CHAPTER-1
INTRODUCTION

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Society is an ever-changing phenomenon. On the other side rapid scientific investigation, technological innovation, and rapid industrialization are current factors for social change. Every individual tries to adjust with even changing society. Being a social creature, man has to face many situations around him. These situations lead to satisfaction and sometimes to dissatisfaction. In order to lead a happy and prosperous life, man has to adjust with the demands of the external environment as well as those of his psychological and physical make up. If one examines the various activities of an individual’s life, he will find that most of those involve adjustment of the individual to his vocational, social and economic problems. The problem of adjustment starts right from the birth of the child and continues till his death. Thus adjustment can be said as harmony between the person and his environment. It has been observed that process of academic achievement is related to personality also. The concept of personality plays a pivotal role understanding the complex of human behavior. No a days the clinical psychology, as a major field of personality diagnosis, is highly attainment of positive self-attitudes that determine the motivational goals of the
individuals. The development of personality to an extent also depends upon the size of the family, birth order of the particular child and the environment in which he is reared up.

The individual as a person has his own interests, aptitudes, emotions, attitudes, sense of value and that matter a lot. The development of a full individual potentially becomes an asset to the nation and to the mankind as a whole. The individual must be studied from all the dimensions — social, political, economic, aesthetic, moral, spiritual. The society depends upon the contribution of its individual citizens and the individual owes itself to the society for its support and reciprocation. Youth is the backbone of the society because all round development of the youth affects the social and national development of a country.

The aspects has brought about a new challenge to the educators research personnel’s and has result in a mushroom and growth of research to bring about a new revolution in the field of academic achievement.

The roots of altruism lie in the basis of human nature. It is derived from the Latin word 'alter' or 'other' literally making 'otherism'. It refers to living for others. In fact, without this pervasive web of mutual help and concern no human society could exist happily. Altruistic behavior is perhaps viewed as a part of three-ways reciprocal interaction having characteristics of the persons, the situation, and the
person's behavior. Altruism is defined, in general as intentional voluntary behavior that benefits another and is not performed with the expectation of receiving external rewards or avoiding external punishments or aversive stimuli.

1.1 CONCEPT OF ALTRUISM

The original use of the concept of “altruism” is traced to Auguste Comte, a French mathematician and philosopher during the first half of the 1800s. The French word that was later translated to “altruism” was an adjective that meant ‘of or to other, what is another’s somebody else’. When the word was translated into English, the Oxford English Dictionary defined it as ‘devotion to the welfare of others, regarding for others, as a principle of action: opposed to egoism or selfishness’.

Webster’s Dictionary of the English language defines altruism as ‘consideration for other people without any thought of self as principle of conduct’.

Wilson (1975) defined altruism as "Self destructive behavior performed for the benefit of others".

People with a prosocial orientation may, under conditions which still need to be further specified, be willing to endure greater sacrifices and to give up more of their self interest for the sake of others (Staub, 1974). In fact without this pervasive web of mutual help and concern no human society could long endure. This signifies that the roots of
“altruism” lie in the basic of human nature.

Altruism according to Bandura (1977) refers to voluntary actions intended to benefit another that are intrinsically motivated that is, acts motivated internal motives such as concern and sympathy for others or by values and self rewards rather than personal gains. Internalized values instigating altruism include a belief in the importance of other welfare or justice. Individuals may reinforce or reward themselves with felling of self-esteem pride, or self satisfaction when they may punished themselves (with guilt or felling of worthless) when they do not. Baston et al (1986) argue that prosocial acts motivated by value are actually selfishly rather than altruistically motivated.

Baston (1983) conceptualized altruism as a desire within one organism to increase the welfare of another organism as an end state goal.

According to Eisenberg altruistic behaviors consists of those behaviours which are motivated by another oriented or normal concerns rather than rewards or the desire to reduce aversive affective states. Buck and Ginsberg (1991) opined that altruism is the tendency of one organism to act to increase the welfare of another organism with no obvious benefit and often at a cost to the actor.

According to Grusiec (1991) altruism refers to acts of concern for others such as sharing, helping, showing concern
and consideration, reassuring and defending that are performed independent of hope of reward or fear of punishment from external source.

Baston and Olsson (1991) suggested that the human capacity for altruism is limited to those for whom we feel empathy. When empathy for the person in need is low, the pattern of helping suggests underlying egoistic motivation. According to them it is not that we never help people for whom we feel little empathy we often do but only when it is in our best interest.

1.2 FOUNDATION OF ALTRUISM

Grusiec (1991) points out that both psychoanalytic and cognitive development theory have little room for early altruism. Empathic distress and concern for others according to traditional formulation of cognitive development theory should not be possible until children grow out of the egocentric mode of function in which they can no point of view other than their own. Recent observation, however indicate that even very young children are capable of understanding the phenomenal world and other point of view of experiencing their distress empathically and therefore recognizing that those individuals are in a state of need. With the addition of helping skill, they are then able to respond in an altruistic manner. Other motivational systems that also function quite early in the course of development may be responsible, as well as, for acts of altruism. These systems
appear to revolve around the young child’s desire for mastery and social interaction.

