Go and do likewise." (Luke 10: 29-37 KJV)

To psychologists who reflect on the parable, it seems to suggest situational and personality differences between the unhelpful priest and Levite and the helpful Samaritan. What might each have been thinking and doing when he came upon the robbery victim on that desolate road? What sort of people were they?

One can specialize on differences in thought. Both the priest and Levite were religious functionaries who could be expected to have their minds occupied with religious matters. The priest's role in religious activities is obvious. The Levite's role, although less obvious, is equally important. The Levite was necessary participants in temple ceremonies. Much less can be said with any confidence about what the Samaritan might have been thinking, but, in contrast to the others, it was most likely not of a religious nature, for Samaritans were religious outcasts.

Not only was the Samaritan most likely thinking about more mundane matters than the priest and Levite, but, because he was socially less important, it seems likely that he was operating on a quite different time schedule. One can imagine the priest and Levite, prominent public figures, hurrying along with little black books full of meetings and appointments, glancingurry at their sundials. In contrast, the Samaritan would likely have far fewer and less important people coming on him to be at a particular place at a particular time, and therefore might be expected to be in less of a hurry than the prominent priest or Levite.

In addition to these situational factors, one finds personality factors suggested as well. Central among these, and apparently basic to the point that Jesus was trying to make, is a distinction between types of religiosity. Both the priest and Levite are extremely "religious." But it seems to be precisely the type of religiosity that the parable challenges. At issue is the motivation for one's religion and ethical behavior. Jesus seems to feel that the religious leaders of his time, though certainly respected and upholding citizens, may be "vain bric-a-brac" for what it will get them, both in terms of the admiration of their fellowmen and in the eyes of God. New Testament scholar B. H. Robinson (1979) noted that the Samaritan is at the other end of the spectrum:

The Samaritan does not love his fellow citizens or God. The need of neighbor are is made evident, and the Samaritan responds without any premeditation. (pp. 214-15)

That is, the Samaritan is interpersonally responding spontaneously to the situation, not as being preoccupied with the abstract ethical or organizational do's and don'ts of religion as the priest and Levite would seem to be. This is not to say that the Samaritan is portrayed as irreligious. A major intent of the parable would seem to be to present the Samaritan as a religious and ethical example, but at the same time to contrast his type of religiosity with the more common conception of religiosity that the priest and Levite represent.

To summarize the variables suggested as affecting helping behavior by the parable, the situational variables include the content of one's thinking and the amount of hurry in one's journey. The major dispositional variable seems to be differing types of religiosity. Certainly these variables do not exhaust the list that could be elicited from the parable, but they do suggest several research hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 1.** The parable implies that people who encounter a situation, possibly calling for a helping response while thinking religious and ethical thoughts will be no more likely to offer aid than persons thinking about something else. Such a hypothesis seems to run counter to a theory that focuses on norms in determining helping behavior because a normative account would predict that the increased salience of helping norms produced by thinking about religious and ethical appeals would increase helping behavior.

**Hypothesis 2.** Persons encountering a possible helping situation when they are
The order of presentation of the scale in the question-naire was RELI, AR, D-O.

Consistent with prior research (Barton, 1951), a principal-component analysis of the total scale scores of the individual items for the 70 questionnaire pro-duces a theoretically meaningful, orthogonal, un-rotated three-component structure with the following loadings:

Religion or means: received similar very high loadings from AR-I (r = .88) and AR-I (r = .71) and a moderate positive loading from RELI-ET.

D-O: received high loadings from RELI-ET (r = .87), RELI-ET (r = .75), AR-I (r = .58), and D-O (r = .75). After this configuration, and again according to Allport and Ross's recommendations, this component seemed to involve religiosity as an end in itself with some intrinsic value.

Religion or means: received a third very high loading (from RELI-ET) and a moderate load- ing from RELI-ET (r = .75). Following Rayson, this component was considered to involve religiosity emerging out of an individual's search for meaning in his personal and social world.

The three religious personality scales examined in the experimental research were constructed through the use of complex estimation factor scores coeffi-cients from these three components.

