Altruism is a social and interpersonal construct related to various types of prosocial behavior. While its definition varies depending on the discipline, altruism is often defined as an action that is done with the intention of helping another. In essence, biologists and evolutionary scientists often focus on the benefit of a particular behavior while psychologists are interested in understanding the motivation behind the behavior. From a biological or evolutionary perspective, altruism is a behavior that decreases the fitness or genetic contribution of one individual while increasing the fitness of another. In psychological research, altruism is conceptualized as a motivational state that a person possesses with the goal of increasing the welfare of another person. Altruism is, therefore, opposed by egoism, which is the motivation to increase one’s own welfare. Understanding why humans engage in prosocial behaviors such as altruism when it is often contrary to our own self-interest and occasionally our well-being has been a topic of increasing interest, both behaviorally and within the brain.

Altruism and related constructs such as cooperation and reciprocity are mostly viewed as uniquely human traits; however, some aspects of these constructs have been reported in other species. For example, monkeys will refuse food when they learn that by taking the food, a shock will be delivered to another monkey. Dolphins have been reported to help other dolphins who have been caught in nets, and elephants will give support to other elephants who are too weak to stand or who are emotionally distressed. In humans, there is evidence that infants exhibit altruistic behavior beginning at a young age. For example, infants as young as 14–18 months of age assist others in obtaining out-of-reach objects and help to open cabinets for others.Infants engage in these behaviors without reward or encouragement from an adult and expectedly without knowledge of concepts such as reciprocation and reputation. (Warneken and Tomasello , 2009) suggest that altruistic behaviors observed in children may serve to maintain and foster future altruistic behaviors throughout development and into adulthood.

Previous behavioral research suggests that humans willingly interact with strangers in ways that are beneficial to others, even when it is not in their own best interest. Additionally, humans have been reported to continue to engage in altruistic behaviors even in situations when there will be no future interaction . (Fehr E, Fischbacher U, Gächter S, 2002) suggest that if two strangers are allowed to engage in repeated anonymous monetary exchanges in the laboratory, there exists a high probability that altruistic behavior will spontaneously emerge. Therefore, these findings propose that there appears to be a natural tendency for humans to exhibit altruistic behaviors.

While prosocial acts benefit others, research suggests that individuals engaged in altruistic behaviors also benefit. Several studies report physical and psychological benefits associated with altruistic behavior. For example, volunteerism is positively correlated with self-reported happiness, health, and well-being. Hunter and Linn demonstrated that when compared to those who did not volunteer, older adults who volunteered regularly showed greater satisfaction in life and exhibited reduced rates of depression and anxiety. Volunteerism and helping behavior are also associated with physical health and longevity .In a study investigating the effects of volunteerism on physical health, Moen et al showed that mothers who belonged to a volunteer group were less likely to experience a major illness. In a study of adults over 55 years of age, individuals were 63% less likely to die if they had volunteered for multiple groups in a given time point. Even after controlling for health status prior to the study, volunteering was associated with a significant reduction (44%) in mortality. Engaging in acts of kindness has also been associated with increased well-being. These findings indicate that being aware of the kindness of others and of ones own acts of kindness is related to increased self-reported levels of well-being.A study by (Otake K, Shimai S, Tanaka-Matsumi J, Otsui K, Fredrickson BL. , 2006) asked participants to count the number of acts of kindness they performed for one week. The experimental data were compared with a control condition that did not partake in the “counting kindness” task. Results indicated that counting acts of kindness significantly increased self-reported levels of happiness. Together, these studies suggest that altruistic behaviors not only benefit others but also have profound positive effects on the current and future physical and psychological well-being of the person performing the behavior. In the article, we review theoretical models of human altruism and recent neuroimaging research demonstrating how altruism is processed within the brain. First, we will review concepts of altruism followed by the ways in which altruism has been measured behaviorally. Finally, we review empirical neuroimaging research, which has directly investigated the neural correlates of altruistic behavior.