Much of the work on early altruism has been carried out by Rheingold, Hay and West and Rheingold (1982) who have observed that children as early as 12 month of age frequently bring the attention of both parents and strangers to objects by pointing at them as well as actually sharing them. The evidence in very young children of an ability to show concern for others has also been documented in Dunn’s work with sibling (Dunn and Munn, 1986).

Kin selection provides a parsimonious explanation of altruism and is consistent with the more traditional view of each organism functioning to maximize its own survival. The central concept of kin-selection is “inclusive fitness” (Hamilton, 1964). It states that an individual’s genetic fitness is measured not only by the survival and reproduction of the individual and his or her offspring but also by the enhancement of the fitness of other relatives who share the same genes. It permits the selection of acts that may be beneficial to other but detrimental to the individual own survival or reproduction and are therefore, by definition altruistic. Kin selection specifies the condition under which individual are selected to perform altruism acts or to for go selfish acts because of the negative consequence for the reproduction success of relatives. In sum natural selection favors genetic tendencies in which one confers benefits toward one’s kin-the nearer the kin (i.e., the greater the
percentage of genes shared by common descent) the more helpful the behaviors and the greater readiness to sacrifice one’s own fitness.

Trivers (1971, 1985) put forth a model of reciprocal altruism, which focuses on direct benefit to the reproduction unit, of the individual. In this model Trivers has attempted to show that natural selection favours altruism, even between non-related individuals, because of its long-term benefit to the organism performing it. Further he contends that there should be selection for altruism among organisms who exchange altruistic acts over a period of time so long as (1) the benefit to the recipient exceeds the cost to the altruism is favoured provided that it is repaid.

Simon (1990) recently argued that “Docility” - the tendency to believe what one is expected to learn and believe can account for persons behaving altruistically in the biological-genetic sense of risking one’s own reproduction fitness in order to benefit others. He founded that if altruism results from docility then the fitness of altruist results from docility then the fitness of altruist will actually exceed the fitness of selfish individuals as long as the demands of altruism that society imposes on docile individuals as long as the demands of altruism that society imposes on docile individual are excessive compared with the advantageous knowledge and skills acquired through docility.

Johnson et al. (1992) have further added that “docility produces altruism” position only when one assume that
powerful source of influence in a given society are more strongly supportive of altruism than of a lack of altruism and that altruism towards other persons, even when these others are not friends or relatives of the altruist result in an increased reproductive fitness. A review of studies of correlates of human altruism favors reciprocal altruism over docility as an explanation for individual differences in altruism toward non-kin.

Buck and Ginsberg (1991) are of the view that altruism and other kinds of behaviours involved species specific behaviors systems that derive from and are based upon affective bonds of affinities, often are hierarchically structured, that characterize the social system of the species. Such bonds are species typical and range from those involved in mating parenting and peer coalitions to the more complex social roles that are central to the formation and maintenance of socially cohesive groups. Further Buck and Ginsburg (1991) proposed the communicative gene hypothesis at the root of spontaneous affective communication, which in turn, form the basic of all social behavior including empathic emotion and altruism. This spontaneous communication normally is sufficient to produce social bonds such that individuals act in concert and individual social rolls that are beneficial to the group but not necessary to each individual within it.
1.3 SOCIALIZATION TECHNIQUES AND THEIR EFFECTS ON ALTRUISTIC BEHAVIOR:

Grusec (1991) mentions that the agents of socialization include parents and siblings, peers, teachers, the school, organizers of extra curricular activities and the media. In some cases, attempts to foster altruism are deliberate in others they are the result of experience that may not be aimed directly at encouraging protocol pro-activities in the child but that are nevertheless potent.

Grusec (1991) in a study trained mother of 4-and 7-year old to observe and report incidents of altruistic behavior that they observed in their children in a home setting.

Their reports indicated that spontaneous altruism in young children is most frequently respond to by other people in the child environment with some form of social reinforcement acknowledge, thanks, smiles, hugs, and praise. Altruism is never followed by material reward.

Grusec (1980) that 8 year old who were told that they had shared because they were kind and helpful people perform better on a numbers of tests of Altruism than did 8-year olds who were socially reinforced for their sharing by being told that they had done a kind and helpful thing. Thus character attributions or dispositional praise seems to be more powerful in their effect than social reinforcement.

Hoffman (1970) suggested that power-assertion is detrimental to the socialization process because it arouses
the anger hostility and reactance in the recipient.

Radke-Yarrow et al. (1983) concluded that power assertion used by parents who have positive attitude towards their children and who are responsive to them is much effective. In other words, strong control, or power assertion is detrimental when paired with coldness and rejection but not when paired with warmth and affection.

