

Development of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire: A Short Version

Vineetha V.^{1*}, Prof. A. Velayudhan²

ABSTRACT

In the present study a short version tool of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire (43 items) was developed. In order to make shorter version, the original tool (Altruistic Personality Questionnaire) was administered to 387 participants (n=43). First items analysis was carried out and tool was reduced to 27 items. In order to check the factor structure, exploratory factor analysis was carried out and three factors emerged out. For establishing the psychometric properties of the test, simple sample size of 43, Males (N=13, M=88.30 Age = 25-40 SD =15.60) AND FEMALES = 30 M= 96.60 Age =25-40 SD =15.13) of different age groups were collected from DIPR AND DIPAS. The internal consistency reliability (0.869) was found to be high. To establish the concurrent and construct validity, it was correlated with the Adult prosocialness Scale (.390) Self Altruistic Scale (.334) Empathy Scale (.172) and interpersonal Reactivity Index Scale (.413). In this study analyzed there is significant difference between male and female in prosocial behavior.

Keywords: *Altruistic Personality Questionnaire*

In the present study a short version tool of altruistic personality questionnaire (43 items) was developed. In order to make short version, the original tool (altruistic personality questionnaire [(total items 80] Rushton 1981) was administered to 387 participants (n= 43). The altruistic personality is defined as “an enduring tendency of think about the welfare and rights of other people, to feel concern and empathy for them, and to act in a way that benefits them” (Penner & Finkelstein, 1998.). Altruism is a relatively stable motive which reflects te degree to which a person is willing to provide help to others without expecting any benefit in return. There are three components of the altruistic personality. The first one is *Dispositional Empathy*, or a permanent readiness to empathize with people in need. The second one is *Orientation for prosocial behavior*, it refers to the focus of the motive to engage in any voluntary behavior that benefits another person. The third one is social responsibility, or the dispositional focus of individual on moral obligations that makes them act in correspondents with their normal beliefs (Cialdini et al, 1991). ‘Altruistic personality’ is motivations such as empathy, norms of appropriate behavior, and a tendency to experience cognitive and affective empathy. Role –taking abilities provide the capacity to empathies and norms of behavior are internalized, guiding judgments. Altruism as a describe

¹Doctoral Scholar of Psychology, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore

²Professor and Head, Department of Psychology, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore

*Corresponding Author

Received: September 24, 2023; Revision Received: October 25, 2025; Accepted: October 28, 2025

Development of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire: A Short Version

to benefit someone else for his or her sake rather than one's own benefit. Altruism or selflessness is the principal or practice of concern for the welfare of others.

Prosocial behavior is driven by a combination of egoistic and altruistic motivations. (Knickerbockers 2013) Arousal and effect theories share the guiding principle that people are motivated to behave in ways that help them to attain some goal, and the interpretation of this arousal can shape the nature of prosocial motivation (Penner 2005). Reciprocal altruism explores the evolutionary advantages of helping unrelated individuals, where the favour is repaid in kind (Penner 2005), and while indirect reciprocity addresses the receipt of such long – term benefits or rewards for short term prosocial acts. Furthermore, altruistic are more likely to indirectly reciprocate other's prosocial behaviors (Simpson 2008).

In assessing altruistic and egoistic motivations, gender and age may be factors. The related concept of moral reasoning and defined as reasoning about moral dilemmas where one person's needs desires conflict with those of needy others, with formal obligations minimal or absent (Carlo 1996). Adolescent girls have also been found to express higher level modes of moral reasoning than adolescent boys (Carlo 1996). Personal and contextual factors are also said to influence one's personal moral reasoning.

There are situational factors which contribute to prosocial behavior, involving concerns of extrinsic incentives and social reputation. The over justification effect addresses the dominance of extrinsic incentives as the presence of rewards and punishment cloud one's true motives, often deterring prosocial behavior (Benabou 2005). Typically, rewards confer benefit, while punishment confers harm to the recipients. Thus, intrinsic is superseded by extrinsic incentives, leading to decreased motivation and reduced performance in terms of prosocial behavior (Benabou 2005).

