ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER
VOLUME-6 | ISSUE-6 | JUNE-2017 | ISSN No 2277 - 8179 | IF : 4.176 | IC Value : 78.46
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

A STUDY OF ALTRUSTIC BEHAVIOUR OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS OF PUNJAB IN RELATION TO GENDER AND LOCALITY

Education

Yashpreet Kaur Research Scholar ,Punjabi University ,Patiala.

ABSTRACT

The present study has been undertaken to study altruistic behaviour in relation to gender and locality among university students of Punjab. 100 university students (M=50, F=50) are taken as sample. The Self-Report Altruism Scale is used to collect the data in the study. Descriptive method is used as a method of research. The results of the study show that gender and locality differences are not significant. It means gender and locality has no effect on altruistic behaviour.

KEYWORDS:

Altruism, Gender, Locality, University Students.

Introduction

Society can be self-sustained with its human components of which the major workforce is the youth. Youths are major factors contributing to the level of development in any society. Youths must be committed to take up moral values and upholding them through life as these values will shape the ways they think, speak and even act. Moral standards can rise in society if the zeal of youths brings about the restoration of moral values. One of the important values is altruism which is defined as one who helps others without reward. Nowadays, students generally concentrate on their studies and not on the values such as altruism, empathy, sympathy, sacrifice, etc. Altruistic behaviour among students is one of the considerable values for getting good personality and it will help them become better citizens.

Altruism

Helping others is viewed as one of the most highly respected displays of human behaviour. Person helps one another out of many reasons, but when one person helps another voluntarily and without anticipation of any benefit, it is called altruism. Altruism is the quality of unselfish concern for the welfare of others. Pure Altruism means giving without regard to reward or the benefits that recognition of the giving may bring. The term 'altruism' was coined by French sociologist, August Comte. It means the good of others. Altruism is precisely 'other-ism': the effort or actual ability to act in the interest of others (Novak, 1992). Macaulay and Berkowitz (1970) defined altruism as 'behavior carried out to benefit another without anticipation of rewards from external sources. Rushton (1980) defined altruism as "social behaviour carried out to achieve positive outcomes for another rather than for self." Batson (1991) defined altruism as a motivational state with the ultimate goal of increasing another's welfare. Howard and Piliavin (2000) defined altruism as helping others in the absence of psychological rewards which are conceived as benefits to the agents. Altruism is a form of pro-social behaviour in which a person will voluntarily help another at some cost to oneself (Cardwell et al. 2002). According to Aranson et al. (2004). "Altruism refers to a kind of selfless help, which is based on pure desire to help others." Altruism refers to, "the behaviour that helps people with no apparent gain or with potential cost of one's self (West et al. 2007)." The central idea in definitions of altruism is of benefiting others, welfare of others in some manner. It is a voluntary behaviour not motivated by the expectation of external rewards or by the avoidance of aversive external stimuli.

Reasons Behind Helping

Altruistic behaviour is multiply determined. Many scholars have studied reasons behind people engaging in pro-social behaviours. Researchers have emphasized empathy to be underlying the pro-social behavior (Baston et al. 1983, Fultz et al. 1986, Baston and Olesan 1991). Some people in the society could be considered as more helpful than others. Baston tried to explain this individual difference through empathy-altruism hypothesis. Factors that influence the level of empathic feeling become a determinant in altruistic behaviours. Studies on human altruistic behaviour reveal that altruism is related with several variables as family pattern, social values, gender, personality, emotional status etc.

Role of Gender in Helping

Gender plays an important role in helping behaviour. Generally gender roles are to be rooted in biology e.g. boys are found more aggressive than girls. In the society, men and women have to play different roles. From childhood girls are taught to be nurturing, caring, soft and feminine, while boys are taught to be strong, courageous, competitive and aggressive. Difference in male and female behaviour is also due to role expectations as well as differences in socialization process. The major socializing agents are parents, teachers, friends and media. Boys are trained to be active, achieving, aggressive, independent, ambitious and rational and are encouraged to attain higher education, higher prestige and socialized to compete while girls are socialized to be passive, nurturing, dependent, responsive and emotional. Eisenberg et al. (2006) pointed out that "based on stereotypic gender roles, females generally are expected and believed to be more responsive, empathetic, and prosocial than males, whereas males are expected to be relatively independent and achievement oriented." Research studies on altruism and gender have found several patterns. There are evidences that show that men are more likely to help others than are women (Feinman, 1978, Eagly and Crowley, 1986), other studies show that women are more likely to help others than are men (Bihm et al, 1979, Shigetomi, et al. 1981, Srivastava and Gupta, 1981, Zarbatany et al.1985, Schenk and Heinish, 1986, Eisenberg, et al. 2006) and even more research studies show that there is no difference between men and women's helping behaviour (Krebs, 1970, Boice and Goldman, 1981, Zeldin et al.,1982, Agochiya, 1992,Chou ,1998, Dietz et al., 2002, Singh and Singh ,2015). However, in spite of having so much research on gender and altruistic behaviour, the results are inconsistent.