According to the attachment theory (Bowl by 1969: Ainsworth et al 1978) securely attachment children ought to be more altruistic. Main and Weston reported that securely attached 12 month old children were more likely to respond to the social overtures of an adult dressed as a clown, and show greater distress when he cried than were insecurely attachment children.

Other source of Altruistic caring, aside from empathy felling for the person in need, have been proposed, including and Altruistic personality (Staub, 1974: Rush ton, 1980) prineplized prosoical values (Schwartz and Howart, 1984” Baston 1989: Staub, 1989)

Wentowaski (1981) explored the helping patterns among older adults who received service from others. He found a significant correlation between opportunities to engage in helping activities and the maintenance of self esteem. Significant relationships among Altruistic orientation self esteem and perceived control were found in a study of attitudes expressed by residents of Florida retirement
Many development researchers have maintained that altruism increase with age during childhood (e.g., Gelfand and Hartmann, 1980; Underwood and Moore, 1982). Older children are more likely to justify prosocial behaviours with altruistic tendencies, e.g. (other oriented) as opposed to non-altruistic, self-related consideration (Bar-Tal, 1982; Eisenberg, 1986). Rush ton et al. (1986) found prosocial tendencies to increase with age and aggressive one to decline.

1.4 EMPATHY AND ALTRUISM

Since long time empathy has been considered the main source of Altruism. Batson et al suggested that if there are source of Altruistic caring other than empathy they have yet to be explored. Several researchers (e.g., Hoffman, 1975;1976; Batson, Darley and Coke, 1978; Batson and Coke 1981) have suggested that empathic emotion leads to motivation directed towards the Altruistic goal of increasing the empathy Altruism hypothesis. The empathy Altruism hypothesis contradicts the common assumption in psychology that all motivation, including all prosocial motivation is ultimately directed towards the egoistic goal of increasing one own welfare (Wallch and Wallch, 1983)

Support for the empathy-altruism hypothesis has been flown from a series of students using x ease of escape design. Researchers consistently found that when empathy was low,
helping dropped dramatically if escape was easy. When empathy was high, however helping remained high even if the empathically aroused individuals could easily reduce their arousal by escaping exposure of the suffering victim (Baston et al.. 1983; Fultz et al 1986)

Archer et al. (1981), however suggested that felling empathy for a person in need may lead to increased helping because the empahic individual wants to avoid negative social evaluation. Fult; et al. (1986) conducting two systematic experimental studies and concluded that the motivation to help evoked by empathy is not egoistic motivation to avoid negative social evaluation.

Batson (1987) tested a major egoistic alternative to the empathy altruism hypothesis viz...aversive arousal reduction. According to this hypothesis helping the victim is usually the best way to get rid of the source, therefore empathically aroused individuals help to benefit them by reducing their empathic arousal. Empathy change the anticipated reward or punishment structure of the situation, making more beneficial to the self and so increasing the egoistic motivation to help. Baston et al. (1988) designed and conducted five studies to test these proposed egoistic alternatives hypothesis. Result of these five studies did not support either the emphasis specific punishment hypothesis instead, result of each study supported the empathy altruism hypothesis. Evidence for the hypothesis that empathy emotion evokes altruism motivation continues to mount.
Baston and Olesan (1991) studied the status of empathy altruism hypothesis and found it to be valid. According to them empathy induced altruistic motivation is a potentially important psychological resource which harnessed and put to work, may yield important practical as well as theoretical benefit.

1.5 Bystander Intervention: Helping a Stranger in Distress

Social psychological studies have found that bystander intervention is affected by characteristics of the situation (is the evening pleasant or freezing cold) characteristic of the potential helper (is the passing motorist late for an appointment?) and characteristics of the person in need (are you male or female).

1.5.1 The Situation:

Research has documented the importance of several situational factors, including the presence of presence of other people, the nature of the physical environment and the pressure of limited time.

1.5.2 The presence of other:

Bibb Latane and John Darley (1970) proposed that the very presence of so many onlookers may have been a reason for the lack of helping. The more people present, the less likely it was that any one individual actually offered help, and the longer the average delay before help was given. Darley and Lantane called this the bystander effect.
Why does the presence of other sometimes inhibit helpfulness? A cost benefit or decision making analysis of prosocial behavior suggests several explanation. One is the diffusion of responsibility created by the presence of other people. If only one person witnesses a victim in distress, then he or she is totally responsible for responding to the situation and will bear all the guilt or blame for non-intervention. When others are present, help come from several people.

A second explanation for the bystander effect concerns ambiguity in the interpretation of the situation. Potential helpers are sometimes uncertain whether a particular situation is actually an emergency. The behavior of other bystanders can influence how we ourselves define a situation and react to it. If other ignore a situation or act as if nothing is happening, we too may assume that no emergency exist. The impact of bystanders on interpreting a situation was demonstrated by Latane and Darley (1970).