Concepts of altruistic behavior

Altruism is often associated with other concepts such as altruistic punishment, reward, reciprocity, and cooperation. Altruistic punishment (a powerful social tool that can persuade social defectors to behave prosocially) plays a central role in maintaining cooperation. Altruistic punishment results in the punishment of an individual for violating a social norm, often by a third party or outside observer who is not directly affected by the violation. In a study completed by Fehr et al, participants played a public goods game (PGG) with two conditions. One condition allowed another person to punish those who did not play fairly while the other condition did not allow punishment. Specifically, at the end of each round, each participant could pay to allocate a punishment, ranging from 1 to 10 points, to the member being punished. Each point would cost the participant 1 monetary unit but would cost the punished participant 3 monetary units. The researchers found that in situations where altruistic punishment is a possibility, cooperation is more likely, but when altruistic punishment is not allowed, the rate of cooperation is greatly reduced.

Reciprocity, which is similar to altruism in that the action may be harmful to the self and beneficial to another, involves the expectation that the other person will act similarly in a subsequent interaction. Reciprocal altruism is more likely to take place in small groups of isolated people, which allows repeated interactions. A person who is a strong reciprocator obeys social norms of a group and therefore tends to punish partners or group members who violate social norms. Strong reciprocators have the predisposition to cooperate even where there is no apparent benefit to doing so. There is evidence that during in-group situations, rewarding and punishing others based on social norms results in cooperation.These effects of punishing can translate to future encounters where previously punished individuals increase cooperation with new partners.

Cooperation and altruism are often studied together or considered equivalent constructs. Cooperation takes place when two or more people work together to achieve a common goal. Cooperation involves working toward a common goal where both parties are invested, whereas altruistic behaviors are often one sided with no overt positive outcome for the party engaging in altruistic behavior. A type of cooperation known as conditional cooperation occurs when an individual is initially willing to take a risk and cooperate in a particular situation because they believe that others will act similarly in a subsequent interaction. This behavior may change if the partner or group members do not also cooperate This is different from cooperation because in traditional cooperation both parties involved are equally at risk, while in conditional cooperation, one person is willing to increase their risk in hopes that it will pay off later. Cooperation is therefore similar to reciprocal altruism because having knowledge about the intentions of others is an important motivator for cooperative behavior.

Measuring altruism

Self-report measures

In psychological research, altruism is demonstrated through prosocial behaviors, which can be measured via self-report scales that specifically measure altruistic behavior or through personality measures. The Altruistic Personality Scale measures altruistic tendencies by gauging the frequency that a person engages in prosocial behaviors. Altruistic behavior in the workplace, which involves actions by an organization’s employees who are meant to help others but are not formally rewarded, has been studied using the Citizenship Behavior Scale and the Helping Behavior Scale. The Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale measures five facets of workplace altruism, and the Helping Behavior Scale was designed to measure global altruism and helping behavior in work place. Another way to measure altruism is through the Big Five Model of Personality. Specifically, the altruism facet within the global trait of Agreeableness on the NEO Personality Inventory is often used to assess altruistic tendencies. Additionally, economic and neuroeconomic studies tend to utilize behavioral measures of altruism because they are readily available, easy to use, and have been shown to be reliable for measuring altruism.

The claim and the hypothesis on which this text is based is that altruism forms the cornerstone of societal cohesion, the everyday well-being of individuals, and the central manifestation of values. Most sociological and economic studies consider altruism, and particularly selfless helping behavior as a superfluous category that blends into the white background noise in scientific explanation. Much research views humans and humanity in a way best described in David Hume’s words, as “homo homini lupus”. Altruism is thus often neglected as a secondary ad hoc explanation as its explanatory power compared to selfishness is considered to be less. This however need not − nor should it − be the case with altruism. Appreciation of various forms of altruism can bring considerable benefit for the understanding of the interaction between people both in theoretical considerations and empirical studies. Altruism, an essential and pivotal part of humanity, can be regarded a universal phenomenon, since it has been found in all known societies. The forms of altruism vary greatly between and within societies, however, and probably between different eras in the same societies. Altruism usually refers to actions that take other human beings into consideration; action concerned with the well-being of others. The concept was brought into the social sciences by Auguste Comte (1798-1857) in the mid 19th century as the antonym of selfishness. The term derives from the Latin “alter”, “other”. The concept was quickly established and the first date recorded by the Oxford English Dictionary is 1853 (Hardin 1993, 225) The concept has since remained part of the social and natural science vocabulary. In Comte’s often restated view, altruism is the most important sociological question. In his view, individuals have two distinct motives: egoism and altruism, and although most behaviour concerns self-serving motives, the unselfish desire to help others also motivates behaviour.