Role of Locality in Helping

Geographic location or residence tends to influence people's behaviour of caring and sharing due to their social interactions. For instance, rural residents are more likely to help or share due to the fact that they have been used to live cohesively as opposed to urban residents who are more disintegrated. Robert, Skipper and James (2006) observed that locality of a child played an important role. A child who grows up in a rural area where respect is supreme, obedience is law and fear of God/gods exist will definitely be more morally inclined than one who grows up in urban center where little or no attention is being given to some aspects of the child behaviour and attitude. Obviously, morality starts with respect and obedience to the elderly, a behaviour that is common to the rural population than to the urban population. Some research studies show that those who are residing in a city are more prosocial than those in a village (Weiner, 1976, Robert et al.,1978) and other studies show that those living in the rural area demonstrated a higher level of altruistic behavior than those living in the urban areas (Steblay, 1987, Sundari, 2015). While other research shows that same level of help was given in the urban and nonurban areas (Goldman, 2010).

Altruism is basic for making and existence of society. It is vital to have altruism in everyone's life so that the society can bloom and succeed as a whole. Without altruism, society does not flourish together. The study seeks to addresses the research problem and the gaps in the literature discussed earlier. It is found that the results of different studies are not in consistence with one another. In view of the above review, the researcher wants to investigate whether such factors like gender and

locality will affect altruistic behaviour among university students or not.

Objective of the Study

1. To study altruism among university students in terms of gender and locality

HYPOTHESIS

1. There is no significant difference on altruistic behaviour of male and female of university students.
2. There is no significant difference on altruistic behaviour of urban and rural university students.

Operational Definition

Altruism is a behaviour carried out to benefit another without anticipation of any reward.

University Students refer to students pursuing their tertiary education in university or in any college affiliated to the university.

Method

In the present study, the investigator followed the descriptive method to study the altruism in relation to gender and locale.

Sample

A representative sample of 100 university students studying at Punjabi University, Patiala campus was selected through random sampling technique from different faculties and courses of study. Out of 100 university students 50 students were male and 50 students were female. Out of 50 male and female students, 25 students each were from rural locality and 25 students each were from urban locality.

Measures

In the present study, the investigator used the "The Self-Report Altruism Scale" by Rushton, Chrisjohn and Fukken, 1981. The scale is a self-report inventory. It contains 20 items. It measures the attitudes and behaviours which are potentially altruistic in nature.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The Mean, SD along with t-test were used to study and compare the altruistic behaviour of university students in relation to gender and locality.

Results and Discussion-Analysis of obtained data was done which is discussed below:

TABLE-1: Comparison of Altruistic Behaviour of University Students

	N	Mean	S.D.	t-value
Male	50	57.78	11.93	0.058
Female	50	57.64	12.24	
Urban	50	57.94	12.25	0.19
Rural	50	57.48	11.92	
Urban Male	25	57.56	12.99	0.22
Urban Female	25	58.32	11.73	
Rural Male	25	58	11.04	0.36
Rural Female	25	56.96	12.95	
Urban Male	25	57.56	12.99	0.13
Rural Male	25	58	11.04	
Urban Female	25	58.32	11.73	0.39
Rural Female	25	56.96	12.95	

The Table 1 shows that the mean score on the altruism of male university students is 57.78 with SD of 11.93 whereas the mean score of female students is 57.64 with SD of 12.24. The t-value is 0.058 which is not significant even at 0.05 levels. The results are in conformity with the previous findings of Krebs, 1970, Boice and Goldman, 1981, Zeldin and Savines, 1983, Agochiya, 1992, Chou, 1998, Dietz et al., 2002, Singh and Singh, 2015. Hence the hypothesis '*There is no significant gender difference in altruism among university students*' is accepted.

The Table 1 shows that the mean score on the altruism of urban university students is 57.94 with SD of 12.25 whereas the mean score of rural students is 57.48 with SD of 11.92. The t-value, testing the significance of mean difference in altruism is 0.19, which is not significant. The results are as same as some previous studies (Goldmanet al. 2010). Thus the hypothesis '*There is no significant locality difference in altruism among university students*' is accepted. The mean score on altruism of urban male is 57.56 and S.D. is 12.99 while the mean score of urban female is 58.32 with S.D. of 11.73.The t-test value is 0.22 which is not significant. The mean score on altruistic behavior of rural male is 58 and S.D. is 11.04 while the mean score on altruism of rural female is 56.96 with the S.D. 12.95.After employing t–test, t-value is 0.36, which is not significant.

The Table 1 shows that the mean score on the altruism of urban male university students is 57.56 with SD of 12.99 whereas the mean score of rural male students is 58 with SD of 11.04. The t-value is 0.13, which is not significant. The mean score on the altruism of urban female university students is 58.32 with SD of 11.73 whereas the mean score of rural female students is 56.96 with SD of 12.95. The t-value is 0.39, which is not significant.

Conclusion

In the light of these results, it is concluded that there is no significant gender and locality difference in altruistic behaviour. There is no significant difference on altruistic behaviour of male in different location (urban, rural). There is no significant difference on altruistic behaviour of female in different location (urban, rural).There is no significant difference between urban male and urban female and between rural male and rural female on altruistic behavoiur. There are many other factors such as personality traits, demographical factors, situation, type of appeal, mood, bystander effect, empathy etc. that along with gender and locality are helpful in altruistic behaviour.