A third factor in the strength of the bystander effect is evaluation apprehension. If we know that other people are watching our behavior, we may try to do what we think other expect of us and to present ourselves in favorable light (Baumeister, 1982)

1.6. ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS:

The physical setting also influences willingness to help, think for a moment about whether you are more likely
to stop to help a stranded motorist on a pleasant sunny day
or a cold, rainy one? On a dark street in a poor section of
town, or in a well lighted affluent area? On a country lane, or
in a big city? Much research has documented the impact of
environmental conditions such as weather, city size, and
noise level on helping.

The effects of weather on helping were investigated in
two field studies by Cunningham (1979). In one study he
found that people were significantly more likely to help when
the day was sunny and when the temperature was
comfortable. In a second study conducted in a climate left
more generous tips people are more likely to help a stranded
motorist in sunny rather than at night (Skolinc, 1977). In
short weather does make a difference in helping, although
psychologist are still debating the exact reasons for this
effect. Another environmental factor that can affect prosocial
behavior is noise. Starting with the general idea that noise
can reduce people responsiveness to all events in the
environment; several researchers have investigated whether
noisy conditions reduce the likelihood of helping a stranger
in distress (Sherrod and Downs, 1974).

1.6.1 Time Pressures:

Imagine that you are walking across campus when a
student stops you to ask for help with a found drive for
needy children. Are you more likely to help if you are out for
a stroll or if you are late for a midterm exam? Both common
sense and research evidence suggest that we are sometimes
in too much of a hurry to help.

1.6.2 The Helper:

Situational factors can greatly increase or decrease the likelihood that people will act in a prosocial way. In an effort to understand why some people help more than others; researches have investigated both relatively enduring personality characteristics and more fleeting moods and psychological states.

1.7 CONCEPT OF PERSONALITY:

The word personality has been derived from the word 'persona' which means theatrical mask. 'Persona' has four distinct meanings:

(1) What appears to others and not one really is.

(II) The part one plays in life.

(III) The sum of total qualities

(IV) The distinction and dignity as in the style of writing.

According to first meaning the personality may be thought as external appearance and not the true self. The second meaning of persona regards personality as role which the player played. The third distinctive personal qualities in the personality and the last derivative have significance of prestige and dignity.

What we are and what we hope to aspire to become is our personality. It influences our behaviour to a large extent. It is total integration of the individual which is expressed
values, believes, experiences, manners, attitudes, ambitions, aspiration, interests, sentiments, temperature and traits.

- **Philosophical vies:**
  
  According to this view, personality is ideal of perfection.

- **Layman's view:**
  
  According to this view, personality is the facial expression, movement, manner, externality of the individual, his dress, gesture, physique etc.

- **Biophysical view:**
  
  According to this view, personality is what a man is with in himself and external behaviour provides what is with in the individual.

- **Sociaological view:**
  
  Sociologist define personality in terms of social and stimulus value. They put foresaid the individual in the background of the society.

- **Psychoanalytic view:**
  
  Freud is of the view that there are three major constituents of personality:

  (a) Id: It is immoral, illogical and unconscious. It is the total of natural and general tendencies that can not be satisfied in the society.

  (b) Ego: Ego is the social self. It has relationship with goal as well as moral wish.
(c) Super ego: It is known as moral self. It is the higher and ideal part of society.

- **Psychological view:**

  Jung has classified personality mainly into two types on the basis of social activities:

  (a) Extroverts: These people take much interest in others. These are emotional, stable, can make decisions firmly, strongly and easily. These are social and redistrict view. Businessman, players, actors and politician come under this category.

  (b) Introverts: These persons are always interested in self. These are self centered and lonely. These are idealistic and take part in social activities. Neither these can take quick decision nor these can act upon it. Scientists, philosophers etc. come under this category. But in general we never come across such person who is fully extroverts or introverts. The traits both extroverts and introverts can be seen in the society.

  According Allport (1959) "Personality is the dynamic organisation with in the individual of those psycho physical systems that determines his unique adjustment to his environment"

**1.7.1 PERSONALITY TRAITS**

A trait may be regarded as a dimension of personality as a scale along which one characteristic or aspect of personality may be measured. For example dominance,
submission trait that a person may show in any degree. Few people like at either extreme, must show the characteristic in moderate degree. As a trait dominance submission is regarded as only one dimension of personality. People also vary in other dimensions, and as many traits may be identified as are required to account for observation of behaviour. Although a trait is a description of human behaviour, not every word that describes behaviour defines a trait. The most important requirement is that the trait must describe the consistent behaviour of an individual.

1.7.1.2 TRAITS DIMENSION:

There are number of dimensions along with which traits can be classified. These dimensions have to do with different kinds of traits that writers have postulated for adequate description of personality. They include such distinction as common versus unique traits surface versus underlying traits, broad versus narrow traits and whether the content of traits involves abilities, motivational and control process.

1.7.1.3 COMMON VERSUS UNIQUE TRAITS:

Some traits are found widely distributed through the population or among certain groups. Therefore, we can speak of traits that an individual shares with others. Trait term like honesty and aggressiveness are used by society to evaluate the behaviour of persons in general and are some time called 'Common Traits'. A particular person may not be aggressive or most honest individual in his group and this relative
position may be consistent in a wide variety of situations. The trait terms aggressiveness of honesty can be applied along a scale of degree to all individuals or groups.

