

## A Study of Altruism and Aggression among Rural Adolescents

Prabhakar S. Patil<sup>1\*</sup>, Jeevan R. Patil<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The study was undertaken to know the aggression level and altruism among the rural adolescence. The sample of the study comprised of 60 students in which 30 boys and 30 girls were selected randomly from Saravade college student. Aggression and Altruism scale were used for the present study. Results show that there is no gender difference was found with respect to altruism and aggression among rural adolescence.

**Keywords:** *Altruism, Aggression.*

Altruism refers to behavior by an individual that increases the fitness of another individual (recipient) while decreasing the fitness of the actor. There are two major ways to measure altruism. One is investigating the amount of money an individual is willing to give to someone else in an experimental situation, such as the dictator game (Camerer, 2003). The other is using a self-report altruism scale that asks respondents how they have behaved altruistically in various situations (e.g., Rushton, Chrisjohn, and Fekken, 1988). Previous studies have revealed that individual differences in degree of altruism. One possible contributor to individual differences in altruism is personality (Costa and McCrae, 1992). Altruistic behaviors towards strangers, however, involve neither inclusive fitness nor direct reciprocation. Indirect reciprocity and competitive altruism theories propose that actors benefit in the long term by “purchasing” increased cooperation from others when they “pay” for altruistic behavior. That is, altruistic behavior towards strangers is a form of investment (Bshary and Bergmuller, 2008).

Theoretical studies indicate that building a good reputation plays an important role in the evolution of reciprocal altruism through indirect reciprocity (e.g., Nowak and Sigmund, 1998). We examined the effect of the big five traits on altruism towards each category of recipient using a multiple regression analysis. Following Ben-Ner and Kramer (2010), we predicted that personality would affect altruistic behavior toward family members less than it would affect altruistic behavior toward friends or strangers. As each item on the SRAS-DS

<sup>1</sup> (Bhogavati College, Kurukali.)

<sup>2</sup> (Rajaram College, Kolhapur)

*\*Responding Author*

## **A Study of Altruism and Aggression among Rural Adolescents**

addresses the frequency with one has engaged in altruistic behavior in daily life, the scores of people who do not frequently interact with others are low. Therefore, it was expected that extraversion would contribute to altruism toward all three types of recipients, as people who are high in extraversion tend to seek out opportunities to engage with others.

Researcher says that Prosocial behavior increased normal, social and psychological development. Altruism in children has been studied and has been found that family system influences the personality development of the child and this in turn influence the altruistic behavior as studied earlier. Researchers have also found out that gender also influences altruistic behavior in children. Cialdini et al. found that altruistic behavior appeared in girls persisted for longer time.

Human aggression is believed to be affected by several factors, such as individual, cultural and situational factors in both males and females. In the early 1960s, many specialists considered aggression to be an intrinsically male phenomenon and claimed that aggression in females was so rare that studying it in detail was hardly worth the effort (Buss, 1961). Eventually, however, the accumulation of knowledge from different fields, including ethnology, psychology and anthropology, resulted in a much broader understanding of aggression. Under the new paradigm, three different types of aggression were described: physical (more typical of males in all human cultures); direct verbal; and indirect (Osterman et al, 1998; Butovskaya & Kozitnsev, 1999a; 1999b; Sutton & Smith, 1999; Butovskaya, 2001).

Although, cross culturally, men tend to engage in physical aggression more often than women, women, too, may be physically aggressive in many cultures (Fry, 1998; Butovskaya et al, 2007). Both men and women are verbally aggressive worldwide (Burbank, 1994). Several recent studies also indicate a growing level of female aggression (especially physical aggression) in modern society, which can at least partly be attributed to changes in socialization practices (Butovskaya & Demianovitsch, 2002). These findings are especially relevant in view of the fact that, in situations of conflict with their peers, adolescents, regardless of their sex, tend behavior (Bjorkqvist, 1997). Indirect aggression, especially, has received much attention. This has been defined as (gossiping or spreading rumours) and is believed to be the best way for the perpetrator to maintain their anonymity and minimize the possibility of retaliation (Bjorkqvist et al, 1992). This behavior is not easily observed, and hence the necessary information may be collected mainly by means of interviews and questionnaires. Similar phenomena have also 1997). However, social and relational aggression may be accompanied by certain direct forms of non-physical aggression, such as negative facial expressions in the case of social aggression, or excluding peers from the group in the case of social aggression.

Bhateri (2015) A Comparative Study of Aggression between Males and Females. A.H. Buss and M. Perry (1992) gave four types of aggression – anger, hostility, physical aggression and verbal aggression. A total of 200 subjects (97 females, 103 males) were used in the study.

## A Study of Altruism and Aggression among Rural Adolescents

Revealed that males are more aggressive in experimental aggressive behavior than females and there is no significant difference in anger, hostility, physical aggression and verbal aggression between males and females.