Scheduling of Experimental Study

Since the subject's acquiring a helping response was staged situations, the entire experimental study took place in 3 days, December 14-16, 1970, between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. A tight schedule was used in an effort to maintain reasonably consistent weather and light conditions. Temperatures fluctuated ac-cording to the New York Times for the 3 days during these hours was not more than 1 degree Fahrenheit. We took no scores felt, although the third day was cloudy, whereas the rest were sunny. With 6 days the subjects were randomly assigned to ex-perimental conditions.

Procedure

When a subject appeared for the experiment, an assistant (who was blind with respect to the person- ally assigned him to read a brief scenario which explained that he was participating in a study of the behavioral aspects of the subject's. After developing the rationale for the study, the statement was:

In two cases, the number of subjects in the intermediate-bury conditions. This worked against the prediction that the more highly confirmed (the bury predictions) and made no difference to the message variable too.

What we have called you is for today is to pro-vide us with some additional material which will give us a clearer picture of how you think than does the questionnaire material we have gathered thus far. Questionnaires are helpful, but tend to be somewhat artificial. Therefore, we would like to record a 3-minute talk you give based on the following passage. ... Variable 7: Message. In the task-relevant condition the passage read:

With increasing frequency the question is being asked: What jobs or profession do students in psychology especially enjoy most, and in what jobs are they most effective? The answer to this question is not an answer that the question was even asked. Students who were thought for the ministry, and once both society and the ministry saw itself as a rela-tively clear understanding of what made a "good" minister, there was no need ever to take the question for one what other jobs was society employment ever to be an asset. Today, however, neither society nor many students have a very clearly defined conception of what a "good" minister is or of what sorts of jobs are professions are the next context in which to minister. Many psychology students, apparently seriously concerned with "ministering," seems to feel that it is impossible to minster in the professional clergy. Other students, no less concerned, find the clergy the most viable profession for ministry. You are some other jobs and/or professions which for psychology experience is an asset? And, indeed, how much of an asset is it for the professional ministry? Or, even more broadly, can one minister through an "unminister-able" job at all?

In the helping-conditions, the subject was given the paragraph of the Good Samaritan story as printed earlier in this article. Next, regardless of conditions, the subject was asked:

You can say whatever you wish based on the passage. Because we are interested in how you think we are sure you will be glad to use notes in giving the talk. Do you understand what you are to do? If not, the assistant will be glad to answer questions.

After the assistant had made certain that the subject was ready, he was asked if there were any questions, and then said:

since they're farther tight on space in this building, we've used a free office in the building next door for recording the talks. Let me show you how to turn on the electron to this electronic machine. This is where Professor Steiner's laboratory is. If you go to the door (plateau at map), there's a sign, you're right here. You'll direct you to the office we're using for recording. Another of Professor Steiner's students will set you up for recording your talk is the map chart.

Variable 17: Memory. In the high-memory condition the assistant then looked at his watch and said, 70%.
hurry will be less likely to offer aid than persons not in a hurry.

Epilogue. Concerning types of religiosity, persons who are religious in a Samarian-like fashion will help more frequently than those religious in a priest or Levite fashion. Obviously, this last hypothesis is hardly operationalized as stated. Prior research by one of the investigators on types of religiosity (Ratson, 1971), however, led us to dif
erentiate three distinct ways of being religious: (a) for what it will gain one (cf. Freud, 1927, and perhaps the priest and Levite), (b) for its own intrinsic value (cf. Alpert & Ross, 1967), and (c) as a response to and quest for meaning in one's everyday life (cf. Ratson, 1971). Both of the latter conceptions would be proposed by their ex-
ponents as related to the more Samarianlike "true" religiosity. Therefore, depending on the theorist one follows, the third hypothesis may be stated like this: People (a) who are religious for intrinsic reasons (Alpert & Ross, 1967) or (b), whose religiosity emerges out of questioning the meaning of their everyday lives (Ratson, 1971) will be more likely to stop to offer help to the victim.

The parable of the Good Samaritan also suggested how we would measure people's helping behavior—their response to a stranger stumped by the side of one's path. The victim should appear somewhat ambiguous—ill
dressed, possibly in need of help, but also prob-
ably drunk or even potentially dangerous.

