Chapter – 1

INTRODUCTION

Basically man is a social being. To be social means interaction with and dependence on other people. Man’s existence depends upon co-operation and co-existence, not on jungle rule- ‘survival of the fittest’. Cooperation and co-existence require helping each other not because of selfish motives only but on selfless service to other also. This selfless service is the backbone of the advancement of the culture, civilization and religion. Social psychologists have probably exaggerated the negative aspects of human nature. Human behaviour is regarded as essentially selfish and controlled by reward and punishment. For example, a number of social thinkers have views that a person is innately selfish (e.g. Hobbs, Machiavelli and Freud). The Darwinian concept of “struggle for existence” and “survival of fittest” explain that human beings have to face competition of every step in their lives. But the development of human civilization would have been impossible, if the positive aspects of human behavior, i.e., cooperation and helping others, was lacking from the mankind. Reality is that, altruistic behaviour is as innate and basic to human nature as selfish behaviour.

Altruism is defined as the concern for the well being of others without concern for one’s own self interest. Socio psychological studies of acts of charity
most often fall under the behaviour “Pro-social behaviour”, “Altruism”, or ‘Helping behaviour in contrast to” anti social behaviour. Pro-social behaviour is defined as voluntary behaviour performed with the intention of benefiting another persons or group of person (stand and Wrightswan, 1981). The voluntary and intentional aspect of pro-social behaviour is an important part of the definition because it excludes beneficial behaviour forced on person or actions that incidentally benefit another. Co-operations is also pro-social behaviour but it contributes to the attainment of mutual goals.

The term altruism was first published by Auguste Comte (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1967). The term egoism has frequently been used to explain altruism which is opposite to each other. Consequently, alter ego, means one’s second self, a friend, a representative.

**Concept of Altruism**

The word altruism has its origin in the Latin word’ alter’ meaning ‘others’. In order to define and understand altruism the significance of the term’ others’ should very clearly be understood

The human thought with respect to’ others’ may roughly be boxed in two categories. All pleasant thoughts in love category, and all unpleasant ones in hate category. What really happens when we are possessed by either of these two types of thoughts. If we love our inferiors, that is, persons who are lower in authority or social status. Our love manifests towards them in the form of
benevolence. When we love our equals, than it sprouts in the form of extending all possible help and wishing their well being. The manifestation of our love thoughts toward our superiors takes place in the form of reverence and in extreme cases it changes to worship. On the contrary our feelings of hate towards our inferiors are expressed in the form of scorn contempt or disdain. When we hate our equals, it results in anger, disrespect violence or an inflict injury. Our expressions of hate towards superiors is invariably in the form of fear. Thus the term ‘others’ includes all human beings who are our inferiors, equals or superiors to us whom, we can either love or hate. With respect to the concept of altruism this dividing line of ‘others is eliminated and the two categories merge together. The dictionary meaning of altruism states altruism as principle of living and acting for the interest of others. Thus’ for an altruistic there exists no category of human beings. Whom he hates for his or her ‘others’, are all human beings irrespective of cast, creed or nationality. An altruistic wishes well for every one and acts for the good of every one. For him there exist no preferences or likings among one another.

Researchers in social behaviour used the term altruism in a rather restricted way for a variety of reasons. For a behavioural scientist model altruistic are rare in existence. For him altruism is an example of extreme social behaviour and hard to handle. For a behavioural scientist even the study of altruism creates problems. However, biologists made a frequent use of altruism. From a biologist point of view altruism is a heroic phenomenon. Often self
destructive, directed towards the well beings of other (s) (Wispe 1978). While being unanimous on the focal point of welfare of others, both behavioural scientists and biologists differ in the concept of altruism it self. From a behavioural point of view, altruism is a generic term for other directed behavioural and there are many synonyms for such a behaviour pattern. From a biologist point of view altruism is an index of individual’s urge to do good to others even at the cost of self sacrifice. The self sacrifice may be extreme. Resulting in the self destruction or self annihilation or merely an inconvenience. In-spite-of the conceptual differences altruism is an individuals characteristic behaviour associated with wishing and doing good to others coupled with the preparedness for extreme self-sacrifice. Wispe (1978) identified altruism with positive social behaviour having the two other important principle forms: helping and sympathy.

Researches in the field of positive social behaviour have been in their initial stages in the recent past, may be because the behavioural scientists have only been concerned largely with antisocial behaviour. But the studies on positive social behaviour are getting momentum and are being rewarded.

An article on reciprocity norms by Gouldner (1960) was a classic one. Berkowitz (Berkowitz and Daniels.1963) established the legitimacy of investigating helping behaviour under laboratory conditions. Campbell (1965) courageously used the philosophical word ‘altruism’ in psychology. Aronfreed (1968) reported about sympathy in children and Latane and Darely’s (1970)
work on the unresponsive by stander captured the imagination of behavioural scientist.

Recently three developed certain factors which stimulate the interest in social scientists for the study of positive social behaviour. Political activism involving students and professors experimentation in communal living and resurgence in peace movements etc. are some to name. Voluntary performance of a pro-social act; intention to benefit others and having no personal motive in consideration while indulging in a prosocial act, are the three factors identified by Dennies Krebs (1970) by which conventional wisdom defines a prosocial act. According to Ervin Staub (1978).”... Pro-social behaviour refers to behaviour benefiting others. A pro-social behaviour may be judged altruistic if it appears to have intended to benefit others rather than to gain either material or social rewards.

The current violent trends in the society have led social scientist to pay their special attention to the study of pro-social behaviour leading to the new remedial theories for aggressive behaviour (Berkowitz, Buss. 1961: Dollrd, Miller, Doob, Mowrer and Sears, 1939). The degree of self-sacrifice and the extent of benefit to the recipient are the measures of a pro-social behaviour. Pro-social behaviour is extremely important at the individuals level. There may be a variety of reasons prompting an individual to act pro-socially such as the realization of urgency for help to other, his own instinct of heroism and his
persistent desire to share satisfaction with benefited, (Latane and Darely 1970, Hay and West, 1976).

The study of pro-social behaviour and morality has begun to demonstrate that there is a positive side of man. “All men have the mind which can not bear to see the suffering of others.” (Chan 1963).

Investigators in the field of study of ‘positive social behaviour’ have been using the term, ‘helping behaviour’ rather than ‘altruism’. Moreover social psychologist have not been able to draw a clear line to distinct one from the another. Even altruism has been perceived from two angles, objective altruism and subjective altruism.

Macauley and Berkowitz (1970) defined altruism in brief as :

“Altruism is behaviour carried out to benefit another without anticipation of external rewards.”

Bryan and Test (1967) view altruism as “those acts wherein individuals share or sacrifice a presumed positive reinforcer for no apparent social or material gain.