In contrast, we can talk about individual or 'unique traits' referring to pattern of behaviour or characteristics of personality that have no interpersonal reference but apply only to a single person. Frequently, the common traits terms are not useful for describing certain consistent attributes of a particular individual that are not share in any degree by others. The consistence from which the unique trait is inferred are inter-individual. That is the person behaves in a particular manner or has some characteristics that is unique to him and characterizes him much of the time.

1.7.1.4 SURFACE VERSUS DEPTH TRAITS:

Most of the writers about traits have recognized a further distinction with respect to traits dimensions, one trait should be readily understandable in the context of the previous discussion of theory construction and consistency of underlying personality structure. Traits considered at the behavioural or action level are called 'Surface Traits' as opposed to underlying or "Depth Traits" size of vocabulary, arithmetically and tactfulness in social situation might be considered as surface traits accounting for the observed surface manifestations.

Writers have used a variety of terms to make the same distinction between surface and depth traits. Cattel(1950) for
example referred to 'surface' and 'source' traits. Allport borrowed the terms 'genotypical' and 'phonotypical' from Lewia, who took them from the field of genetics and applied them by analogy the surface depth dimension.

1.7.1.5 BROAD VERSUS NARROW TRAITS:

Another dimension along with traits has to do with the number of types of behaviour that can be considered under a particular trait term. For example, in Cattell’s system of classifying traits the smallest behaviour fragments or narrow traits of 'Manual dexterity' but this could be split into 'dexterity in 'Shuffling Cattels', dexterity with a screw-driver and so on. In other words many traits elements make up broad or general traits like manual dexterity, which can include a wide variety of specific acts. This could be considered a minor trait. However, these individual behaviour tend to cluster together to form a relatively large constellation of acts, which is classified as a 'broad trait'.

It would be an endless and impractical task to try to describe personality in terms of the thousands of narrow traits that can be identified. It is more economical to look for groups or clusters of traits that ordinarily go together there is clinical and statistical evidence to show that persons who are dominant in their relationship with others tend also to be assertive, egotistic, tough, indicative and hardhearted. Thus traits elements or narrow traits are grouped together in such a way that specific behaviour patterns can be organized under a single, more general heading of a broad traits.
1.7.1.6 DYNAMIC STYLISTIC AND ABILITY TRAITS:

The consideration of traits dimensions emphasizes formal characteristic of traits that is their scope or breadth, their surface or substance a characteristic and the extent to which a trait is common or unique. Traits can also be classified by content, that is the kind of behavioural characteristic to which they apply. For example, Cattell (1950) identified three rough modes for source traits. He spoke of 'ability traits' such as general intelligence. 'Dynamic traits' such as general intelligence. 'Dynamic traits' primarily concern inducing or stable motivation patterns and regulating, controlling characteristic of the personality. 'Treatment Traits' have to do with the style of manner in which an individual functions within the context of his capacities and motivation. Temperament Traits in Cattell's system are largely constitutional in nature and includes speed, energy and emotional reactivity.

Many writers have objected to this inclusion to dynamic as well as stylistic characteristic under the traits for example, MC-Clelland (1951) reserved the term "Traits" to apply to characteristic that are essentially stylistic and he used the separate term, "Motive" to forces that power behaviour. Thus, Whereas Aliport and Cattell are willing to speak of "Motive Traits", Mc-Clelland speaks of traits and motives separately. For present purpose, this is a terminological distinction rather than one of any important functional significance.
Efforts to identify a single personality profile of the helpful person have not been very successful. Rather, it appears that specific personality traits dispose people to help in some types of situation, but notion others (Romer, Gruder and Lizzadro, 1986). For instance, Satow (1975) found that people with a high need for approval were more likely to denote money to a charity than those low in need for social approval. But only when others were watching them, presumably, people high in need for approval were motivated by a desire to win praise from others, and so acted more prosocial only when their good deeds would be noticed (Deutsch and Lamberti, 1986).

- **Mood:**

  There is considerable evidence that people are more willing to help when they are in a good mood e.g. people are more likely to help if they found a time in phone booth (Isen and Simmonds, 1978) been given a free cookie at the college library (Isen, and Levin, 1972), succeeded on some experimental tasks (Isen, 1970), or listed to soothing music (Fried and Berkowitz, 1979) than if these mood enhancing events have not occurred. Apparently a warm glow of positive felling increases the willing to act prosaically.

1.8 **ALTRUISTIC VERSUS SELF-SERVING MOTIVE’S:**

We noted earlier that true altruism is defined by the person intentions we act altruistically only when we help with no exception of receiving a personal benefit. This
reasoning has led researchers to study the motives that lead people to help and to contrast helping based on personal distress versus empathic concern.