Introspection is another major factor in prosocial behavior. Which concern over one's self – image, individuals often try to self – evaluate their own actions from a neutral, third person point of view. In the motives are acceptable, they are typically into behavior. Psychologist and sociologist identify a strong need for conformity between one's internal values and motivations, and one's external actions (Benabou 2005). It is also generally that empathic responses precede many (but not all) prosocial acts. (penner 2005) factor analysis of several prosocial personality traits have led to two dimensions of the dimensions of the prosocial personality.

Although situational factors can be creating individual difference in influencing helping behaviors in many contexts (Darely & Batson, 1973; Latane & Darley, 1970), researchers have demonstrated some evidence of individual differences in helping tendencies that endure over time and across at least some situations. People who are more helpful in one situation are likely to be more helpful in other situation as well (Hampson, 1984; Rushton, 1981).

Rushton and his colleagues (1984) on twin studies found that individual difference in helpfulness is partly genetically based. Thus, even if altruistic motivation may not always lead to helping behavior, people do differ on this motive. The altruistic motive to help is clearly distinct from the egoistic motive to help. This is the basis of the current endeavor in trying to locate individual differences in personality as far as altruism is concerned.

Development of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire: A Short Version

Thus unlike other tools measuring altruism or prosocialness which focus mainly on the behavioral component, for example, Self Report Altruism Scale developed by Rushton et al. (1981) or A measures of Altruism developed by Manisha Sen and V K Kool (1984) or on perspective taking and prosocial behavior together, for example, A scale to measures Adults' prosocialness by Caprara et al.(2005), this tool attempts to look at the altruistic personality in a holistic way. Which a long history in psychology, particularly social psychology, the phenomenon of prosocial behavior combines intrinsic, extrinsic, and reputational motivations (Benabou 2005).

Objectives

- To understand the relationship between the prosocial behavior and altruism
- To identify the relationship between the altruistic behavior and empathy
- To identify the relationship between the altruistic behavior and interpersonal reactivity index
- To understand the relationship between the altruistic personality and gender and age

METHODS AND MATERIAL

Rational behind the study

Altruistic personality questionnaire does not explain much variance (only 27%) and the psychometric properties of the tool were not established properly. Although the altruistic personality questionnaire (APQ) appears to be a highly reliable and valid measures, but the length of the tool (43 items) can be problematic I some research applications.

Procedure

A total number of 387 undergraduate and postgraduate Indian students participated in this study. A non – probability sampling technique was used. That is, the sample does not reflect a random sample of students available. The method of on-probability sampling that was employed in this case was incidental sampling. This method is essentially guide by convenience and economy. For item analysis, participants were 312 students were studying in undergraduate or postgraduate courses

For item analysis, participants were 312 students who were studying in undergraduate or postgraduate course in the following institutes in New Delhi – University of Delhi, Jawaharlal Nehru University and school of planning and Architecture. There were 206 female respondents and 106 male respondents, whose mean age was 24.9 years (SD = 7.2) For establishing the psychometric properties of the test, sample size of 43, males (N = 13, M=88.30) Age = 22-40 SD = 15 .60) and female (N= 30 M = 96.60 Age =25 – 40 SD = 15.13) of different age groups were collected from DLPR (Defence Institute of Psychological Research) and DIPAS (Defence Institute of Physiology & Allied Science). Incidental non random sampling procedure was employed to collect data.

Data was collected through questionnaire method. The questionnaire was given to the participants through two ways - face to face and electronic mail. In the item analysis phase, only 1 questionnaire consisting of 43 items was presented to the participants. For examining how much the responses on the test being developed were socially desirable and whether it had satisfactory psychometric properties 5 questionnaires were used. The questionnaire used for the research was all fixed responses questionnaires.

Development of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire: A Short Version

Psychometric Evaluation and Item Refinement

A number of procedures were used for psychometric evaluation of the altruistic personality inventory (API). First item analysis were performed, which included an evaluation of the mean and variance of the item responses, corrected item correlation and an alpha if item deleted analysis. Second, after any bad item was deleted, internal consistency of score from the final scale was evaluated. Finally, factor analysis were performed to evaluate the theoretical salience of factor structure and to determine if any additional items should be removed from the measure.