Similarly, Walster and Pillavin (1972) argued “Altruistic behaviour is generally thought of as behaviour that benefits another rather than the self as something that is done out of the goodness of one’s heart.”

Taylar, Peplau and Sears (1994) has defined altruism as :

“Any act that helps or is designed to help others, regardless of the helpers’ motives.”
Ervin Staub (1978) stated that:

“Pro-social behaviour refers to behaviour benefiting other. A pro-social act may be judged altruistic if it appears to have been intended to benefit other rather than to gain either material or social rewards.”

Amato (1990) described planned helping behavior as behaviour intentionally chosen in advance. Planned behavior provides the participants with time to reflect on the situation and respond in ways consistent with individuals preference. When helping behavior occurs with a stronger it is almost always spontaneous.

According to Aronfreed (1970), “only the help that come as a result of empathic reaction can be called as altruistic behaviour.”

Samaritron (1976) suggested that:

“An altruistic person is concerned and helpful even when no benefits are offered or expected to return.”

On the basis of all the definitions as mentioned above, we can summaries that altruistic behaviour is that:

1. It is motivated behaviour
2. It is voluntary behaviour
3. Its aim is to benefit others
4. It is carried out without expecting any reward in return.
5. It is unselfish concern.
Other psychologists have stand additional necessary conditions in defining altruism. For Aronfreed (1970) and Cohen (1972), empathy is an essential condition for altruistic behaviour. Only help that comes as a result of empathic reaction to another’s experience can be called altruistic. Leeds (1963) presented three conditions for altruistic behaviour.

1. It must be treated as an end in itself.
2. It must be elicited voluntarily, and
3. It must be judged by other as ‘doing good’.

**Theories of Altruism:**

Some of the theories and approaches to study the development of altruistic behaviour are:

- Social learning theory
- Cognitive development theory
- Biological theory
- Psychoanalytic theory
- Latane and Darely’s theory
- Empathy-Altruistic theory (unselfish helping)
- Normative theory
- Equity theory
- Promotive tension theory
- Cultural approach
- Social exchanges theory
• Justice theory
• Reciprocity theory
• Piliavin’s and Piliavin approach

**Social Learning Theory**

Social learning theorists generally have emphasized the acquisition and development of over responses. They maintain that most human behavior is learned, moulded, and shaped by environmental events, especially rewards, punishments, and modeling. Essentially, the processes and mechanisms of animals’ and humans acquisition of a wide variety of responses, including fears, social skills, aggression, and conformity, are also invoked to explain the development of moral standard and behaviour. Conscience, has been defined in learning theory terms as “conditioned anxiety responses to certain types of situations and action” established through the pairing of punishment or other aversive stimulations with disapproved responses. (Eysenck, 1960).

Social learning theory provides some principle of learning. Children learn altruism in through various form of learning like imitation, reinforcement. Children’s altruism develops by watching their parents, friends and teachers. In this theory, ‘moral character’ is defined as learning habits and virtues that are included by parents and teachers (Hartshorne & May, 1928). Mass media like T.V., media etc is effective source of altruism. Bandura and Walter argue that an observer who imitates the actions of a model will give a more or less complete
performance of the action on the very first try. Bandura emphasized this theory also rests heavily upon the principle of reinforcement. He believes that social behavior are first learned through the observation of models and these newly learned behavior are then either strengthened through positive reinforcement and weakened through the absence of reinforcement (or occasionally through negative reinforcement). If a child is rewarded by praise or attention for sharing possessions or for helping someone in distress, these responses will be strengthened (Gelfand, Hartmann, Cromer, Smith, & page, 1975; Grusec & Redler, 1980). But how reward can change the direction of the behavior. “The assumption is that most pro-social actions appear to be controlled by the individual rather than by extrinsic rewards. Controls were originally external (through the administration of rewards and punishments by an external agent), but that behavior became independent of these external sections, and the individual comes to administer his own rewards and experiences, children learn which responses bring parental praise, and they being to praise themselves for these reinforced actions. Rolter, (1954) suggest that reward and punishment are influential determinants of pro-social action.

Now two important concept that have been introduced in this theory are observational learning and cognitive regulators.

In observational learning, substantial proportions of the individual’s helping and sharing responses are acquired through observation and imitations of a models behavior, without direct reinforcements. In Bandura’s view,
observational learning involves four types of processes: attention, retention, motor production, and motivation. Thus individuals imitate only if they attend to a model, store in their minds what they have observed, are able to physically enact the observed behaviour, and are motivated to do so.

Cognitive activities guide and regulated the individual’s behaviour. In Bandura’s (1977, 1986) view, intentions and self evaluative processes play important roles in the self regulation of behaviour. Through the use of cognitive representations, individuals can anticipate the outcomes of behaviour and act in ways that are intended to bring about a desired state of affairs.

According to social cognitive theory, children acquire internal standards and rules by imitating models any by understanding socializers, explanations of moral behaviour. Moral development, including pro-social behaviour, is viewed as a product of the interaction between social forces and the individual’s changing cognitive capacities, According to Mischel & Mischel, (1976), moral behaviour are learned through processes such as conditioning and modeling morality develops through trial and error as well as though deliberate instruction, that certain actions are reinforced and other, punished.

**Cognitive Developmental Theory**

Each perceives the environment and organises stimuli, and behaves as an intelligent being. According to Piaget, intelligence, which includes all cognitive functions, serves the purpose of adaptation. Cognitive development means the
interaction between changing mental structures and environmental events. The
cognitive developmental models of Jean Piaget and his student Lawrence
Kohlberg’s propose that moral development proceeds through a series of stages
that reflect cognitive development.

According to Piaget three stages are necessary for the development of
children. First stage occurs between birth to six years of age when a child
develop a cognitive sense of other. During this stage, the child is morally
realistic, regarding duty as ‘self-subsistent and independent of the mind, or
imposing itself regardless of the circumstances in which the individual may find
himself.” (Piaget, 1932/1965), the moral judgment of the child, P.) At this stage
the thinking of children is characterised by belief in immanent justice and in the
absoluteness of the values held. The intermediate period in the development of
moral reasoning begins about the age of 7 or 8 years. At this age the child interacts
more extensively with peers and has more egalitarian, give and take relationships
with others. The most mature stage begins about 11 or 12 years of age. At this
stage the child develops the sense of other having their personal identity and
feeling. Equity dominates the child’s thinking about justice, extenuating
circumstances, motivations, and intentions weigh heavily in making moral
judgment.

According to Piaget, individual differences in progress are due to variation
in cognitive maturity, opportunities for peer cooperation and reciprocal role
taking and moral education. All factors changes in moral reasoning. Altruism almost depends on the moral reasoning.

Indeed, with increasing age, individual tend to view a prosocial act that reaps a social or material reward, that is coerced, that is based on reciprocity considerations, or that fulfills a social obligation as being less kind than acts performed voluntarily and without reward (Baldwin & Baldwin, 1970; Benson, Hartmann, & Gelfand, 1981; Cohen et al. 1981).