REFERENCES

1. Agochiya, D.P. (1992). A Cross-Cultural Study of Personality, Values and Altruistic Behaviour of Youth Workers. Ph.D. Thesis in Psychology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
2. Aronson, E., Robin M. A., Robin M. and Timothy D. W. (2004). Social Psychology, 5/e. Lebanon, IN: Prentice Hall.
3. Batson, C.D. (1991). The Altruism Question? Towards a Social-Psychological Answer. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
4. Batson, C.D. and Olesan, K.C. (1991). Current status of empathy-altruism hypothesis. In M.S. Clark (Ed.), Prosocial behaviour. London: Sage Publications.
5. Batson, C. D., O'Quin, K., Fultz, J., Vanderplas, M.and Isen, A. (1983). Self-reported distress and empathy and egoistic versus altruistic motivation for helping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 706-718.
6. Bihm, E., Gaudet, I., and Sale, O. (1979). Altruistic responses under conditions of anonymity. Journal of Social Psychology, 109, 25- 30.
7. Boice, K., and Goldman, M. (1981). Helping Behavior as affect by type of request and identity of caller. The Journal of Social Psychology, 115, 95-101.
8. Cardwell, M., Clarck, L., and Meldrum, C.(2002). Psychology: For A2Level, 2/e. London: Collins Publishing.
9. Chou, K. (1998). Effects of age, gender, and participation in volunteer activities on the altruistic behavior of Chinese adolescents. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 159, 195-201.
10. Dietz, T., Kalof, L., and Stern, P. (2002). Gender, values, and environmentalism. Social Science Quarterly, 83, 353-364.
11. Eagly, A. H., and Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. Psychological Bulletin, 100, 283-308.
12. Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R., and Spinrad, T. (2006). Prosocial Development. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon, and R. Lerner (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
13. Feinman, S. (1978). When Does Sex Affect Altruistic Behaviour? Psychological Reports, 43, 12-18.
14. Fultz, J., Batson, C. D., Fortenbach, V. A., McCarthy, P. M. and Varney, L. L. (1986). Social evaluation and the empathy-altruism hypothesis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50 (4), 761-769.
15. Goldman, M. , Helen E. L. and Richard E. Carrill.(1982).Altruistic Behavior in Rural and Urban, Residential and Business Areas. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 3(2), 155-160.
16. Howard, J. A. and Piliavin ,J. A.. (2000).Altruism. In Edgar F. Borgatta (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Sociology. New York: Macmillian.
17. Krebs, D. (1970). Altruism - An examination of the concept and a review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 71, 258-302.
18. Macaulay, J. R., and Berkowitz, L. (1970). Altruism and helping behavior. New York: Academic Press.
19. Novak, Philip. (1992). Religion and Altruism. California: Institute of Noetic Sciences.
20. Robert O. H., Kenneth M. S. and Pamela S. (1978). Urban-Rural Differences in Responsiveness to an Altruistic Model. The Journal of Social Psychology, 105(1), 99-105.
21. Robert, R.L., James, K and Skipper, J. (2006). Differential rates of rural urban delinquency: A social control approach. American society of criminology,19(3), 383-399.
22. Rushton, J. P. (1980). Altruism, socialization, and society. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
23. Schenk, J., and Heinish, R. (1986). Self-Descriptions by Means of Sex-Role Scales and Personality Scales: A Critical Evolution of Recent Masculinity and Feminity Scales. Personality and Individual Differences, 7(2), 161-168.
24. Shigetomi, C., Hartmann, D. P., and Gelfand, D. M. (1981). Sex differences in children's reputations for helpfulness. Developmental Psychology, 17, 434-437.
25. Singh, K., and Singh, A. (2015). A Study of Modernity Behaviour of University Students of Punjab in Relation to Altruism and Activism. GHG Journal of Sixth Thought 2(2),1-5.
26. Srivastava, N. and Gupta, P. (1981). Sex differences on measure of altruism. Psychological Studies, 2, 92-95.
27. Steblay, N. M. (1987).Helping behavior in rural and urban environments: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 102(3), 346-356.
28. Sundari,S. (2015).Altruistic Behaviour And Gender Gap : An Economic Analysis.

Journal of Economic and Social Development, 11(1), 97-114.
29. Weiner, F. H. (1976) Altruism, ambiance, and action: The effects of rural and urban rearingon helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34(1), 112-124.
30. West, A., Griffin, A.S. and Gardner, A. (2007). Social Semantics: Altruism, Cooperation, Mutualism, Strong Reciprocity and Group Selection. Journal of Evolutionary Biology, 20 (1), 415-432.
31. Zarbatany, L., Hartmann, D., Gelfand, D., and Vinciguerra, P. (1985). Gender differences in altruistic reputation: are they artifactual? Developmental Psychology, 21, 97-101.
32. Zeldin, R.S., Small, S.A. and Savin-Williams, R.C. (1982).Prosocial interaction in two mixed sex adolescent groups. Child Development, 53, 1492-1498.