Item Analysis

For the item analysis Skewness and Kurtosis, item total correlation and factor loading procedure were used. In this item analysis numbers of items were removed on the basis of procedures.

Skewness and Kurtosis

In preliminary analysis, some of the items which were highly skewed, which were not normally distributed was deleted from the analysis (items 12, items 33, item 38, item 43)

Item Total Correlation

After that, item correlation was performed on the left over 39 items and those items having total correlation less than $<.25$ were deleted from the analysis (item 4, item5, item14, item15, item17, item24, item29, item35). Finally, 31 items were retained for further analysis.

Table No 1: item – total correlation for altruistic personality questionnaire

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
VAR00001	131.9514	331.459	.413	.866
VAR00002	131.9854	333.735	.319	.868
VAR00003	131.2253	338.714	.276	.869
VAR00006	132.0389	332.242	.365	.867
VAR00007	132.0065	329.312	.375	.867
VAR00008	131.3663	335.366	.342	.868
VAR00009	131.6159	338.802	.267	.869
VAR00010	131.8574	328.220	.444	.866
VAR00011	131.5057	328.841	.498	.865
VAR00013	131.6207	331.190	.436	.866
VAR00016	131.8152	328.073	.446	.866
VAR00018	131.2804	334.218	.379	.867
VAR00019	131.6126	329.387	.453	.866
VAR00020	131.5446	336.356	.334	.868
VAR00021	131.4571	334.528	.354	.868
VAR00022	132.0324	322.126	.513	.864
VAR00023	131.9935	334.646	.351	.868
VAR00025	132.6305	328.022	.466	.865
VAR00026	131.6240	331.823	.379	.867
VAR00027	131.3047	336.826	.319	.868
VAR00028	132.0097	325.055	.521	.864
VAR00030	131.4749	329.591	.468	.865
VAR00031	131.9724	330.183	.389	.867

Development of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire: A Short Version

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
VAR00032	132.2755	329.700	.433	.866
VAR00034	131.5624	333.211	.353	.868
VAR00036	132.1815	322.198	.520	.864
VAR00037	131.9968	326.575	.483	.865
VAR00039	131.6013	324.669	.537	.864
VAR00040	131.8703	323.973	.503	.864
VAR00041	131.4943	333.932	.355	.867
VAR00042	132.0000	322.481	.554	.863

Factor Lading

In further analysis, factor analysis was performed on left over refined 31 items and those items having less than 0.3 factors loading were removed from the analysis. Apart from the less factor loadings, cross – loadings – items were detached from the analysis. Apart from the less facto loadings, cross – loading – items were detached from the analysis (item 27, item 37, item 40, item 42). Finally, 27 items were maintained.

Table 2 factor loadings of rotated component matrix of APQ

Rotated Component Matrix ^a			
	Component		
	1	2	3
VAR00001		.669	
VAR00002		.668	
VAR00003	.462		
VAR00006		.585	
VAR00007			.690
VAR00008	.595		
VAR00009	.458		
VAR00010		.480	
VAR00011	.680		
VAR00013	.549		
VAR00016			.604
VAR00018	.588		
VAR00019	.657		
VAR00020	.511		
VAR00021	.539		
VAR00022		.604	
VAR00023	.498		
VAR00025		.633	
VAR00026	.515		
VAR00028		.667	
VAR00030	.604		
VAR00031	.432		
VAR00032		.590	
VAR00034	.487		
VAR00036			.670
VAR00039		.514	
VAR00041	.457		

Development of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire: A Short Version

Factorial study

In order to find out the factorial structure of the 27 items Altruistic personality questionnaire, exploratory factor analysis was carried out. To check the sample adequacy, the KMO measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity were carried out. The results (KMO= 0.858) indicated clearly that the sample is adequate enough to carry out the factor analysis. Bartlett's Test (4865.8 $p = .000$) indicated that the correlation matrix representing the 27 item statements contained at least one factor.