In Kohlberg’s theory, changes in moral reasoning result from basic changes in cognitive structures that is changes in way of thinking. According to him, children’s moral development advances through a sequences of six stages, ordered into three levels of moral orientation. It deals with changes that occur in middle childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. Like Piaget, Kohlberg asserted that progress from one moral stage to the next is the result of the interaction of the maturation of the organism and experience. The idea that maturity of moral judgment depends one’s level of cognitive development is central to its theory. The attainment of a particular stage of thinking and reasoning is considered a necessary. The empirical support for the notion that cognitive is significantly correlated with moral reasoning is impressive; cognitive development, as assessed by I.Q. (Kohlberg, 1969; Arbuthno, 1973; Harris et al, 1976; Kuhn, 1977) or performance on Piagetian logical tasks (Cauble, 1976 Kuhn et al, 1977) has been associated with level of moral judgement. Moreover, Kohlberg’s
hypothesis that role-taking opportunities contribute to the development of moral maturity (Moir, 1974; Ambron & Irwin., 1975; Kurdek, 1978).

Several studied have explored that there is a significant relationship between moral judgement and altruistic behaviour. Children and adolescents with mature moral judgement are likely to manifest more helping and generosity than are peers at lower level of moral reasoning (Underwood & Moore, 1982; Eisenberg, 1986). Empathic, other-oriented preschoolers and school age. Children are more likely to share or donate valuable objects to others than are children lower in nprosocial moral reasoning (Eisenberg, Shell, Pasternack, Lennon, Beller, & Mathy, 1987).

**Biological Theory**

Biological theory gained new prominence in the 1960’s and 1970’s. In the controversial discipline of sociology the idea was that genes account for human social behaviour and an attempt was made to explain altruism behaviour in evolutionary terms (Barash, 1971; Wilson, 1975;).

Biological view of altruism, imposed by Wilson, (1975.b 1978) and some other biologists invoke the concepts of Kinselection, a broadened view of natural selection. Through self-sacrificing actions, it is argued, that animal increases the probability that it’s close relatives, who shares its genes, will survive. Shared genes are preserved by the altruist’s sacrifice and these can then be transmitted. If the genes causing the altruism are shared by two organisms because of
common descent, and it the altruistic act by one organism increases the joint contribution of these genes to the next generation, the propensity to altruism will spread through the gene pool. This occurs even through the altruist makes less of a solitary contribution to the gene pool as the price of its altruistic act (Wilson, 1975). Among human twins aged 5 to 13 years, identical twins (who share all genes) have been observed to cooperate and help one another more then have fraternal twins (who share half their genes) (Segal, 1984). Studies of other species such as ant and aphids indicate that the greater the genetic similarity between two individuals, the more likely it is that one will act to provide help to the other (Ridley & Dawkins, 1981) This tendency, know as the ‘selfish gene’, acts to promote survival because when you helps other who are generically similar to yourself, those individuals are more likely to live and to reproduce, thus preserving and passing on genes like yours (Rushton, Russell & Wells, 1984.)

In many cases, many animals and people behave altruistically towards non-relatives. Female bluebirds occasionally provide foster parenting to nesting deserted by their mother (Hayes Felton, & Cohen, 1985) Sociobiologists use the concept of reciprocal altruism to explain this behaviour (Trivers, 1971). The fundamental idea is that the altruistic act entails danger to the altruists, but also may serve to evoke a reciprocal altruistic act by the beneficiary at some future time, that is the altruist may in the future be the target of the beneficiary’s altruistic acts.
Altruism increases the individual’s own fitness not that of the individual’s Kin. Altruistic persons have higher prestige and are better accepted by others than are altruistic persons, and therefore are more likely to survive and reproduce (Hill, 1984).

Cultural factors and learning may interact with genetic predisposition in a manner that produces a level of altruism that is adaptive in a given culture (Mac Donald, 1984).

There is no doubt that human have a biological potential for altruistic actions. Human altruism is often adaptive. Hoffman, (1981) Machean, (1982) suggest that it is the capacity for empathy that has evolved in human and is the basis for biologically based altruism. The capacity for empathy will be enhance through natural selection.

In recent work, Lumsden and Wilson have discussed a theory gene culture theory. They propose that genes prescribe a set of biological processes, that control the development of the brain. These processes are dependent on the individual’s cultural context, that is on the information derived from the individuals culture and physical environment. This theory suggests that genetic and cultural factor can not be totally differentiated; they are interdependent. Both influence the development of social behaviour, including prosocial action.

In reviewing the literature on altruism, Buck and Ginsburg (1991) conclude that there is no evidence of a gene that determines prosocial behaviour. Fiske, (1991), suggest that people are inherently sociable, and when people
interact in social relationships, “they are always prosocial usually helpful, and often altruistic.”

**Psychoanalytic Theory**

The Psychoanalytic theory emphasizes the invade tendency of human towards aggression and destruction but at the same time, maintains that the life and death instinct are inseparable. Both the life and death instincts are equally essential part of human nature. In psychoanalytic theory, human beings have the potential to use self knowledge toward betterment of their condition. The psychoanalytic concept of identification by which social value are taught to be internalized has been employed in the research on prosocial behaviour. Identification is considerable importance in the internalization as well as in the incorporation of parental and societal prohibitions. If parents are nurturing, generous and altruistic, their children may adopt these characteristics through identification. It’s all become often unconsciously. Identification results among things in a person limiting his aggressiveness toward those with whom he has identified himself and in his sparing them and giving them help (Freud S. 1921 – 1953) Freud hypothesized. That the process of identification resulted in the development of ego which (Lewis 1971) describes as comprising of both a ‘sense of guild’ and ‘ego ideal’. The child may acquire prosocial behaviour either through feelings of guild inflicted by the conscious of moral transgression. Guild,
self-destruction, sexual strivings, and conflicts about homosexuality are fundamental forces of generosity and altruism (Feniche, 1945; Glover, 1968;).

Freud acknowledged the role other more positive impulses in the development of altruism. Individual development seems to us a product of the interplay of two trends, the striving for happiness, generally called ‘egoistic’, and the impulse towards merging with other in the community, which we call ‘altruistic’. (Freud, 1930/1953). Empathy role-taking guild and development of altruistic motives (Hoffman, 1970) or through the internalization of ego ideals that develop in autonomous value system (Watff, 1978).

Flugel, 1945; & Breger, 1973; have stressed the dominant role of ego processes rather than instincts, in the development of personality and morality. They regard identification and moral development and adulthood “The acquisition of conscience and moral standard is, thus a part of the more general process of self or ego development a process characterized by the creative stage-wise, transformation of self through the internalizations of new roles.