Similar views were later put by in his early work “The Division of Labour in Society” [1893]. Durkheim argues that wherever there are communities there is altruism since communities exhibit solidarity (Durkheim 1966, 186.) Durkheim linked egoism and altruism to the deepening of the societal division of labour, the transformation from mechanical to organic solidarity. Likewise, he linked egoism and altruism to the maintenance of moral communality demanded by and included in the transformed solidarity. According to Durkheim, it is not a question of linear change from egoism to altruism but of different forms of communality constructed under different circumstances. In his opinion, both egoism and altruism have been a part of each human consciousness from the very beginning, since consciousness that does not reflect both elements cannot exist (Durkheim 1966, 212.) Unselfishness is expected to come from the deepest foundation of our social life; people cannot live together without mutual understanding, and thus without mutual sacrifice, and without being bonded together in a strong, durable manner. (Durkheim 1966, 212.) Today’s late-modern – or post-modern to some observers – societal context creates an especially interesting framework for the study of altruism: while individuals are less dependent on social ties and traditions than ever before, we are increasingly tied to other types of network, including global ones. In today´s Western societies, individuals live in the midst of multiple novel networks in several senses of the word. People may, for instance, not be interested in helping their neighbours but have godchildren on the other side of the world. In other words, as the networks of individuals and what could be called `personal groups of good life´ are changing, so too is altruism. The changes in the forms of altruism and helping behaviour might even be playing a role in the transformation of social networks. Furthermore, in this context of rapidly transforming social networks (both from more dependence to less dependence, and vice versa) we can no longer simply divide people into individualists and collectivists. As Maffesoli (1996, 63) has written, today´s social relationships within the sporadic networks can express even closer communality than traditional social ties.

We have come a long way in the development of civil society from rural self-help and communality to international volunteering in developing countries, internet peer groups, and so forth. Old and the new forms also live today side by side. In the streets of the major cities one might run into a Salvation Army fundraising pot and Red Cross fundraisers, or young people hired to recruit supporters for various more specific causes and associations, like Unicef or Amnesty International. Similarly in volunteerism it has become increasingly difficult for many associations and institutions to enlist and engage volunteers for long-term activities, which of course naturally still exist, but younger people in many countries are interested in joining a short-term project “if only someone would ask me to come along” (concerning Finland, see Yeung 2002). Thus, all in all, altruism is indeed changing. Nevertheless, we still lack up-to-date studies and discussions on altruism, specifically in the European context. As pointed out by Wuthnow (1993, 345), theoretical and empirical work in sociology since the 1960s has shown “a decided reluctance to employ the idea of altruism as such”. Altruism relates to several currently topical academic themes, including happiness, experiences of the good life, trust, social capital, citizen activity, participation, empowerment, and so forth,. This working paper focuses both on theoretical analysis of altruism and on its links with the promotion of an active civil society. The main goal is to separate different forms of altruism and to examine the factors contributing to the changing degrees of altruism. This paper also aims to specify the definition of altruism, its various forms, and the conceptual and empirical dilemmas related to it. After a brief look at the history of altruism research, the article will discuss how altruism has been understood within different disciplines. Special interest is directed to the intersections between social science and biology literature.