Responses to the APQ items were made on a five-point Likert scale. Exploratory factor analysis was performed on the 27 items with SPSSv16.0 using Varimax rotation (Varimax with Kaiser Normalization), which allows for correlation among subscales (Costello & Osbourne, 2005; Russell, 2002). To ensure minimal ambiguity among factors, criteria for an acceptable factor solution were (a) that factors have minimum Eigen value of 1, (b) the exclusion of factor with loading below 0.40 (c) the exclusion of items with loading 0.40 or more if there was cross loading greater than .30 on any other factors, and (d) that there should be a minimum of three items on each factor (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). On the basis of empirical research, Kline (1993) reported that a factor analysis requires three criteria to ensure stable factors: at least 100 participants (Bartlett & Kline, 1981), at least 2 participants per variable (Bartlett & Kline), and at least 20 participants per extracted factor (Arrindell & Van der Ende, 1985). The sample in the present study met or exceeded all three criteria. It was, therefore, sufficient for us to conduct a factor analysis and to have confidence. APQ was subjected to a principal component analysis followed by a varimax rotation method. The Eigen value (Kaiser, 1970), and the scree test (Cattell 1978) criteria were used to determine the number of factors to enter into the rotation. Three principle factors with Eigen values >1.0 were extracted. Kaiser criterion (Eigen values more than unity), a scree test, and the interpretability of resulting factor structure (Floyds & Widaman 1995) were used.

Table No 3 Three Factors Percentage Of Variance Of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire

Total Variance Explained						
Comp	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Eigen Value	% Var	C % V			
1	6.741	24.965	24.965	6.741	24.965	24.965
2	3.096	11.467	36.432	3.096	11.467	36.432
3	1.392	5.157	41.588	1.392	5.157	41.588

Reliability

Reliability is one of the central characteristics of any test. A well-made scientific instrument should yield precise result both at present and over time. Reliability refers to the consistency of score which reflected in the reproducibility of scores. The consistency of scores obtained upon testing and retesting is referred to as "internal consistency" of the test scores. Reliability is not a property of the test per se but of test score. The correlation coefficient indicating temporal stability is known as coefficient of stability, and the correlation coefficient indicating internal consistency is known as coefficient of internal consistency or alpha coefficient.

Development of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire: A Short Version

Internal consistency

Internal consistency reliability indicates the homogeneity of the test. If all the items of the same test measure the same function or trait, the test is said to be homogeneous one and its internal consistency reliability would be high. There is several measure of internal consistency. One of the most useful features of measures of internal consistency is that they can be calculated based on a single sample with just one test administration. The Alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951) is probably the most pervasive of the internal consistency indices. It is most suitable for personality tests which have multiple –scored items. In fact, it is so pervasive that I have almost become synonymous with reliability.

Domain	Reliability Statistics	
	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
APQ	0.869	27
Factor-1	0.833	15
Factor-2	0.824	9
Factor-3	0.753	3

Internal consistency of the Altruistic Personality questionnaire and its dimensions

From the table it can be seen that internal consistency reliability of Altruistic personality Questionnaire high ($=.869$). Thus, the item comprising the test may be said to be homogenous and all them tap the same construct. The Alpha co-efficient value of Factor 1, Factor 2, and Factor 3 are 0.833, 0.824, and 0.753 respectively. Thus the dimensions are also homogenous and all the items under each of them measure the relevant construct.

VALIDITY

Validity is another significant feature of a scientific instrument. The term “validity” means truth. Thus, validity refers to the degree to which a test measure what it purports to measure. Validity is the correlation of the test with some independent criteria. This correlation is called the validity coefficient. Validity is concerned with generalize ability. When a test is valid, it means that its conclusion can be generalized in relation to the general population. It has three important properties- a test is not generally valid, it is valid only for a particular purpose; it is not a fixed process rather it is an unending process; it is matter of degree and not an all – or- none property. These are three purpose of testing; representation of a certain specified area of content, establishment of a functional relationship with a variable available at present or in future, measurement of hypothetical trait or quality. Corresponding to each of these purposes, these are three main types of validity- content validity, correlation related validity and construct validity.