Although parents may contribute the primary content of the child’s ego ideal, subsequent identifications with ‘significant others’ also are seen as influential (Settlage, 1972). Many changes in moral orientations, values and attitudes accompany the maturation of ego structure (Flugel, 1945).
Latane and Darley’s Theory (Decision Making Model)

Latane and Darley (1970) carried out humorous experiments. They formulated a theoretical model and described a helping response as the end point of a series of five cognitive decision. Help is provided only if the appropriate decision is made at each step.

1. The first decision is whether to shit one’s attention from whatever one is doing to the unexpected emergency-to notice that something is wrong.

2. The second step is to interpret the situation correctly what is going on? He must decide whether the event is an emergency or not. Often there is some degree of ambiguity in emergency situation, So potential helpers hold back and wait for additional information in order to be sure about the situation. The more ambiguous your the situation, the less likely people are to offer help (Bickman, 1972).

3. At the third decision point in the model the bystander either does or does not assume responsibility to act if he has noticed event as an emergency. You are not likely to do anything about it unless your decide that it’s your responsibility to help. Schwartz and Gottlies, (1980) arranged for participants to witness and ‘emergency’ either alone or with a second person. As in many other studies, helping behaviour was less likely to occur when these where tow bystanders then where these was one. Of those who were along, 80% said that they felt personally responsible for
offering help, only 17% of those who had a fellow bystander mentioned any feeling of responsibility.

4. Once a bystander assumes responsibility, there is a fourth decision point. How can the victim be helped? In an emergency situation, it seldom makes sense to take time to consult with others about what to do. In some emergencies, almost anyone is able to provide the necessary aid. Other emergencies call for special skills, and useful help can be provided only by those who have the required training.

5. The final decision in the model is whether or not to act. He must decide how to implement the decision to help. If the bystanders are able to communicate about what is going on and what to do about it. For this reason, prosocial behaviour is less inhibited by the bystander effect. If the bystander are acquainted than if they are stranger (Rutkowski & Gruder, 1983).

Out of the Latane and Darley work, a whole line of research has emerged which has focused on conditions.

Piliavin, Davidio, Gaertner and Clark 1981, also dealing with emergency situations, suggested that observation of this situation elicits a state of physiological arousal in the bystander. Helping behaviour may reduce this oversize arousal, but an individual decides to the help depends on the calculation of costs and rewards involved in helping and not helping.

Schwartz and Howard, (1981) presented a five step sequential model which involves: (a) the perception of someone in need as well as identification of
potential helpful actions and recognition of one’s own ability to engage in these action. (b) generation of feelings of moral obligation. (c) assessment of the cost and benefits of potential actions. (d) evaluation and reassessment. Of potential responses and (e) selection of an action. In general, the modal illustrates the specific steps which occur in the decision making process by taking into account the effect of the specific situational conditions and personal variables that influence the perception, interpretation, and defensive redefinition of a situation that calls for helping responses.

Staub, (1978) proposed a model which specifies the manner in which situational and personality factors jointly affect helping behaviour. According to Staub, helping behaviour occurs as a function of personal goals (motives), however, the activation of the behaviour depends on the importance of the goal relative to other goals and on the characteristics of the situation.

**Empathy – Altruistic Theory (Unselfish Helping)**

Some writer’s (Chandler & greens pan, 1972 Borke, 1971, 1973, Buckley, Siegel & Ness, 1979;) defines empathy as the cognitive ability to recognize and understand the thoughts feelings, or intentions of another individual.

Alternatively, other writers (Staub, 1978, Iannotti, 1979; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1991) defines empathy as responding to another person’s emotional state with a vicarious emotional reaction that resembles what the other person is experiencing.
An individual experiences distress in response to the distress for others. This appears to be an evolutionarily useful response, and it has been observed in monkeys and apes (Brother, 1990) and in some children as young as twelve month of age (Ungerer et al. 1990). This is found in those whose parents had been more affectionate with them and had discussed their own and other individuals feelings to a greater extent. Zahn, Waxter, (1990) found if we have grown up in a supportive family, such reactions are encouraged.

The empathy-altruism hypothesis, proposed by Batson and his colleagues (1981), suggest that at least some prosocial behaviour is motivated solely by the desire to help the recipient (Batson & Oleson, 1991), Empathy includes feeling sympathetic and compassionate towards the victim (Betancourt, 1990). The individual who expresses sympathy or empathic concern very much wants to have control over emergency situation and to be able to provide help (Smith, 1992).
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When a person perceives an emergency in which help is needed, empathy is aroused, and then helping occurs. If empathy is not aroused helping will not occur.

**Normative Theory**

The normative approach attempts to explain altruistic behaviour as being dictated by societal norms. The term “norms is typically used to refer to a set of expectations member of a group hold concerning how one ought to behave. (Thibaul, 1959; Homans, 1961;) Many norms are stable in a society because these sets of expected behaviour are passed from generation to generation as a part of the culture. Thibaul and Hilley suggest that norm replace interpersonal influence in the control of individuals behaviour. Norms are usually regarded as rules of behaviour and generally individuals consider that one should conform to norms. On important reason for conformity is the concern about reactions of the other individuals. Another reason why people behave according to prescribed norms is that norms help them in defining reality and reduce uncertainly (Jones, 1967).

In an ambiguous or confused situation, people tend to rely on norms that prescribed how to read rather than evaluating in the particular situation. Finally on the basis of Heider’s (1985) assumption people have a need for predictability, the conformity to norms can be seen as arising from the willingness and desire to line in a world in which the behaviour is regulated by rules. In such a world a
person knows what is expected from him in order to behave in a socially acceptable manner.

Several theorists (Berkowitz, 1972; Staub, 1972) suggests that altruistic behaviour is also guided by prescriptions of social norms. Specifically, it has been proposed that altruism is regulated by tow social norms; the norms of social responsibility and the norms of reciprocity.

Berkowitz and Daniels; (1993), Berkowitz and Friedmar; 1967, suggested the existence of a social responsibility norm which prescribes that on individual should help those who depend an him and need his assistance thus and individual who learns that somebody is dependent on his help feels an anticipation to aid that person, even through he can anticipate on direct return benefits. At time people act to help others, not for material gain but simply to do what is right.

Normative explanation fall into circular reasoning technology, that is it is always possible to say that the behaviour was guided by norms if a person behaves according to the norms. At the same time it is said that the norm was not activated in the particular situation.

In response to this criticism it was suggested that altruistic behaviour is guided to the large extent by personal norms as the individual self expectation which are derived from socially shared norms. These norms are product of the interaction between expectations of societal norms and personal experiences in the socialization process.
Studies have conformed that individuals who are aware of the consequences of their acts and who feel personal responsibilities to carry out altruistic acts tend be more altruistic.