The dilemma of definition As Monroe (1996, 6) has noted of altruism, “there is a remarkable lack of agreement over what is meant by the term.” Altruism is often used interchangeably with pro-social behaviour, helping, sacrifice, and giving, as well as even cooperation and sharing. Several philosophers have also pondered the definition of altruism (recent examples include Sober 2002; Wyschogrod 2002). What then indeed is the concept of altruism about? Macaulay and Berkowitz’s classic definition of altruism is “behaviour carried out to benefit another without anticipation of rewards from external sources” (1970). As Rushton and Sorrentino (1981b, 425-440) have noted, this definition includes internal rewards, such as alleviation of guilt, increase in self-esteem, and feeling good about oneself. They have further noted that such a definition offers the advantage of avoiding both the philosophical dilemma of true unselfishness and unobservable variables. Krebs and Von Hesteren (1992, 149) have summarised the key components of altruism quite well as follows: self, other, cost, and welfare. Monroe, the originator of the perspective theory of altruism, has defined altruism as “behaviour intended to benefit another, even when this risks possible sacrifice to the welfare of the actor” (Monroe 1996, 6). She has also outlined six critical points in the definition: • 1) Altruism entails action. • 2) The action must be goal-directed, either consciously or reflexively. • 3) The goal must concern the welfare of another. • 4) Intentions count more than consequences • 5) The act must carry some possibility of decrease in the actor’s own welfare. • 6) There must be no conditions or anticipation of reward. Monroe sees human behaviour occupying a continuum with pure self-interest and pure altruism as its poles (Monroe 1996, 6-7; Hardin 1993, 225-236; Staub 1991), and Monroe considers altruism to be empirically relatively rare. Some of these six critical points, however, seem more difficult than others, and divide scholarly views. The sixth criterion: “no conditions or anticipation of reward” is particularly tricky. In other words, the question of whether the actor is allowed to gain joy from altruism − or expect to gain it prior to the action of the behavior

A study was conducted by (Eisenberg N & Lennon R, 1983) Reviews the literature on sex differences in empathy (defined as vicarious affective responding to the emotional state of another) and related capacities (affective role taking and decoding of nonverbal cues). The literature is discussed according to method used to assess empathy and affective role taking. Where appropriate, meta-analyses were also computed. In general, sex differences in empathy were found to be a function of the methods used to assess empathy. There was a large sex difference favoring women when the measure of empathy was self-report scales; moderate differences (favoring females) were found for reflexive crying and self-report measures in laboratory situations; and no sex differences were evident when the measure of empathy was either physiological or unobtrusive observations of nonverbal reactions to another's emotional state. Moreover, few sex differences were found for children's affective role taking and decoding abilities.

A study was conducted by (Macro Bani , Barbara Giussani, 2010) An overview of European blood donors shows that the distribution of men and women donors is similar in many countries, with Italy being an exception in that women account for only 30% of donors. Gender medicine is a key issue in this context, even though gender studies are very limited in the transfusion field, whether considered broadly or with specific regards to the selection, management and retention of donors. It, therefore, seemed important to compare the presence of women among blood donors in different European countries and examine the roles that gender is reported to play in the donation of blood in order to identify possible implications for communication with and management of the donor. The published studies showed that gender plays key roles in the motivation to give blood (women being more altruistic, men being more individualistic) and in adverse reactions, which was a particularly critical problem leading to fewer women become regular donors. A few aspects specific to the management of donors in Italy also emerged.

A study was conducted by (Debra J. Mesch Melissa S Brown Zachary I Moore Amir Daniel Hayat, 2011) The paper examined the mechanisms for giving by investigating the psychological and values differences between men and women's motivations for giving. They explored two of the eight mechanisms for giving developed by Bekkers and Wiepking as a framework for why people give—principle of care and empathic concern. Are there differences in these motives for giving by gender, and can these differences in values and the psychological benefits that people receive when making donations explain gender differences in charitable giving? Are women more likely to give and give more than men because of their higher levels of empathic concern and principle of care? They used two US national data sets to test our hypotheses. The results for both data sets indicate significant differences in motives by gender, as well as differences in the probability of giving and amount given by gender, even after controlling for empathic concern and principle of care measures. The findings are discussed in terms of the importance of viewing charitable giving through a gender lens as well as practical implications for practitioners.