Concurrent Validity:

Concurrent validity focuses on the extent to which scores from a new measure are related to scores from a criterion measure administered at the same time. For concurrent validity, Self-Report Altruism scale (Rushton et al. 1981) was used as a criterion. It has satisfactory psychometric properties, with adequate reliability and validity. Findings revealed that altruistic personality questionnaire and its facets are significantly correlated with the independent criteria (i.e. Altruism Scales) $r = 0.389$, $p < 0.01$. Factor I $r = 0.43$, $p < 0.01$; Factor II $r = 0.21$, $p < 0.01$; and Factor III $r = .072$, (see Table No)

Development of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire: A Short Version

Inter-Correlations between Altruistic personality And Its Facets with Self reported altruism scale

S.No	Variables	N	Mean/SD	SRA	API	Fac1	Fac2	Fac3
1	SRA	241	51/11.5	1				
2	APQ	241	93/13.7	.389**	1			
3	Fac1	241	54.7/8.4	.434**	.795**	1		
4	Fac2	241	28.6/6.6	.215**	.762**	.257**	1	
5	Fac3	241	9.6/3.0	.072	.625**	.236**	.531**	1

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)*

Construct Validity

Convergent and discriminate methods were employed to establish the construct validity of the questionnaire. This process has to do with relationships between the construct of interest and other similar or dissimilar constructs. For this study to establish the convergent validity mental toughness correlates with other theoretical related measures (i.e. prosocial behaviour, altruism, interpersonal reactivity index and empathy scale). To establish the construct validity following procedures were employed.

Sample

For establishing psychometric properties of the test, it was administered to a 43 participants. (13 Male and 30 female)

Measures

The following tools were administered to establish the construct validity of the tool.

SCALES

Adult Prosocialness Scale

Capara et al. (2005) constructed this 16 item scale for assessing individual difference in prosocialness. This items reflect behaviors and feeling that can be traced back to one of her types of actions, namely, sharing, helping taking care of, and feeling empathetic with others and their needs and requests. For each prosocialness items, participants indicated on a five – point like scle whether the statement was Never/ almost never true (coded1), Occasionally true (coded 2) sometimes true (coded 3), often true (coded 4), and almost / always true (coded 5).

Empathy scale

Berkowits & Daniels (1964) empathic concern and empathy for the other oriented emotion (1) knowing another's internal state, (2) adopting another's posture (motor mimicry) or matching another's neural responses,(3) coming to feel as the other feels, (4) projecting oneself into another's situation,(5) adopting an imagine – other perspective (or perspective taking), (6) adopting an imagine- self perspective, and (7) feeling vicarious personal distress.

Interpersonal Reactivity Index

Davis, M.H. (1983). Constructed this 28-items answered in 5 point liker scale ranging from “Does not describe me well” to “Describe me very well”. The measure has 4 subscales, each made up of 7 different items. Perspective Taking – the tendency to spontaneously adopt the psychological point of view of others. Fantasy- taps respondent's tendencies to transpose themselves imaginatively into the feelings and actions of fictitious characters in books, movies, and plays. Empathic concern-assesses “other-oriented” fallings of sympathy and

Development of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire: A Short Version

concern for unfortunate others Personal Distress- measure “self – oriented” feelings of personal anxiety and unease intense interpersonal settings.

Convergent and discriminate methods

Convergent and discriminate methods were employed to establish the construct validity of the tool. This process has to do with relationships between the construct of interest and other similar or dissimilar constructs. For satisfactory construct validity it is essential that the test correlates with other theoretical measures with which it should correlate and it is equally essential that it must not correlate with other measures with which it should not. When the test correlates with its expected referents, the process is known as convergent validity. When the test correlates poorly (or not at all) with measures with which it should not, because it differs from those referents or measures, the procedure is known as divergent validation. Significant correlations ranging from 0.40 to 0.85 indicate good convergent validity, whereas correlations above 0.85 indicate that scales are measuring the same constructs and low or no significant correlations indicate discriminate validity (De Vaus, 2002; Mc Dowell & Newell, 1996).

In order to investigate the convergent and discriminate validity, Pearson’s correlations between altruistic personality questionnaire and its related constructs were computed

RESULTS

Inter- Correlations Between Altruistic Personality Test And Its Related Constructs.