The theory considers, that situations are important determinants of altruistic behaviour and individuals differ in the degree in which they internalize norms.

**Equity Theory**

The equity theory is proposed by Adam’s (1965). It is similar to the nation of distributive justice Adams postulated that in human interactions between individuals are for the exchange of input for outcomes, it’s means that we seek to maintain a balance between what we give and what we receive and what other give and what they receive. Adams’ (1965) and Walster (1973) points out that in society, individuals have learned to meet standard i.e. equitable and just to other member in the society.

The equity norm takes into account the inputs of the person to the groups efforts to accumulate resources and the outputs in term of rewards distributed to them. Groups might assess the value of inputs in different ways but could give credit for contributed, resources effect, time seniority and amount of responsibility. According to Walster et al. the reason for equalizing of rewards is that the group can maximize collective rewards by evolving a system for apportioning rewards and costs equitably among themselves a relationship is
equitable when the positive outcomes (rewards) and negative outcomes (costs) for each individual are equal.

In some experiments, individual have spontaneously shard an overabundance of rewards, and deprived partners have been quick to demand their fair share (Leventhal, Allen, and Kemelgor, 1969; Maxwell, Retcliffe 1969). In addition, individuals who receive more than their fair share experience distress usually quilt (Adams and Rosenbaum, 1962; Adams, (1963) and those who receive less then their fair share are also distressed usually angered (Jacques, 1961); Leventhat, et al. 1969; Walster, 1970:)

Individuals in an inequitable relationship attempt to eliminate the distress that occurs because of the inequity by restoring equity. The more inequity that exist a the more distress they feel (Brock and Becker, 1966; Carlsmith and Gross, 1969) and the hander they seek to restore equity (Brock and Buss, 1962).

**Promotive Tension Theory**

Lewin has given the concept of tension theory. Hornstein (1978) presented the Lewinian analysis of Prosocial behavior and made use of Lewin’s concept of tension. Lewin has suggested the three different basic categories of tension.

1. Tension arising from one’s own need, such as desire to see movie or have sexual intercourse.
2. Tension arising induced need.
3. Tension arising from the need to satisfy interpersonal demands.

Hornstein (1972, 1976) adds a fourth category that is called “Promotive tension” which he defines as tension coordinated to another’s needs goals. This form of tension is reduced by engaging oneself in altruistic acts. Further, this addition of the fourth category has been justified by presenting evidence for the phenomenon and pointing out the circumstances when such tension arise. Cooperative social condition as compared to competitive or individualistic ones, provide a basis for the arousal of promotive tension. In general there are three different conditions which seen to be basic for the formation of promotive social relationship:

a. ... those in which social structure crates promotive interdependence among individual goals.

b. ... relationship in which individuals share common membership in the social category, and

c. ... relationship in which individuals are linked only by opinion similarity and interpersonal attraction.

Out of these conditions the second and third are marked by an absence of primitive interdependence among individual goals. The linked facts, similar beliefs and attitudes and absence of negative sentiments promote the formation of ‘we bonds’ that in turn facilitates helping behaviour. Thus promotive tension theory indicates the predispositions of helping concentrates or factors involved in the outset of helping behaviour. In short tension theory investigates the
phenomenology of certain characteristics that initiate the helping relationship. It is with mentioning that once begun this helping relationship is less concerned with the outcomes of the relationship.

**Cultural Approach**

The cultural approach attempts to explain altruism on a societal level, looking for the cultural condition of altruistic behaviour. One explanation of altruistic behaviour based on biological and social evolution was proposed by Campbell (1965). He first pointed out that an external threat to the existence of any society or groups increases both individuals, hostility towards the threatening outgroup and individual’s solidarity within the group. The solidarity among the members of the group is exhibited through loyalty cooperation and altruistic behaviour. Individuals are even ready to sacrifice their lives for the group cause in the situations of external threat. Campbell suggested that these reactions have had survival value in the history of human societies or groups. Group and societies that were able to increase ethnocentric self sacrificial loyalty have had better chances to survive than the group who were not able to command such loyalty. Campbell further suggested that ‘In a long history in which groups and individuals have varied widely and in which only some have survived, the surviving groups will to have those social customs and genes which have furthered survival in intergroup conflict.’” Thus, Campbell premised that the
disposition for ethnocentric and altruistic behaviour has become in born as a result of biological as socio-cultural evolution.

In a recent paper, Campbell (1972) modified his original position proposing that ‘self-sacrificial dispositions, including especially the willingness to risk death in warfare, are in man a product of a social indoctrination, which is counter to rather than supported by genetically transmitted behavioral disposition.” Campbell’s modified theory suggests that altruistic behavior can not be genetic because inherent in the altruistic behavioural pattern in the very real possibility that the altruistic will not survive over the selfish person. In man genetic competition and selfishness produce the possibility of evolving genetic altruism. Man can achieve altruistic behaviour only through social-cultural evolution, which is carried out through cultural indoctrination.

A very similar view was expressed by Cohen (1972) who agrees with Campbell (1972) that man operates by guidance of self-cultural reality in which individuals find themselves. Thus according to Cohen, “the development of altruism depends on the extent to which individuals acquire feelings of empathy, they can acquire such feeling in social and cultural setting that reward this type of feelings. Cohen (1972) argues that the intensity of empathy varies across social groups. The reason for the differences are the differential family structure and interfamly relation in different societies.

Empathy can develop only in nuclear families that have durable and stable relationship and share the household responsibilities with other adults. Cohen’s
analysis suggests that altruism can be learned but its learning can originate only in cultures with certain social structures, and therefore emotional components of altruism as psychological attributes of individuals are also widespread across cultures.

We can say that both Campbell and Cohen suggest that altruism is developed in human groups as results of certain cultural conditions. Human beings are innately motivated to pursue their own self-interest, but the culture can socialize them to be altruistic. The developmental approach has maintained that altruism is acquired through the process of social learning and that individuals differ in their altruistic behaviour. The cultural approach has argued in favour of the social evolution of altruism.

**Social-Exchange Theory**

The concept of social exchange is implied in the norm of reciprocity. One of the earliest and most detailed treatments of this concept is found in George Homan’s (1958, 1979) work. Humans has adopted the view that all social interaction constitutes an exchange of goods which can be material or nonmaterial.

Homan’s argues that the probability of the occurrence of a given action is dependent upon the extent to which that action has been rewarded in the past; thus we are more likely to enter into exchange with people with whom past exchange has proved rewarding. Similarly the more rewarding a past exchange
has been the more. We are willing to give up to establish such an exchange again.

According to Thibaut & Kelley, 1959, Blau, 1964; an individual’s behaviour is guided by the principle of maximizing rewards minimizing costs in order to obtain the most profitable outcomes in any human interaction.