Further, the parable suggests a means by which the incident could be perceived as a real one rather than part of a psychological experiment in which one's behavior was under surveillance and might be shaped by demanded characteristics (Orne, 1962), evaluation ap-
proachment (Rosenberg, 1965), or other po
tentially artificial determinants of helping behavior. The victim should be encouraged not in the experimental context but on the road between various tasks.

Method

In order to examine the influence of these variables on helping behavior, voluntary students were asked to participate in a study on religious education and vacations. In the first testing session, presence questions concerning types of religiosity were administered. In a second individual session, the subject began experimental procedures in one build-
ing and was asked to react to a series of buildings for later procedures. While in transit, the subject pasted a clipped "victim" plant in an alleyway. The

dependent variable was whether and how the sub-
ject helped the victim. The independent variables were the degree to which the subject was told to hurry in reaching the offering building and the talk he was to give when he arrived there. Some sub-
jects were to give a talk on the job in which

rural students would be most effective, others

on the parable of the Good Samaritan.

Subjects

The subjects for the questionnaire administration were 72 students at Princeton Theological Seminary. Twenty-seven of them, those who might be reached by religiously, were scheduled for the experiment. Of the 47, 1 subject's data were not included in the analysis—1 because of contamination of the experi-

mental procedures during their testing and 4 due to suspicion of the experimental situation. Each subject was paid $3 for the questionnaire session and $1.50 for the experimental session.

Personality Measures

Detailed description of the personality scales used may be found elsewhere (Ratson, 1971), so for present purposes will be brief. The general personality construct under examination was re-

ligiosity. Various conceptions of religiosity have been allowed in recent years based on different psychometric scales. The conventions setting to gen-

erally the most interest is the Alpert and Ross (1967) distinction between "intrinsic" versus "extrinsic" religiosity (cf. also Alsen & Spilka, 1967, on "com-

bined" versus "consummated" religiosity). This bipolar conception of religiosity was measured with this research with the McGehee (1966) and Ratson (1971), who suggested three-dimensional indexes measuring one's religiosity. In the present research, type of religiosity was measured with each three dimensions of religiosity provided six 

encompass scales: (a) an "orthodox" (O) scale patterned after that used by Glueck and Stark (1966), with special agreement with the definition of Protestantism: (b) the Alpert-Ross index (R-E) scale, measuring the use of religion as a means to an end rather than as an end in itself; (c) the Alpert-Ross "intrinsic" (I-E) scale, mea-

suring the use of religion as an end in itself; (d) the relative use of scales of the Religious Life Inventory (RELI-E), designed to measure the influence of significant others and situations in pre-

forming one's religiosity: (e) the intrinsic "external" scale of the Religious Life Inventory (RELI-E), designed to measure the degree of "internal" one's religiosity; and (f) the intrinsic scale of the Religious Life Inventory (RELI-E), designed to measure the degree to which one's religiosity in-

volves a commitment of the meaning of life arising out of one's involvement with his social environment.
you're him. They were expecting you a few minutes ago. We'd better get moving. The assistant should be waiting for you so you'd better hurry. It shouldn't take but just a minute or two. In the intermediate-hurry condition he said, "The assistant is ready for you, so please go right over." In the low-hurry condition he said, "I'll be a few minutes before they're ready for you, but you might as well head on over. If you have to wait over there, it shouldn't be long."

The incident. When the subject passed through the alley, the victim was sitting slumped in a door- way, head down, eyes closed, not moving. As the subject went by, the victim snatched a tissue and greened, keeping his head down. If the subject stepped and asked if something was wrong or offered to help, the victim started and somewhat grunted, said, "Oh, thank you, no... No, it's all right." [Pause]. I've got this regulatory condition (cough). The doctor's given me these pills to take, and I just took one... if I just sit and rest for a few minutes I'll be O.K. . . . Thanks very much for stopping though [smiles weakly]! If the subject persisted, insisting on taking the victim inside the building, the victim allowed him to do so and thanked him.