S.NO	Variables	N	Mean	SD	APQ	Prosocial	Empathy	Interpersonal
1	APQ Scale	43	94.5	21.9	1			
2	Pro-socialness Scale	43	63.8	8.8	0.390**	1		
3	Empathy Scale	43	48.6	7.0	0.172	.100	1	
4	IRI Scale	43	91.6	11.6	0.413**	.190	.153	1

** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

It can be seen from the table that Altruistic Personality Questionnaire is significantly correlated with adult prosocialness scale ($r = .390$), Empathy scale ($r = .172$) and the interpersonal scale ($r = .413$) at 0.001 level of significance.

Age and Altruistic personality

In order to identify the age difference in altruism, data was collected from 43 participants. The age of the participants mean and SD is 24.9 and 7.2 only, altruistic personality mean and SD is 92.75 and 15.89 only. As we can see from the table the significant correlation between Age and Altruistic personality is 0.01 levels.

Inter- Correlation between Age and Altruistic Personality

S.No	Variables	N	Mean	SD	APQ	Age
1	APQ	387	92.75	15.8	1	
2	Age	387	24.9	7.2	0.175**	1

**correlation is significance at the 0.001 level (2-tailed)

Development of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire: A Short Version

Gender difference on Altruistic personality

As we can observe from the table, there is a significant difference in the scores of males and females on the dimensions of Altruistic personality Questionnaire. The mean score of males is 88.30 and SD is 15.60 and the mean score of female is 96.66 and SD is 15.13.

Gender difference on Altruistic Personality questionnaire

	Gender	N	Mean	SEM	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
APQ	Male	181	88.30(15.6)	1.16006	5.341	385	.000
	Female	206	96.66(15.13)	1.05454			

Present study found the significant difference between male and females as far as pro social behavior is concerned, mean score of males and females is 88.30 and 96.66, this difference is probably due the fact females are more altruistic (motivation to help) and males are more likely to engage in pro social acts (so they are concerned with performing the prosocial actions) and this tool (APQ), traces altruism which is considered as the motivation to help others out of pure regard for their needs rather than how the action will benefit oneself.

CONCLUSION

Original Altruistic personality questionnaire (APQ) does not explain much variance and psychometric properties of the tool were not established properly. APQ is a lengthy tool 43 items, which appears to be problematic in some research applications, especially when administering the tool to older adults, so in order to overcome this problem and to make it available for all types of researches like survey research. We decided to develop a short-term version of the tool. Original scale consists of 43 items; first proceed with item analysis where highly skewed items were deleted from the analysis. Then, item total correlation was performed on the remaining 39 items, and those items having total correlation less than <.25 were deleted from the analysis. In further analysis, factor analysis was performed on remaining 31 items and those items having total correlation less than <.4 were removed from the analysis. Finally, 27 items were retained. After establishing the item analysis, internal consistency Reliability was established (.869). To establish the concurrent validity of the tool it was correlated with the Adult Prosocialness Scale (.390), Self Report Altruism Scale (.334), Empathy Scale (.172) and Interpersonal Reactivity Index Scale (.413). Results of the present study is also consistent with reviewed literature, showing that as people age, they are more likely to show prosocial behavior, thus from the results we can conclude that elderly people are more likely t show helpful behavior than younger. In present study significant difference was found between the males and the females as far as prosocial behavior is concerned.

REFERENCES

- Aronson, E.; Wilson, T.D.; & Akert, A.M. (2005). Psychology (5th ed.). Upper saddle river, NJ: Prentice Hall. ISBN 0-13-178686-5
- Batson, C.D.; Dyck, J.L.; Brandt, J.R.; Batson, J.G. & Powell, A. L. (1988). "Five studies Testing Two New Egoistic Alternatives to the Empathy- Altruism Hypothesis". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 55 (1):52-77.
- Batson, C. Five Studies Testing Two New Egoistic Alternatives to the Empathy-Altruism Hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Vol. 55. 1997
- Batson, C. Self-Reported distress and Empathy and Egoistic versus Altruistic Motivation for helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1983

Development of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire: A Short Version