Exchange theory considers altruism as behaviour instrumental in receiving future rewards. Social exchange involves that one who does a favour for another expects future return (Gouldner 1960; Blau, 1964) Gouldner (1960) even suggested that is a norm of reciprocity which ‘obliges’ the one who has first received a benefit to repay it some time; it thus provides some realistic grounds for the confidence, in one who first with the valuable, that he will be repaid.

The social approval, gratitude, personal obligation are also important ‘goods’ of social interaction. Thus according to the social exchange approach altruistic acts may be carried out with expectations of social rewards. Blau (1964) suggested that these expectations are important causes for altruistic behaviour. Satisfaction of one’s values can be important reward (Homans). So as long as man’s values are altruistic, he can take profit in altruism too. Doing to another person may be a pay off by itself. Similarly, on rare occasions an individual will help another in need even without expecting any form of gratitude from the recipient (Blau, 1964). An individual may also give away money because his conscience demands that he should help the under privilege and
without expecting any from of gratitude from them. Such an act is an exchange of help for internal approval.

Generally, exchange theorists consider altruism an exceptional, rare behavior. The exchanges approach maintains that individuals in most situations help others because they expect material of social rewards. Such help is not considered altruistic, according to the definition of altruistic behaviour. Exchange theory recognizes that on rare occasions individual can help other without expecting external rewards. In these situation the exchanges theorists argue, individuals reward themselves for the carried out help, the definition of altruism recognizes the possibility of self-rewarding as a result of helping or doing favours. Thus according to exchange theory altruistic acts are possible but they occur very infrequently.

**Justice Theory**

Homans (1961) introduced the principle of Justice. He considers important in assessing reward-cost out come. This theory tells us that individuals who are in exchange relations compare their profits from the exchanges by subtracting costs (e.g., satisfaction, pride, money) in relation to their investments. The investments are the relevant characteristics. When the compared proportionality between profits and investments does not occur from social exchanges, the rule of distributive justice is violated.
The donor who helps and the recipient who receives the help are considered to be in an exchange relation. In this exchange a donor incurs some cost and the recipient receives some rewards. The comparison of profit between the donor and the recipient indicates that the distributive justice failed. Schematically, the comparison appear as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Recipient’s rewards-cost (profits)} & \quad \text{or} \quad \text{Donor’s rewards-costs (Profits)} \\
\text{Recipient’s investments} & \quad \text{Donor’s investment}
\end{align*}
\]

The recipient according to homans, who has a more favourable ratio of profits to investments than the donor, feels and obligation to repay the donor. Such an obligation derive from feelings of guilt, which are proportional to the extant of the advantage.

**Reciprocity Theory**

This theory is formulated by Gouldner (1960). Gouldner states that you should help those who help you, has the specific function of encouraging people to initiate positive exchanges with other. It acts as a ‘starting mechanism’ for social exchange, providing the initiator with an assurance that anything offered will be reciprocated and not simply exploited by other’s Positive social exchange can provide the basis for friendship and alliances and can allow conciliatory action to break a cycle of conflict. It would be difficult to imagine an orderly society without a norm of reciprocity. Indeed cross-cultural research has led to the conclusion that the norm of reciprocity is a universal rule of behaviour (Gouldner, 1960, Mauss, 1967).
It should be noted that the concept of reciprocity is not designed to explain altruism directly; if focus on why recipients of altruism should feel obligated to repay altruistic helper. However, the concept can also be generalized from direct reciprocity to more universal reciprocity.

The obligation to reciprocated varies as a function of the perceived motives, resources, and cost of the donor. Whether the benefit was expected by the recipient also adds to the obligation. A person feels little sense of obligation if a fifth is given reluctantly. Research has shown that subject are more apt to reciprocate benefits when the benefits are given voluntarily rather than when they are a requirement of experimental procedures (Gorason and Berkowitz, 1966, Schopten and Tompson, 1968, Nemeth, 1970, Greenberg and Shapiro, 1971).

In laboratory situation it is typically found that subjects provide help to others in proportion to the amount of benefits they receive (Wilke & Lanzetta, 1970). This is Probably because the costs incurred in providing benefits are the same for donors and recipients. When costs were mainipulated, gratitude was related to both the value of benefit received and the costs incurred by the benefactor (Muir and Weinstein, 1962, Tesser, Gatewood and Drives, 1968).

Indebtedness theory attempt to analyses the process underlying reciprocity. The concept of the norm reciprocity in term of a psychological state of indebtedness (Greenberg, 1968). Indebtedness is an unpleasant arousal state
characterized by alertness to cues relevant to the reduction of an obligation. This state may be viewed as a special case of cognitive dissonance (Greenberg, 1968).

Empirical support for the conceptualization of an state of indebtedness was found in the number of studies Greenberg and Shapiro (1971) found that a person was more willing to ask for needed help, and thus become indebted, when he anticipated being able to return the favour than when he did not. In this study, the subject was led to believe that the purpose of this experiment was to investigate a performance of physically disabled workers. Another postulate of indebtedness that has been investigated is the recipient’s motivation to reduce the magnitude of indebtedness.

In short, the recipient feels an obligation to reciprocate. At this point there is need for further research. Most research in this field, has limited to the laboratory. To generalize the findings, the researches should carry out field experiments.

**Piliavin’s and Piliavin Approach**

Piliavin and Piliavin Model (1972), assumes that observation of an emergency situation elicits a state of psychological arousal in the bystander. The feeling of arousal is the first phase in the bystander’s reactions to an emergency situation and the degree of arousal. He experiences depends on a number of variables –
1. Perceived severity of the emergency situation. The greater the severity, the higher the arousal.

2. Physical distance from the emergency: the closer the bystander is to the emergency, higher the arousal.

3. Feeling of Empathy: If the bystander feels empathy as a result of perceived similarity to the victim or emotional attachment to the victim. Then he will experience a high level arousal.

4. Length of emergency: The longer the emergency lasts without any help, higher the arousal.

The proposed model analyses the decision-making process of the bystander who has to decide whether or not to intervene in the emergency. It is assumed that the observation of an emergency situation elicits a state of the psychologist arousal in the bystander. The only direct evidence for this assumption comes from the study by Lazarus (1968).

A new paradigm for research in social psychology has also been suggested (M.C. Guire 1973). Some of the suggestions could be utilized in studying helping behaviour in emergency would be to collect data about events that have occurred in the past.

**Handicapped Children**

In a democratic country like ours every child has the right to education, the right to receive help in learning to the limits of his capacity, whether that
capacity be small or great. It is consistent with a democratic philosophy that all children be given equal opportunity to learn whether they are average. Bright, dull, retarded, blind, deaf, crippled, delinquent, emotionally disturbed or otherwise limited or deviant in their capacities to learn. Equality of opportunity denotes two things equality of access to school education and equality of success in school. The teacher cannot understand the special needs of such children. In fact, our failure to understand the special needs of such children have been major factors for our failure to reach the target of universalization of elementary education within the stipulated period. These children with special needs are called exceptional.