Adolescence is an important part for human life. As adolescence is a transitional stage of development between childhood and adulthood, girls and boys face many physiological and psychological changes in their life. The inability to cope with the changes may lead to other negative consequences such as poor academic performance, low self-esteem and low well-being. These consequences, in turn, can lead to various behavioral problems including anxiety, depression, anger, school drop-out, drug and alcohol abuse etc. Several factors have been to explain the causes of anger of adolescents.

### *Objectives:*

- 1) To find out the difference between male and female on altruism among rural adolescences
- 2) To find out the difference between male and female on aggression among rural adolescences

### *Hypotheses*

- 1) There will be significance difference between male and female on altruism among rural adolescences
- 2) There will be significance difference between male and female on aggression among rural adolescences.

## **METHOD:-**

### *Sample-*

The sample of the study comprised of 60 students in which 30 boys and 30 girls, Selected randomly from Sarvade village. The age range of the students will be 16 to 18.

### *Tools-*

The following standardized psychological tests used to collect the data.

#### **1. Manifest Aggression Scale (MAS)**

This scale is developed by Dr. Ram Ashis Singh. It can be administered either individual or in group. This scale is available in Hindi and English version. each statement has two alternative answer Yes or No. For the computation of reliability of the present MAS, the scale was administered to 250 subjects ( age range was 14 to 26yrs) both male and female belonging to rural and urban strata of the society. The reliability co-efficient was .73. and validity –coefficient was 081.

#### **2. Altruism scale (ALTS)**

This scale is prepared by Rai & Singh consist 30 items. Each item has three alternatives responses, say altruistic, neutral and egoistic. This scale had been found to be highly reliable and valid. This group test is meant for 10 to 19 years age group adolescents. The responses obtained in the form of tick marks on 30 items of altruistic scale are quantified. Each item of

## A Study of Altruism and Aggression among Rural Adolescents

the scale has three alternative responses, i.e., altruistic, neutral and egoistic. In order to get a suitable classification, this test was administered on 500 boys and 500 girls in the range of 10 and 19 yrs. Reliability coefficient is 0.84 and validity co-efficient is 0.63.

### *Statistical analysis-*

The data was statistically analyzed by using of 't' test to find out the difference in altruism and Aggression.

## **RESULT**

*Table No -1. Significance of mean difference between male & female on altruism among rural adolescences*

	Altruism				
Factor	N	Mean	sd	df	't' value
Male	30	46.53	5.09	58	0.15NS
Female	30	47.86	5.33		
Total	60				

*Table No .2 Significance of mean difference between male and female on aggression among rural adolescences*

	Aggression				
Factor	N	Mean	sd	df	't' value
Male	30	62.76	8.06	58	0.43NS
Female	30	62.46	5.67		
Total	60				

\* Significant at 0.01 level, \*\* Significant at 0.05 level, Not Significant

## **DISCUSSION and Interpretation:-**

The perusal of table -1 makes it clear that the mean score of male 46.53 (SD = 5.09) is less than mean score of female 47.86 (SD= 5.33) on altruism. The obtained 't' value is (0.15) which is not statistically significant at 0.05 level. The results make it clear that male and female are not differing significantly on their altruism.

The perusal of table No-2 makes it clear that the mean score of male 62.76 (SD= 8.06) is more than mean score of female 62.46 (SD= 5.67) on Aggression. The obtained' value is (0.43) which is statistically not significant at 0.05 levels. The results make it clear that male and female students are not differing significantly on their Aggression.

## **CONCLUSIONS:-**

1. There is no significant difference found between male and female students on altruism. It means that male and female are equal to altruism.
2. There is no significant difference found between male and female students on Aggression.

**REFERENCES:**

- Bhateri and Rajbir Singh (2015) A Comparative Study of Aggression between Males and Females, *Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* Volume 20, Issue 8, PP 43-51.
- Brooks-Gunn J, Duncan GJ. (1997) the effects of poverty on children. *Future Child.*7(2):55–71.
- Bshary, R. and Bergmuller, R. (2008) Distinguishing four fundamental approaches to the evolution of helping, *J. Evol. Biol.* 21, 405–420
- Colman, A.M. (2013). *A Dictionary of psychology*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*, Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Camerer, C. (2003). *Behavioral game theory: experiments on strategic interaction*. Princeton NJ: University Press.
- Fraser Mark W. (2000) Urban Violence among African American Males: Integrating Family, Neighborhood, and Peer Perspectives . *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, Volume 27. Issue 3 .
- Myers, D.G. (2005). *Social psychology* (8th ed). New Delhi: McCraw Hill.
- Nowak, M.A. and Sigmund, K. (2005) Evolution of indirect reciprocity. *Nature* 437, 1291–1298
- Rushton and Chrisjohn (1981) The altruistic Personality and the self – report altruism scale. Vol. 2 pp. 293 to 302

**How to cite this article:** Patil P S & Patil J R (2018). A Study of Altruism and Aggression among Rural Adolescents. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Vol. 6, (2), DIP: 18.01.229/20180602, DOI: 10.25215/0602.229