- Batson, C.D., & Leonard, B. (1987). Prosocial Motivation: is it ever Truly Itruistic? *In advances in Experimental Social Psychology*.
- Batson, C. (2011). *Altruism in humans*. New York, NY US: Oxford University Press.]
- [Batson, C. (2012). *A history of prosocial behavior research*. In A. W. Kruglanski, W. Stroebe & A. W. Kruglanski, (Eds.), *Handbook of the history of social psychology* (pp. 243–264). New York, NY US: Psychology Press.]
- Benabou, Roland & Jean Tirol (2005). *Incentives and prosocial behavior*. *National Bureau of Economic Research*, 1-7. Retrieved April 9, 2008, from NEBR Working Paper Series.
- Carlo, Gustavo, Marcia s. da silva, Nancy Eisenberg, Claudia B. Frohlich, & Silvia H. Koller. (1996). *A cross-National study on the Relations among Prosocial moral Reasoning, Gender Role orientations, and Prosocial Behaviors*. *Developmental Psychology* (Vol. 32, No.2, pp. 2231-240).
- Cialdini, Robert B. Empathy-Based Helping: Is it selflessly or selfishly motivated? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1987
- Cialdini, & Robert B. Reinterpreting the Empathy-Altruism Relationship: When One into One Equals Oneness. Arizona State University. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1997. Vol. 73. No 3.1997
- Dovidio, J.F, Piliavin, J.A., Schroeder, D. A., & Penner, L.A. (2006). *The social psychology of prosocial behaviour*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fehr, E.; & Fischbacher, U. (2003). "The nature of human altruism". *Nature* 425 (6960): 785–791.
- Isen A, Clark M, & Schwartz M. Duration of the effect of good mood on helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1976; 34:385–393
- Kayloe, J. C.; & Krause, M (1985). "Rare Find: or the value of volunteerism". *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal* 8 (4): 49–56. doi:10.1037/h0099659
- Knickerbocker, & Roberta L. (2003). *Prosocial Behaviour*. Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, (9pp.1-3).
- Monk-Turner, E.; Blake, V.; Chniel, F.; Forbes, S.; Lensey, L.; & Madzuma, J. (2002). *"Helping hands: A study of altruistic behaviour"*.
- Okasha, & Samir. "Biological Altruism". *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved 13 May 2011.
- Piliavin JA. Altruism and helping: The evolution of a field: The 2008 Cooley-Mead *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 2009; 72:209–225. doi: 10.1177/019027250907200305.
- Penner, Louis A., John F.Dovidio, jane A. piliavin & David A. Schoeder. (2005). *Prosocial Behavior: multilevel Perspectives*. *Annual Review of Psychology* (vol.56, pp.365-392).
- Rushton JP, Chrisjohn RD, & Fekken GC. The altruistic personality and the self-report altruism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 1981; 2:293–302. doi: 10.1016/0191-8869(81)90084-2
- Schwartz, C.; Meisenhelder, J.; Ma, Y.; & Reed, G. (2003). "Altruistic Social Interest Behaviors Are Associated with Better Mental Health". *Psychosomatic Medicine* 65 (5): 778–785.
- Simpson, Brett, & Robb Willer, (2008). Altruism and IndirectnReciprocity; The Interaction of persona and sitution in Prosocial Behavior. *Social Psychology Quarterly* (vol.71, pp.37-50).
- Thoits PA, Hewitt LN. Volunteer work and well-being. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*. 2001;42(2):115–131. doi: 10.2307/3090173.
- Thompson, E. (2001). Empathy and consciousness. *Journal of consciousness studies*, 8, 1-32.

Development of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire: A Short Version

- Trivers, R.L. (1971). "The evolution of reciprocal altruism". *Quarterly Review of Biology* 46: 35–57.
- Twenge, J.M., Baumeister, R.F., DeWall, N.C., Ciarocco, N.J., & Bartels, M.J. (2007). Social Exclusion Decreases Prosocial Behaviour. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 92(1), 56-66.
- Wilson J. *Volunteering*. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2000; 26:215–240. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.215.
- Windsor T, Anstey K, Rodgers B. Volunteering and psychological well-being among young old adults: How much is too much? *The Gerontologist*. 2008; 48(1):59–70. doi: 10.1093/geront/48.159.

Acknowledgment

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Vineetha, V. & Velayudhan, A. (2025). Development of Altruistic Personality Questionnaire: A Short Version. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 13(4), 411-422. DIP:18.01.038.20251304, DOI:10.25215/1304.038