A study was conducted by (Eisenberg ,N.,Fabes, R.A.,Miller, P,A., Fultz,J.,Shell,R.,Mathy,R.M.,& Reno,R.R, 1989)Assessed sympathy and personal distress with facial and physiological indexes (heart rate) as well as self-report indexes and examined the relations of these various indexes to prosocial behavior for children and adults in an easy escape condition. Heart rate deceleration during exposure to the need of others was associated with increased willingness to help. In addition, adults' reported of sympathy, as well as facial sadness and concerned attention, were positively related to their intention to assist. For children, there was some indication that report of positive affect and facial distress were negatively related to prosocial intentions and behavior, whereas facial concern was positively related to the indexes of prosocial behavior. These findings are interpreted as providing additional, convergent support for the notion that sympathy and personal distress are differentially related to prosocial behavior.

A study was conducted by (James Andreoni & Lise Vesterlund) FEB 2001 We study gender differences in altruism by examining a modified dictator game with varying incomes and prices. Our results indicate that the question “which is the fair sex?” has a complicated answer—when altruism is expensive, women are kinder, but when it is cheap, men are more altruistic. That is, we find that the male and female “demand curves for altruism” cross, and that men are more responsive to price changes. Furthermore, men are more likely to be either perfectly selfish or perfectly selfless, whereas women tend to be “equalitarians” who prefer to share evenly.

A study was conducted by (Einolf, 2010) Psychological research has found that women score higher on most measures of the traits, motivations, and values that predict helping others, and women are more likely to help family and friends. However, sex differences in the institutional helping behaviors of volunteering and charitable giving are small. The article seeks to explain this apparent contradiction with the hypotheses that men have more resources and more social capital than women, which compensates for their lower level of motivation. The article tests these hypotheses using data from the 1995 Midlife in the United States (MIDUS) survey. The data showed partial support for these hypotheses, as men score higher on measures of income, education, trust, and secular social networks. However, women had broader social networks through religious participation.

A study was conducted by (Nancy Eisenberg , Tracy L. Spinrad & Ariel Knafo‐Noam, 2015) of the review research and some current theory on the development of prosocial responding (including prosocial behavior and empathy‐related responding) and possible antecedents/causes, outcomes, and correlates. In the initial section of this chapter, we briefly present a general framework for integrating factors that contribute to prosocial responding. Then the empirical literature related to the development of prosocial behavior, with an emphasis on the emerging literature on early development and development during adolescence, is reviewed. Next we review literature on the potential origins of prosocial responding, including potential biological, cultural, familial, and peer/school factors. Then we address sociocognitive correlates of prosocial responding and the relations of temperamental/personality and social‐behavioral individual differences (e.g., aggression) to prosocial behavior and/or empathy‐related responding. Due to space constraints, we focus more on current rather than older publications and disproportionately on topics of central importance to prosocial development and issues that have been foci of interest in the past decade.

A study was conducted by (Oswald, 2010)The impact of cognitive and affective perspective taking on empathic arousal and altruistic responding was investigated in an American, working adult, ethnically diverse population. Altruistic helping, operationalized as the number of hours a participant volunteered to help counsel other adult students, depended on the type of perspective induced. Cognitive and affective perspectives were induced by instructing participants to pay attention to and discern (a) the thoughts of the stimulus person, (b) the feelings of the stimulus person, or (c) distracting, irrelevant details that provided a comparison condition. Participants in the affective perspective-taking condition reported greater empathic arousal than control participants. Participants in the affective perspective-taking condition also offered more help than did those in the cognitive perspective-taking condition or in the control condition.

A study was conducted by (Krebs, 1970) suggests that the study of altruism is important at 3 levels: (a) as it relates to the main goal of socialization, (b) to a core attribute of personality, and (c) to theories concerned with human nature. Independent variables associated with altruism are organized in a 2 \* 4 framework on the basis of the source of experimental measurement and level of generality. Characteristics of the benefactor and characteristics of the recipient are categorized as state variables, trait variables, social roles and demographic attributes, and characteristics influenced by social norms. Research at each level is critically reviewed. Positive and negative affective states, and states induced by the observation of models are found to influence the altruism of benefactors; and dependency and interpersonal attractiveness are found to influence the altruism-eliciting capacity of recipients. Research relevant to personality traits were criticized. Effects were found for sex, age, ordinal position, social class, and nationality in relation to benefactors, and for friendship status, ingroup affiliation, and social class in relation to recipients.