Personal distress refers to our own personal reactions to the suffering of others our felling of shock, horror, sadness, helpelessness or sympathy and caring for other in particular to sharing vicariously or indirectly in the suffering of other.

Personal distress motivates us to reduce our own discomfort. We might do this by helping a personal in need, but we can also do it by escaping from the situation or ignoring the suffering around us. In contrast emphasis concern can be reduced only by actually helping the person in need. Several studies have shown that empathy increases prosocial behavior (Hoffman, 1981)

1.8.1 The Person in Need:

Although the true altruist may be blind to everything but the need of a person in distress, every day prosocial behavior is often influenced by characteristics of the person in need. We are more likely to help people, people we like and people we think deserve assistance.

1.8.2 Helping those we like:

Our initial liking for another person is affected by such factors as physical attractiveness and similarity. Research on prosocial behavior found that the same characteristics also influence helping. In at least some situations those who are
physically attractive are more likely to receive aid. The degree of similarity between the potential helper and person in need is also important.

**1.8.3 Helping those who deserve help:**

Whether a person receive help depends in part on the “merits” of the case e.g. people in a supermarket were more likely to give someone money so they could buy milk rather than cookie dough (Bickman and Kamzan, 1973), presumably because milk is more essential for health than cookies. In both the cases, the legitimacy or appropriateness of the request or problem made a difference. Of course, judgments about the importance of a particular need may be strongly influenced by values. In addition to evaluating the deservingness of the need itself, potential helper may also make inferences about of the person need.

**1.9 THE EXPERIENCE OF RECEIVING HELP:**

Sometimes we react to getting help with happiness and gratitude. The novice swimmer saved from drowning by an alert lifeguard is thankful to be alive and grateful for getting help when it was needed. A student who gets a ride to the airport from a friend is genuinely thankful for the favor of a solder may come to like and respect a platoon buddy who voluntarily offers help (Cook and Pelfrey, 1985). But there are also instances when people react negatively to receiving help. Wended offers to help his five year old get dressed, she may indigents insist she would rather to it herself. Welfare
recipient may react towards social workers with hostility rather than warmth. Countries receiving millions in U.S. foreign aid complain about American policies and “exploitation” of developing nations. What these examples point out is that receiving help can be a mixed blessing. Several social, psychological theories help explain these reactions.

1.9.1 REACTANCE THEORY

According to reactance theory, people want to maximize their personal freedom of choice — perceived threat to this freedom are experienced negatively, and may lead to efforts to reassert one’s independence. So when foreign aid recipients criticized U.S. politics, they may be symbolically proving their independence and reducing feeling of reactance.

1.9.2 Exchange Theory

Cost of indebtedness: providing help involves an exchange of resources from one person to another. When the exchange of help in a relationship is largely one way, it leads to indebtedness and can create an imbalance of power in the relationship (Worehel, 1984). Young adults who receive financial support from their parents may appreciate the assistance, but may also feel that accepting aid gives their parents greater rights to influence their lives.

The exchange perspective suggests that help may be most appreciated when it can be reciprocated, hence maintaining a balance of equality and power in the
relationship. Research shows that people are less likely to ask for help when they think they will be unable to repay the aid in same form (Fisher, Nadler, Whitcher-Alagna, 1982)

1.9.3 Attribution theory: Threats to self-esteem

Accepting help can important implications for our self esteem, if we perceive that people are helping us because they genuinely care about us and our welfare, we may get an ago boost. If accepting aid implies that we are incompetent, unsuccessful, and dependent, help may threaten our self-esteem (Fisher et al., 1982). For instance, people are sometimes reluctant to seek aid from social agencies because they fear humiliation and embarrassment (Williamson, 1974).

According to attribution theory, people are motivated to understand why they need help and why others are offering to give them. If people can attribute their need to external or uncontrollable forces rather than to personal inadequacies, they will be maintained positive self-esteem. Several studies (Fisher et al., 1982; Tessler and Schwartz, 1972) have found that people are more likely to seek help when they can attribute their problem to a difficult situation, rather than to a personal deficiency. It has also been found that help may be easier to accept when person in need does not have to ask for it explicitly. A year long study of welfare recipients (Gross, Walston and Pillavin, 1979) found that people used more of the social services available if their case worker initiated contacts than if the family had to initiate contacts. The researcher suggests that people avoid asking
for help to protect their sense of pride and self worth.

We have that the experience of receiving help is not always positive. There are times when accepting aid can limit our freedom, diminish our power and lower our self-esteem. An understanding of these processes helps to explain why people sometimes react negatively towards helper and why they badly need it. Social psychological factors may also explain the popularity of self help group, are run by the people in need, offer opportunities for reciprocal help, and foster the knowledge that others have the same problem they may minimize the costs of receiving help.