Helping ratings. The victim rates each subject on a scale of helping behavior as follows:

0 = failed to notice the victim as possibly in need at all; 1 = perceived the victim as possibly in need but did not offer aid; 2 = did not stop but helped indirectly (e.g., by telling Stein's assistant about the victim); 3 = stopped and asked if victim needed help; 4 = after stopping, insisted on taking the victim inside and then left him.

The victim was blind to the personality scales and experimental conditions of all subjects. At the suggestion of the victim, another category was added to the rating scale, based on his observations of pilot subjects' behavior:

5 = after stopping, refused to leave the victim (after 3) and insisted on taking him somewhere outside experimental context (e.g., for coffee or to the interview).

(In some cases it was necessary to distinguish Category 6 from Category 5 by the postexperimental questionnaire and Category 2 from Category 1 on the report of the experimental assistant.)

This 5-point scale of helping behavior and a description of the 5 levels were used as a panel of 10 judges (unacquainted with the research) who were asked to rank order (unanonymized) categories in terms of "the amount of helping behavior displayed toward the person in the doorway." Of the 10, 1 judge reversed the order of Categories 6 and 5. Otherwise there was complete agreement with the ranking implied in the presentation of scales above.

The speech. After passing through the alley and entering the door marked on the map, the subject entered a secretary's office. She introduced him to the assistant who gave the subject time to prepare and privately recorded his talk.

Helping behavior questionnaire. After recording the talk, the subject was sent to another experimenter, who administered "an exploratory questionnaire on personal and social ethics." The questionnaire contained several initial questions about the interpersonal relationship between social and personal ethics, and then asked three key questions: (a) "When was the last time you saw a person who seemed to be in need of help?" (b) "When was the last time you stopped to help someone in need?" (c) "Have you had experience helping persons in need? If so, outline briefly." These data were collected as a check on the victim's ratings of whether subjects who did not stop perceived the situation in the alley as one in which helping was needed.

When he returned, the experimenter reviewed the subject's questionnaire, and, if no mention was made of the situation in the alley, probed for reactions to it and then placed into an elaborate debriefing and discussion session.

Debriefing

In the debriefing, the subject was told the exact nature of the study, including the deception involved, and the reasons for the deception were explained. The subject's reactions to the victim and to the study in general were discussed. The role of situational determinants of helping behavior was explained in relation to this particular incident and to other experiences of the subject. All subjects seemed ready to understand the necessity for the deception, and none indicated any resentment of it. After debriefing, the subject was thanked for his time and paid, then he left.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overall Helping Behavior

The average amount of help that a subject offered the victim, by condition, is shown in Table 1. The unequal-N analysis of variance indicates that while the hurry variable was significantly ($F = 3.36, df = 2/34, p < .05$) related to helping behavior, the message variable was not. Subjects in a hurry were likely to offer less help than were subjects not in a hurry. Whether the subject was going to give a speech on the parable of the Good Samaritan or not did not significantly affect his helping behavior on this analysis. Other studies have focused on the question of whether a person initiates helping action or not, rather than on scaled kinds of helping. The data from the present study can also be analyzed on the following terms: Of the 41 subjects, 16 (40%) offered some form of
TABLE 1

**MEAN AND ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GENDER HELPING RESPONSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help receiving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task received</td>
<td>1.365</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>1.365</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message (ct)</td>
<td>7.858</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurry (ct)</td>
<td>20.804</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (ct)</td>
<td>5.215</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>99.663</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>∑SS</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>σ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124.68</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS (ct)</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS (df)</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS (error)</td>
<td>2.408</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

- n = 41
- t < .05

**Meaning:**

Not significantly more likely to stop to help a person by the side of the road than in a normal situation or talk about possible occupations for seminary graduates.

Since both situational hypotheses are confirmed, it is tempting to stop the analysis of these variables at this point. However, multiple regression analysis procedures were also need to analyze the relationship of all of the independent variables of the study and the helping behavior. In addition to being more statistically powerful due to the use of

**TABLE 2**

**SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual variable</th>
<th>Overall equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help receiving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task received</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message (ct)</td>
<td>7.858</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurry (ct)</td>
<td>20.804</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (ct)</td>
<td>5.215</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>99.663</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>∑SS</td>
<td>124.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS (ct)</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS (df)</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS (error)</td>
<td>2.408</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

- n = 41
- t < .05

**Meaning:**

Not significantly more likely to stop to help a person by the side of the road than in a normal situation or talk about possible occupations for seminary graduates.