A study was conducted by (Robert F. Krueger, Brian M. Hicks, Matt McGue, 2001) The relationship between altruism and antisocial behavior has received limited attention because altruism and antisocial behavior tend to be studied and discussed in distinct literatures. The research bridges these literatures by focusing on three fundamental questions. First, are altruism and antisocial behavior opposite ends of a single dimension, or can they coexist in the same individual? Second, do altruism and antisocial behavior have the same or distinct etiologies? Third, do they stem from the same or from distinct aspects of a person's personality? Our findings indicate that altruism and antisocial behavior are uncorrelated tendencies stemming from different sources. Whereas altruism was linked primarily to shared (i.e., familial) environments, unique (i.e., nonfamilial) environments, and personality trait reflecting positive emotionality, antisocial behavior was linked primarily to genes, unique environments, and personality traits reflecting negative emotionality and a lack of constraint.

A study was conducted by (C. Daniel Batson PhD Adam A. Powell MBA, MA, 2003) Prosocial behavior covers the broad range of actions intended to benefit one or more people other than oneself—actions such as helping, comforting, sharing, and cooperation. Altruism is motivation to increase another person's welfare; it is contrasted to egoism, the motivation to increase one's own welfare. There is no one‐to‐one correspondence between prosocial behavior and altruism. Prosocial behavior need not bemotivated by altruism; altruistic motivation need not produce prosocial behavior. Over the past 30 years, the practical concern to promote prosocial behavior has led to both a variance‐accounted‐forempirical approach, which focuses on identifying situational and dispositional determinants of helping and the application of existing psychological theories. Theories invoked to explain prosocial behavior include social learning, tension reduction, norm, exchange or equity, attribution, esteem‐enhancement, and moral reasoning theories. In addition, new theoretical perspectives have been developed by researchers focused on anomalous aspects of why people do—and don't—act prosocially. Their research has raised the possibility of a multiplicity of social motives—altruism, collectivism, and principlism, as well as egoism. It has also raised questions—as yet unanswered—about how these motives might be most effectively orchestrated to increase prosocial behavior

NEED FOR STUDY:

The purpose of this study is to determine whether people who witnessed another person in need of help, would react in a positive way by helping them or would just walk off as if nothing happens. In today’s world even if a person is willing to help someone, the people around them and the environment influence them the most. Their attitude towards pro social behavior differs from individual to individual. In the end of this research study I think at least 50% of them will think about their past mistakes that they would have done or even they will not think about making the same mistake again. As for deciding who and when to help, humans have a tendency to help those who are close to them and worry less about outsiders; there is more personal benefit in helping a friend or relative. However, there are still some individuals who might be motivated to perform helping behaviors out of religious or spiritual reasoning. This leads to the controversial question of whether or not there is such a thing as a truly selfless act. Helping should not be based on gender or by the way a person looks and in the end of the research study I think it will motivate people to help more without any expectations.

Altruistic behavior tends to decline in early adolescence, partly in relation to hormonal and other physiological events of puberty, but then recovers. A new form of selfless civic engagement and volunteering, emerges as adolescents become more socially independent. Participating in church groups, playing or coaching sports, and involvement in school clubs, which require maintenance of altruistic activity over time, contribute to a sense of agency, that one’s acts can make a difference in the lives of others, and the development of identity. Volunteering in adolescence is linked to later civic engagement.

Adults have access to more material resources, knowledge, independence, and, particularly with older and retired adults, more time, than in other stages of life. Exceptional individuals become moral exemplars, demonstrating exceptional moral commitment or heroic sacrifice. However, classic social psychology research on phenomena such as bystander effect, wherein adults in a crowd are less likely to help, show that adults are not automatically more pro social than children and adolescents.