Physical handicapping is a type of exceptional children. Before knowing the meaning, nature and type of physical handicapping, it is necessary to understand the difference between the concepts of handicap, disability and impairment.

**Concept of Handicap, Disability and Impairment**

In the field of special education the three terms impairment, disability and handicap are very often used interchangeably. Thus we can across expressions like hearing impairment, hearing disability, and hearing handicap to refer to hearing loss. These three terms actually mean different things.

An impairment is a permanent or transitory, psychological, or anatomical loss and/or abnormality. This may be so from birth or acquired later. For
example, a hole in the ear drum, a missing or defective part of the body, paralysis after polio, myopia, low level of intelligence, etc.

Impairment may cause functional limitations. Functional limitation means partial or total inability to perform those activities necessary for motor, sensory or mental functions within the range and manner of which a human being is normally capable such as walking, lifting loads, seeing, speaking, hearing, reading, writing, taking interest in and making contact with surroundings. A functional limitation may last for a short time, be permanent or reversible. Limitations may be progressive or regressive.

Impairment leads to disability. Disability is defined as an existing difficulty in performing one or more activities which are generally accepted as essential components of daily living. Due to the impairment there is a reduction in functional ability. For example, due to the hole in the ear drum, the child is unable to hear normally. A visually impaired child cannot see properly because of faulty image formation. An orthopaedically handicapped child cannot use the arms and fingers for gripping. A learning disabled child cannot calculate or understand number relationship like a normal child. Depending in part on the duration of the functional limitation disability may be short term, long term, or permanent.
Medically, disability is physical impairment and inability to perform physical functions normally. Legally, disability is a permanent injury to body for which the person should or should not be compensated. Disability can be divided into three period:

1. Temporary total disability,
2. Temporary partial disability and
3. Permanent disability

Temporary total disability is that period in which the affected person is totally unable to work. During this time he may receive orthopedic, optamological, auditory or speech or any other medical treatment. Temporary partial disability is that period when recovery has reached the stage of improvement so that the person may begin some kind of gainful occupation.

Permanent disability refers to permanent damage to or loss of some part of the body even after any medical treatment.

Just as impairment leads to disability, disability handicaps the individuals. Handicap means a restriction imposed/acquired by the child’s disability which affect the efficiency of his/her day-to-day life activities. The term handicap refers to the problems a person with a disability or impairment encounters in interaction with the environment. A disability may pose a problem in one environment but not in another. The child with an artificial limb may be handicapped when competing against non-disabled peers in a football match but experiences no handicap in the classroom. Thus, a disabled person is not
handicapped, however, unless the physical disability lead to educational, personal, social vocational or other problems. The handicapping effects of a disability can be reduced by corrective services like hearing aids, artificial limbs, medical interventions, etc. The difference between these three terms can be summarised as follows; impairment is structural, disability is functional and handicap is social psychological.

An impairment is defined as a loss of or damage to sensory organs. This may be so from birth, or acquired later. The impairment disturbs the normal functioning of the organ in its respective area. For example, a child with a hole in the ear due to congenital deafness cannot hear properly because of the disturbance in the sound transmission. Similarly, due to visual problems, there is improper formation of images and the child has difficulty in reading.

An orthopedic impairment also refers to the loss of an organ, or abnormality in any part of the organ or body which interferes with its normal functioning. For example, missing fingers or a polio infected arm. Such a child loses the grip of the fingers or the use of arm, for manipulation of objects in his/her learning environment. A child with a mental impairment is unable to learn things as quickly as other can. Difference between these three terms is summarised in following table 1.1:
Table – 1.1
Different between Impairment, Disability, Handicapped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Type of Disability</th>
<th>Impairment</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Handicapped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>Damage in the care mechanism (e.g. hole in eardrum)</td>
<td>Difficulty in transmission of sound</td>
<td>Unable to hear normally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
<td>Detachment of easy muscles (e.g. squint / cross eyed)</td>
<td>Difficulty in focussing the eyes on a particular image</td>
<td>Unable to from single image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Orthopedic Impairment</td>
<td>Paralysis in area</td>
<td>difficulty in using arm for grasping and manipulating</td>
<td>Unable to use the arem like others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Mental Impairment</td>
<td>Deficiency in mental ability</td>
<td>Difficulty inoing things like others</td>
<td>Unable to behave like others, Difficulty in understanding abstract concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Learning disability</td>
<td>Dysfutioning of specific brain faculty (for example motor area)</td>
<td>Difficulty in writing only. Can speak and read normally</td>
<td>Unable to read and write like others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meaning and Types of Physically Handicapped

Three reasons are pertinent for which the term “physically handicapped” has been defined in various ways:

1. There is no clear-cut demarkation between the “ablebodied” and the “handicapped”.
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2. The term “physically handicapped”, “disabled”, and “crippled” are used in an identical sense.

3. Definitions of physically handicapped cited for various purpose and as such they have been based on various criteria.

However, taking the dictionary meaning of the term, it can be said that a physically handicapped person possessing a physical defect which reduces one’s efficiency in performing one’s personal and social obligations according to a socially determined standard.

The ICIDH defines, “Handicap as a disadvantage for an individual resulting from an impairment or a disability, that limits or prevents fulfilment of a role, that is normal (depending on age, sex, and socio-cultural factors) for the individual (cited in Harris, 1995).

According to Sharma (2009) “An individual who is affected with physical impairment that, in any way, limits or inhibits his participation in normal activities may be referred to a physically handicapped.”

Taking this seriously into consideration, the handicapped person may have many problems of adjustment. It must always be remembered that a physically handicapped person is not necessarily mentally deficient. The physically handicapped persons are generally divides as:

1. The visually handicapped or blind
2. Acoustically or hearing handicapped or deaf.
3. Speech and language handicapped or mute.
4. Orthopaedically handicapped or crippled.

1. The visually handicapped or blind:

The visually handicapped children are those who have problems with vision. The person whose visual acuity is less than 6/60 after glass correction may be termed as visually impaired. But this terms does not include with normal or near normal vision. This term rather refers to those people whose visual acuity is so defective that they can not perform their routine life activity independently either in the school, in the society or at home. For the purpose of convenience, we can classify visually improved children into four categories:

(a) **Profoundly impaired** – They are totally blind people having zero acuity in both eyes.

(b) **Severely impaired** – They are partially blind people whose visual acuity in the better eye is less than 6/60 after maximum correction

(c) **Moderately impaired** – They have visual acuity in between 6/24 – 6/60. They can do each and every thing if proper help is given to them, and

(d) **Mildly impaired** – Such people have a little less than normal acuity, i.e. 6/9 – 6/12

2. Acoustically or hearing impairment or deaf:

According to **Hallahan** and **Kauffman** (1991), “Children who cannot hear sounds at or above a certain intensity (loudness) level are classified as deaf, others with a hearing loss are considered hard of hearing”. Conference of
Executives of American Schools for Deaf (1974) defined hearing handicapped in terms of threshold and in terms of their educational adoptability.