Since both situational hypotheses are confirmed, it is tempting to stop the analysis of these variables at this point. However, multiple regression analysis procedures were also need to analyze the relationship of all of the independent variables of the study and the helping behavior. In addition to being more statistically powerful due to the use of
more data information, multiple regression analysis has an advantage over analysis of variance in that it allows for a comparison of the relative effect of the various independent variables in accounting for variance in the dependent variable. Also, multiple regression analysis can compare the effects of continuous as well as non-continuous independent variables on both continuous and non-continuous dependent variables through the use of point biserial correlations, $r_{pb}$ and shows considerable robustness to violation of normality assumptions (Cohen, 1965, 1968). Table 1 reports the results of the multiple regression analysis using both help versus no help and the graded helping scale as dependent measures. In this table, the overall equation $F$s show the $F$ value of the entire regression equation as a particular row variable enters the equation. Individual variable $F$s were computed with all five independent variables in the equation. Although the two situational variables, hurry and message condition, correlated more highly with the dependent measure than any of the religious dispositions variables, only hurry was a significant predictor of whether one would help or not (column 1) or of the overall amount of help given (column 2). These results corroborate the findings of the analysis of variance. 

Notice also that neither form of the third hypothesis, that types of religiosity will predict helping, received support from these data. No correlation between the various measures of religiosity and any form of the dependent measure ever came near statistical significance, even though the multiple regression analysis procedure is a powerful and not particularly conservative statistical test.

PERSONALITY DIFFERENCE AMONG SUBJECTS WHO HELPED

To further investigate the possible influence of personality variables, analyses were carried out using only the data from subjects who offered some kind of help to the victim. Surprisingly (since the number of these subjects was small, only 16) when this was done, one religiosity variable seemed to be significantly related to the kind of helping behavior offered. (The situational variables had no significant effect.) Subjects high on the religion as quest dimension appear likely, when they stop for the victim, to offer help of a more tentative or incomplete nature than are subjects scoring low on this dimension ($r = -0.53, p < .05$).

This result seemed unsettling for the thinking behind either form of Hypothesis 3. Not only do the data suggest that the Alport-Russa-based conception of religion as end does not predict the degree of helping, but the religion as quest component is a significant predictor of offering less help. This latter result seems counterintuitive and out of keeping with previous research (Batson, 1971), which found that this type of religiosity correlated positively with other socially valued characteristics. Further data analysis, however, seemed to suggest a different interpretation of this result.

It will be remembered that one helping coding category was added at the suggestion of the victim after his observation of pilot subjects. The correlation of religious personality variables with helping behavior dichotomized between the added category (1) and all of the others (0) was examined. The correlation between religion as quest and this dichotomous helping scale was essentially unchanged ($r_{pb} = -0.54, p < .05$). Thus, the previously found correlation between the helping scale and religion as quest seems to reflect the tendency of those who score low on the quest dimension to offer help in the added helping category.

What does help in this added category represent? Within the context of the experiment, it represented an embarrassment. The victim's response to persistent offers of help was to assure the helper he was all right, had taken his medicine, just needed to rest for a minute or so, and, if ultimately necessary, to request the helper to leave. But the fewer helpers in this added category often would
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not leave until the final appeal was repeated
several times by the victim (who was prov-
ing increasingly pushy at the possibility of
the arrival of the next subject). Since it
usually involved the subject's attempting to
carry through a pretext plan (e.g., taking
the subject for a cup of coffee or revealing to
him the strength to be found in Christ), and
did not allow information from the victim to
change that plan, we originally labeled this
kind of helping as rigid—an interpretation
supported by its increased likelihood among
highly doctrinal orthodox subjects (r = .65,
p < .01). It also seemed to have an in-
appropriate character. If this more extreme
form of helping behavior is indeed effectively
less helpful, then the second form of Hy-
pothesis 3 does seem to gain support.