**Methodology**

Aim:

To study the gender difference in altruistic behavior among young adults

Objective:

To identify the gender difference in altruistic behavior among young adults

Hypothesis :

There will be significant gender difference in Altruism

Constitutional definitions:

# In an extreme case, altruism may become a synonym of selflessness which is the opposite of selfishness.

In a common way of living, it doesn't deny the singular nature of the subject, but realizes the traits of the individual personality in relation to the others, with a true, direct and personal interaction with each of them. It is focusing both on a single person and the whole community. In a (not only) Christian practice, it is the law of love direct to the ego and his neighbour.

(Hunter & Hunter, 1980). He derived it from the Italian altrui, which in turn was derived from Latin alteri, meaning "other people" or "somebody else".

(Steinberg, 2010) Altruism can be distinguished from feelings of loyalty, in that whilst the latter is predicated upon social relationships, altruism does not consider relationships. Much debate exists as to whether "true" altruism is possible in human psychology. The theory of psychological egoism suggests that no act of sharing, helping or sacrificing can be described as truly altruistic, as the actor may receive an intrinsic reward in the form of personal gratification. The validity of this argument depends on whether intrinsic rewards qualify as "benefits".

The term altruism may also refer to an ethical doctrine that claims that individuals are morally obliged to benefit others. Used in this sense, it is usually contrasted with egoism, which claims individuals are morally obligated to serve themselves first.

Operational definition :

Altruism

Altruistic behavior across situations than might often be supposed, i.e., that there is a trait of

altruism--indeed one sufficiently broad to warrant the concept of 'the altruistic personality.'

Participants

Participants consisted of young adults from 18 to 35 years of age. This age group was included

since individuals start to develop psychologically more and will able to understand the need to

help others. Total of 100 participants out of which 50 males and 50 females were selected .

Procedure:

Primary data was collected by survey method using “Adapted from the Self Report Altruism Scale”. Convenient sampling was done to categorize the participants amongst the interpretations . All responses were taken.

Measures:

DEMOGRAPHICS:

Adapted from the self -report altruism scale demographic information consisted of the

individuals’ name, age, gender.

Tool:

Adapted Self-Report Altruism Scale

Instrument is called as the Adapted from the Self-Report Altruism Scale (Rushton, 1981)

The Scale/Subscale Name is Adapted Self-Report Altruism Scale. The information is cited and

adapted by the CYFAR Life Skills Project, Youth Development. Initiated by the Texas A&M

University. The Developers are P. C. Rushton (original), Peter Witt and Chris Boleman (adapted

version). The year the original scale was published in 1981 (original), 2009 (adapted). Target

Audience(s) are the youth. The tool is available only in English. The original

instrument is widely used with adults and has a reliability of .84.

Description: This 14-item scale assesse

Psychometrics:

Information on reliability and validity are provided below. If information on a particular

psychometric was not found, it is indicated as “no information provided.” It should be

noted that this is not necessarily an indication of a lack of reliability or validity within a

particular scale/instrument, but rather a lack of rigorous testing, for various reasons, by

the developers or other researchers.

Reliability: A correlation of at least .80 is suggested for at least one type of reliability as

evidence; however, standards range from .5 to .9 depending on the intended use and

context for the instrument.

Internal Consistency: No information provided

Inter-rater reliability: No information provided

Test-Retest: No information provided

Validity: The extent to which a measure captures what it is intended to measure.

Content/Face Validity: No information provided

Criterion Validity: No information provided

Construct Validity: No information provided

Reference:

Rushton, P. C., R. (1981). The altruistic personality and the self-report altruism scale.

Personality and Individual Differences, 2(4), 293-302.

CONSTRUCT: Altruism

Scale Name: Adapted Version of the Self-Report Altruism Scale

Developers: P. C. Rushton (original), Peter Witt and Chris Boleman (adapted version)

Scale:

0=Never

1=Once

2=More than once

3=Often

4=Very often

Scoring:

 Sum all item ratings together.

 A higher score indicates greater altruism.