The hard hearing children are those who have learning loss but who can hear if spoken too loudly without a hearing aid. A hearing aid will enable them to hear better. For such children educations in general schools in common will other children is not difficult.

The deaf are those who cannot hear even if spoken to very loudly. The require preparation in basic skills through special techniques before they are admitted in general schools. Hearing aids help them to become more functional.

3. Speech and Language Handicapped or Mute:

Speech handicap refer to minor and major speech and language problems. There are children with mild language and speech disorders in our classrooms, and they often go unnoticed. While speaking and writing they tend to omit, distort, add or substitute words, phrases, letters of the alphabet etc. They stammer and are quite or have long gaps in speaking full sentences. Their problems should be corrected before they start school. The major type of speech disorder are:

(a) Voice disorder
(b) Articulation or pronunciation disorder, and
(c) Fluency disorders

Language is the basis of learning and communication, hence, any disorder in speech and language becomes a barrier in communication, eventually creating a handicap, reversible of course through education, training and therapy.
4. Orthopaedically handicapped or crippled:

Orthopedic disabilities are known as locomotion disabilities or physical disabilities and health impairments. The term orthopedic is related to a physical deformity or disability of the skeletal system and associated motor function (Deutch, Smith and Luckasson, 1992).

Some children have orthopedic handicap or locomotor handicap. Locomotor handicap refers to problems with functioning of bones, joints, and muscles. In some cases the problems are so severe that they require artificial limbs to compensate their crippling conditions. In other cases they need wheel chair or crutches. They need removal of architectural barriers and some environmental modifications in the schools. Usually mildly orthopaedically handicapped children do not have learning problems. They can be integrated in the regular school without much difficulty.

All the physically handicapped children have certain basic problems and need. These problems and needs may be personal, social, educational or psychological. The needs and problems of physically handicapped children are similar to and at the same time different from those for normal children. The needs and problems of handicapped children also very depending upon the direction and degree of their deviation from normal children and their type of handicapping. For example, the needs and problems of mildly and moderately handicapped children are different from those of severely handicapped children.
Similarly, the needs and problems of visually handicapped children are different from hearing impaired children.

Needless to mention that physical handicapping as dependent variable is affected by a number of environmental, chromosomal, hereditary or biological, and medical factors. As independent variable, it can also affects the personality, intelligence, education, social adjustment, psychological set-up and behaviours of the person. In this connection, the role of physical handicapping in altruistic behaviour of the individual cannot be under-rated. The present study is a modest attempt in this direction.

Statement of the Problem

“A Comparative Study of Normal and Physically Handicapped School-going Students in Relation to Altruistic Behaviour.”

VARIABLES:

Independent Variable:

Gender: Two levels of gender are taken i.e. boys and girls.

Socio-Economic Status: Three levels of socio-economic status are taken, i.e. (a) upper class (b) middle class and (c) lower class.

Dependent Variable:

Dependent variable in the present study is altruism, which is measured by an altruism scale.
Objectives of the study

The aim of the present study is to find out the difference between physically normal and physically handicapped students on altruistic behaviour. In this connection, the study is planned to achieve the following objectives:

1. To study the altruistic behaviour of the physically handicapped and physically normal students.
2. To study the effect of socio-economic status on altruistic behaviour of the physically handicapped and physically normal students.
3. To study the effect of gender on altruistic behaviour of physically handicapped and physically normal students.

Hypotheses of the study

“A hypothesis is a proposition about factual and conceptual elements and their relationships that projects beyond known facts and experience for the purpose of further understanding”. It is a conjecture or best guess which involves a condition that has not yet been demonstrated in fact but it merits exploration. It may be formed as a potential solution to a problem, or as an explanation of some unknown fact. It may describe an elements or a relationship which it found true, would, by logical inference offer support to some explanation or theory.
“There is no genuine progress in scientific insight through the Baconian method of accumulating empirical facts without hypothesis or anticipation of nature without some guiding idea we do not know what facts together. Without something to prove, we cannot determine what is relevant and what is irrelevant” M.Cohen.

Hypothesis formation is an important step in a research. In this research three types of null hypothesis are formulated.

**Hypothesis Related to Physically Handicapped Students (Experimental Group).**

- There exists no significant difference in the altruistic behaviour of the physically handicapped male and female school students.
- There exists no significant difference in the altruistic behaviour of the physically handicapped school student of different socio-economic status.
- There exists no significant interaction effect of gender and socio-economic status of the physically handicapped school students on their altruistic behaviour.
Hypothesis Related to Physically Normal Students

(Control Group)

- There exist no significant difference in the altruistic behaviour of physically normal male and female school students.
- There exist no significant difference in the altruistic behaviour of physically normal school students of different socio-economic status.
- There exists no significant interaction effect of gender and socio-economic status of the physically normal school students on their altruistic behaviour.

Hypothesis Related to Physically Handicapped and Physically Normal Students:

- There exists no significant difference between altruistic behaviour of physically handicapped and physically normal school students.
- There exists no significant difference between physically handicapped and physically normal school student in their altruistic behaviour in relation to gender.
- There exists no significant difference between altruistic behaviour in relation to socio-economic status. Physically handicapped and physically normal school students.
Population

The population of this study was comprised of school students of IX to XII class of U.P. Board and C.B.S.E Board. In the study two types of sub population were involved, one coming from physically normal, another coming from physically handicapped students.

Sample

Purposive sampling method is used for drawing sample from both sub populations. For the physically normal students, physically handicapped sample will be taken from the secondary and senior secondary school of U.P. Board and C.B.S.E.. The SES scale is administered to both the sample and on the basis of their SES scores, 300 students from each sample were selected. The sample were selected so that the upper class, middle class, and lower class will be 100 students each and further, these will be classified on the basis of gender, i.e. 150 male and 150 female subject from each sub-population.

Tools and Techniques

The following standardized tools were used in the present study.

1. Altruism scale (ALT) by Dr. S.N. Rai and Sanwat Singh is used.

2. Socio-economic status scale (SESS) Rajbir Singh, Radhey Shyam and Satish Kumar is used.
Research Methodology:

“A scientific investigation is based on a research problem. It attempts to find the relationship between independent and dependent variable. Methodology is the plant structure and strategy of investigations to answer research problem validity, objectively, accurately and economically, this is done through setting up the frame work of adequate tests of the relation among variables (Kerlinger, 1991).”

The present study will be divided into two groups, one groups is experimental (Physically Handicapped Students), other groups is control (Physically Normal Students).