1.10 VALUE PATTERNS:

A value is a belief, a mission, or a philosophy that is meaningful. Whether we are consciously aware of them or not, every individual has a core set of personal values. Values can range from the commonplace, such as the belief in hard work and punctuality, to the more psychological, such as self-reliance, concern for others, and harmony of purpose. Important and enduring beliefs or ideals shared by the members of a culture about what is good or desirable and what is not. Values exert major influence on the behavior of an individual and serve as broad guidelines in all situations. Capacity is of the physical. It is what we have already fully acquired. Values is of the mind and spirit, it is what we aspire to attain. Capacity reflects the values we have already fully accepted mentally, endorsed vitally and mastered physically -- e.g. the capacity to be punctual in the West, or
to make things perfectly, or to organize or to fight courageously. What we call values are capacities still in the making, e.g. generosity, self-giving, taking the other person's point of view, truthfulness. When these values become physical sensitivities, they too are converted into capacities of extraordinary power (MSS). The study of values is to be measure the six basis interests or motives in personality: the Theoretical, Economic, Aesthetic, Social, Political and Religious. This type of classification is based upon Spranger’s type(s) of man. The detail of these values is given below:

1.10.1 The Theoretical

"The dominant interest of the theoretical man is the discovery of truth. In the pursuit of this goal he characteristically takes a 'cognitive' attitude that divests itself of judgments regarding the beauty and utility of objects, and seeks, only to observe and to reason. Since the interests of the theoretical man are empirical, critical and rational he is necessarily an intellectualist, frequently a scientist or philosopher, His chief aim in life is to order and systematize his knowledge."

1.10.2. The Economic

"The economic man is characteristically interested in what is useful. Based originally upon the satisfaction of bodily needs (self preservation), the interest in utilities develops to embrace the practical affairs of the business
world—the production, marketing, and consumption of goods, the elaboration of credit, and accumulation of tangible wealth. This type is thoroughly "Practical" and conforms well to the prevailing stereotype of the average American businessman.

1.10.3. The Aesthetic

"The aesthetic man sees his highest values in form and harmony. Each single experience is judged from the standpoint of grace, symmetry, or fitness. He regards life as a procession of events; each single impression is enjoyed for its own sake. He need not be a creative artist, not need he be effete, he is aesthetic if he but finds his chief interest in the artistic episodes of life."

The aesthetic attitude is, in a sense, diametrically opposed to the theoretical; the former is concerned with the diversity, and the latter with the identities of experience. In the economic sphere the aesthetic sees the process of manufacturing, advertising and trade as a wholesale destruction of the values most important to him. In social affairs he may be said to be interested in persons, he tends towards individualism and self-sufficiency. Aesthetic people often like the beautiful insignia of pomp and power, but oppose political activity when it makes for the repression of individuality. In the field of religion they are likely to confuse beauty with purer religious experience."
1.10.4 The Social

"The highest value for this type is love of people. In the Study of Values it is the altruistic or philanthropic aspect of love that is measured. The social man prizes other persons as ends and is therefore himself kind sympathetic and unselfish. He is likely to find the theoretical, economic, and aesthetic attitudes cold and inhuman."

1.10.5. The Political

"The political man is interested primarily in Power. His activities are not necessarily within the narrow field of politics, but, whatever his vocation, he betrays as a Machtmensch. Leaders in any field generally have high power value."

1.10.6. The Religious

"The highest value of the religious man may be called unity. He is mystical and seeks to comprehend the cosmos as a whole, to relate himself to its embracing totality. Spranger defines the religious man as one "whose mental structure is permanently directed to the creation of the highest and absolutely satisfying value experience." Some men of this type are "immanent mystics," that is, they find their religious experience in the affirmation of life and in active participation therein."

1.11 ALTRUISM AND VALUE PATTERNS:

Peters (1995) described the economic approach in analyzing the family behaviours pioneered by Becker (1991),
focusing on 2 areas, household production and altruism. The household production Model address the important question of how casts, technological changes and social change effect the ways in which family rear children and in turn, reflect the importance of children in society. Becker's work on altruism explores the nature of parent-parent and parent-child relationships and how these relationship affect resource allocation within the family. Modeling altruism also provides insights into how parents behavior towards their children is affected by government policies. 

Van Lange (1999) provides a conceptual framework for understanding differences among prosocial, individualistic and competitive orientations. Whereas traditional models conceptualize prosocial orientation in terms of enhancing joint outcomes, the author proposes an interrogative model of social value orientation in which prosocial orientation is understood in terms of enhancing both joint outcomes and equality in outcomes. Consistent with this integrative model, prosocial orientation (Vs individualistic and competitive orientations) was associated with greater tendencies to enhance both joint outcomes and equality in outcomes, in addition, both goals were positively associated (Study I), consistant with interaction-relevant implications of this model, prosocial orientation was strongly related to reciprocity. Relative to individualists and competitors, prosocials were likely to engage in the same level of cooperation as the inter dependent other did (study-2) and the
same level of cooperation as they anticipated from the interdependent other (study-3)

1.12 JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

The foregoing theoretical discussion of various aspects of altruism reveals the complex nature and divergence of viewpoints regarding it. The existence of pure altruism has been conceptually debated in both the philosophical and psychological circles (Bentham, 1798; McDougall, 1908; Campbell, 1975). Altruism has been conceptualized in terms of different definitions, i.e. as voluntary actions (Bandura, 1977); as a desire within the organism (Batson, 1983); as a motivational behavior (Eisenberg, 1986) etc. Different hypotheses have been proposed regarding the foundation and development of altruism i.e. psychoanalytic cognitive, evolutionary, reciprocal, altruism, docility, species specific behavior system, communication gene-hypothesis, etc pointing to the different modes of development of altruistic behavior.