But perhaps it is the experimenter rather
than the super helpers who are doing the in-
appropriate thing: perhaps the best character-
ization of this kind of helping is as different
rather than as inappropriate. This kind of
helper seems quickly to place a particular
interpretation on the situation, and the help-
ning response seems to follow naturally from
this interpretation. All that can safely be
said is that one style of helping start emerged
in the experiment was directed toward the
presumed underlying needs of the victim and
was little modified by the victim's comments
about his own needs. In contrast, another
style was more tentative and seemed more
responsive to the victim's statements of his
need.

The former kind of helping was likely
to be displayed by subjects who expressed
strong doctrinal orthodoxy. Conversely, this
fixed kind of helping was unlikely among sub-
jects high on the religion as great dimen-
sion. These latter subjects, who conceived
their religion as involving an ongoing search
for meaning in their personal and social world,
seemed more responsive to the victim's im-
mediate needs and more open to the victim's
definitions of his own needs.

CONCLUSION AND REPLICATIONS
A person not in a hurry may stop and offer
help to a person in distress. A person in a
hurry is likely to keep going, logically, he
is likely to keep going even if he is hurrying
to speak on the parole of the Good Samar-
tan, thus inadvertently confirming the poit of
the parole. (Indeed, on several occasions,
a seniory student going to give his talk on
the parole of the Good Samaritan literally
stepped over the victim as he hurried on his
way.)

Although the degree to which a person was
in a hurry had a clearly significant effect on
his likelihood of offering the victim help,
whether he was going to give a sermon on the
parole or on some possible vocational roles of
ministers did not. This lack of effect of ser-
mon topic raises certain difficulties for an ex-
planation of helping behavior involving help-
ing norms and their salience. It is hard to
think of a context in which norms concerning
helping those in distress are more salient than
for a person thinking about the Good Sa-
martan, and yet it did not significantly in-
crease helping behavior. The results were in
the direction suggested by the prior salience
hypothesis, but they were not significant. The
most accurate conclusion seems to be that
salience of helping norms is a less strong
determinant of helping behavior in the pres-
est situation than many, including the present
authors, would expect.

Thinking about the Good Samaritan did
not increase helping behavior, but being in a
hurry decreased it. It is difficult not to con-
clude from this that the frequently cited
explanation that ethics becomes a hurry as
the speed of our daily lives increases is at
least an accurate description. The picture that
this explanation conveys is of a person seeking
another, consciously noting his distress, and
consciously choosing to leave him in distress.
But perhaps this is not entirely accurate, for,
when a person is in a hurry, something seems
to happen that is akin to Tolstoy's (1948)
concept of the 'narrowing of the cognitive
map'. Our seminarians in a hurry noticed the
victim in that in the post-experiment interview
almost all mentioned him as, in reflection,
possibly in need of help. But it seems that
they often had not worked this out when they
were near the victim. Either the interpreta-
tion of them visual picture as a person in
distress or the empathic reaction usually

associated with that interpretation had been deferred because they were hurrying. According to the reflections of some of the subjects, it would be inaccurate to say that they realized the victim's possible distress, then chose to ignore it; instead, because of the time pressures, they did not perceive the scene in the alley as an occasion for an ethical decision.

For other subjects it seems more accurate to conclude that they decided not to stop. They appearedsorting and anxious after the encounter in the alley. For these subjects, what were the elements of the choice that they were making? Why were the perpetrators hurrying? Because the experimenter, whom the subject was helping, was depending on her to get to a particular place quickly. In other words, he was in conflict between stopping to help the victim and continuing on his way to help the experimenter. And this is often true of people in a hurry; they hurry because somebody depends on their being somewhere. Conflict, rather than callousness, can explain their failure to stop.

Finally, as in other studies, personality variables were not useful in predicting whether a person helped or not. But in this study, unlike many previous ones, considerable variations were possible in the kinds of help given, and these variations did relate to personality measures—specifically to religiosity of the quest sort. The clear light of hindsight suggests that the discussion of kinds of helping would have been the appropriate place to look for personality differences all along; whether a person helps or not is an instant decision likely to be situationally controlled.

How a person helps involves a more complex and considered number of decisions, including the time and scope to permit personality characteristics to shape them.
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