**Statistical Analysis**

The data was analyzed using Excel

 Independent Sample t test was used , to analyse the altruistic behavior data collected from

18 to 35 year olds

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1.1 Interpretation between male and female participants

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Gender | Total raw score | Level of altruism |
| Altruism | Male | 986 | LOW |
|  | Female | 1439 | HIGH |

The study identified that female participants are high in altruism than male participants. It was an

expected hypothesis. Hence the above result also proves that being altruistic is going to improve

an individual‘s well-being. To break the myth of today‘s world, lacks well-being has been

broken. Taking into consideration to prove the point that ample NGO‘s have a great number of

youngsters who do their part to the society, they in turn gain a sense of self-satisfaction which

helps in their well-being. The altruistic nature has been a great personality trait in our current

generation of youngsters. They have come to terms with the fact that in helping each other there

can be a great increase of satisfaction in their day to day life. This in turn reflects in the general

well-being of an individual. We have learnt to thrive not only for ourselves but also for our

companions for a better life. Whether or not there are gender differences in altruistic behaviour

in Dictator Game experiments has attracted considerable attention in recent years. Earlier studies

found by (Pablo Brañas-Garza & Ericka Rascón Ramírez, 2018) women to be more altruistic

than men. However, this conclusion has been challenged by more recent accounts, which have

argued that gender differences in altruistic behaviour may be a peculiarity of student samples and

may not extend to other groups. It studied the gender differences in altruistic behavior and,

additionally, in expectations of altruistic behaviour, in a sample of Amazon Mechanical Turk

crowd workers living in the US. In Study 1, it reported a mega-analysis of more than 3, 500

observations and showed that women are significantly more altruistic than men. In Study 2, it

showed that both women and men expect women to be more altruistic than men. From table 1.1

it is very clear that females are high in altruism just ike how the study has explained. A study

by (Rosemary S. L. MillsJan PedersenJoan E. Grusec, 1989) examined sex differences in the

resolution of prosocial dilemmas involving self-sacrifice. Women and men between 17 and 68

years of age were presented with hypothetical situations necessitating a choice between self and

other, and asked to decide what they would choose to do. In addition, participants were asked

why they made the choices they did and how they felt about them. Participants usually made the

self-sacrificing choice, with no differences found between women and men in the distribution of

self and other choices. Choices were justified on the basis of the respondents' own needs or those

of the other person, conflict was minimized, or reasons were offered that involved stereotyped

statements, interpersonal concerns, empathy, internalized affects and values, or a judgment about

the capacity to help. Modes of reasoning differed somewhat between the sexes, with women

using more empathic reasoning than men with other choices, and attributed their self choices

more to minimal conflict and less to concern for the other's interests. There were also sex

differences in participants' self-reported feelings about the choices they made. Specifically, there

was evidence that women experienced more conflict than men about other choices and had more

positive feelings than men did about their self choices.

Table 1.2 TTEST tabulation of adapted self- report altruism scale

Mean scores and the level of significance of the variable

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Gender | N | Mean | Standard deviation | tvalue |
| Altruism | Male | 50 | 19.72 | 5.45 | 0.00 |
|  | Female | 50 | 28.78 | 8.29 |  |

Independent sample ‗t‘ test was used to compare the differences between females and

males in all the variables. There is significant gender difference among young adults in Altruism

On that note there has been a clear and a definitive answer that, being altruistic solely depends on

an individual with regards to gender. Given the situation and the surroundings of a person, the

level of being altruistic can vary, but has something to do with being a particular gender. It is

a unique trait that will definitely differ from every individual. Thus the hypothesis stating "There

will be significant gender difference in Altruism.

Significance of the study :

From the present study it is evident that altruism contributes the most in an individual’s life.

Therefore being altruistic will improve the general well-being of an individual. When there is a

Great increase in the altruistic behavior of a community on the whole, it naturally helps each one

for a better and a prosperous life. And on a personal level, altruism will increase the credibility

of a person and give them a better perspective for any situation they are in.

Limitations and Suggestions

* A larger sample size can be used for a better replicability and generalization.
* The sample is limited only to Chennai. Better representation from various districts and states can be done
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