Some researcher (Grusec, 1991; Mein and George, 1985; Hofman, 1970) have explained the development course of altruistic behavior through the socialization process including the influence of parents, siblings, peer teacher, school and media.

A good number of studies have been conducted to explore the correlates of altruistic behavior. Baston et al. (1983), Fultz et al (1986) Baston and Olesan (1971), have
emphasized empathy to be underlying the prosocial behavior. Studies pertaining to the investigation of bystander intervention (Helping a stranger in distress) have revealed that it is affected by characteristics of the situation character of the person.

A sequel of studies has provided enigmatic findings regarding the relationship between altruism and personality variables. Cattell and Horowitz (1960) found the factor cyclothymiacs highly correlated with altruism in college female students. Fridricks (1960) found conservation socio-economic security and social acceptable factor as related to altruism. Ribal (1962) found some personality types relevant to altruism-

1. The altruistic self,
2. The receptive self and,
3. The inner sustaining self.

Berkowitz (1970) found that people who are wrapped up in themselves self centred and concerned about their own welfare are less likely to be altruistic. Batson (1995) also reported that empathy is the main underlying mechanism of the prosocial behavior.

Similarly enigmatic findings have been obtained regarding the altruism value patterns relationship. Anis and Lawrence (1976) found non significant relationship. Between helping behavior and responses to the study of values (religious scale). Seth et al. (1984) found no significant
differences among Hindus, Muslim and Christians females. Mohan at el (1986) found altruism significant correlated with is theoretic and social value.

A critical analysis of research parting investigation altruism personality and altruism value patterns relationship reveal the gaps and disagreement in finding. Most of the studies have investigated the relationship by using psychometric measures of the constructs. Review of the literature clearly indicates that there is a gap in research finding to the relationship between altruism personality variables and altruism value pattern that need to be further bridged by using the psychometric measure of altruism. Thus, to understand the relationship of the altruism behavior with value patterns and personality variables more systematic research is needed.

Keeping above facts in mind the present study has been designed to understand more systematically, the nature of relationship between altruism value pattern and altruism personality variables.

1.13 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The statement of the problem is, “A study of altruism in relation to personality and value patterns among senior secondary school students.”

1.14 OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF THE TERMS USED:

Different words have their different connotations according to their place of reference, therefore, for the
investigator, it was more essential to explain the words which used repeatedly in her investigation. Some of the terms used in present study are as under:

I. **Altruism**: Altruism a desire within one organism to increase the welfare of another organism as an end state goal.

II. **Personality**: Personality is a dynamic organization within the individual of those psycho-physical systems that determine his unique adjustment to his environment. In the present study, personality of senior secondary school students was measured by using 16 personality factors.

III. **Value Pattern**: Values are beliefs upon which a man acts by preference/interests. In the present study, value pattern means theoretical, Economical, Aesthetical, Social, Political and religious value of senior secondary school students.

IV. **Senior Secondary School Students**: For the present study Senior Secondary School students implies the students of class XI & XII of Government senior secondary school.

1.15 **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**:

The main objectives of the study are:

i. To examine the relationship between measure of personality and altruism of senior secondary school students.
ii. To examine the relationship between measures of value pattern and altruism of senior secondary school students.

iii. To examine the relationship among the measures of personality and value-pattern of senior secondary school students.

iv. To examine the relationship among the measures of personality of senior secondary school students.

v. To examine the relationship among the measure of value pattern of senior secondary school students.

vi. To compare the factor structure of measure of altruism value pattern and personality of senior secondary school students.

1.16 HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY:

The following hypotheses are formulated for the present study:

i. Different measures of personality are likely to have different relationship with measure of altruism of senior secondary school students.

ii. Different measures of value pattern are likely to have different relationship with the measure of altruism of senior secondary school students.

iii. Different measures of personality are likely to have different relationship with the measure of value pattern of senior secondary school students.
iv. Different measures of personality are likely to have different relationship with each other of senior secondary school students

v. Different measures of value pattern are likely to have different relationship with each other of senior secondary school students

vi. Measure of altruism, value pattern and personality are likely to yield distinct factor of senior secondary school students

1.17 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

The present study was delimited to the following:

I. The present study was delimited to altruism personality and value pattern only.

II. The study was confined to the students of senior secondary school students of district Gurgaon only.

III. The study was delimited to the students of age group of 16-21 years only.

IV. The study was delimited to sample of 320 students only.