

# Asian Resonance

## Relationship between Altruism and Personality Traits of Urban Adolescent Students

### Mukul Baran Mandal

Research Scholar,  
Deptt. of Education,  
Burdwan University,  
Burdwan, West Bengal

### Chitrallekha Mehera

Assistant Professor,  
Deptt. of Education,  
Burdwan University,  
Burdwan, West Bengal

#### Abstract

The present study investigates the relationship between Altruism and Big Five Personality Traits of urban adolescent students. Altruism Scale and Big Five Personality Inventory (BFPI), both adopted by the present investigator were administered on 400 urban adolescent students (age 15+ years) comprising equal numbers of boy and girl students. The result revealed that there was significant gender difference in altruism and in all of the Big Five Personality Traits except Openness to Experiences. Adolescent boy urban students scored higher on Extraversion and Neuroticism than adolescent girl urban students. But in cases of Conscientiousness and Agreeableness significant difference went in favor of girls. One notable point is that there was no significant difference in Openness to Experiences between adolescent boy-and girl students, of urban area. Correlation coefficients showed that altruism had more or less impact on Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism of adolescent urban students.

**Keywords:** Altruism, Personality, Urban Students, Adolescent  
**Introduction**

From the primitive age society has been ever changing gradually and the society in its most manifested and extended form appears as today's society where competition to overcome each other prevails in a great manner notwithstanding, cooperation to each other exists. When someone comes to help other, someone seeks advantages from other. Moreover, sometimes it can be seen that helping appears as reciprocal i.e. willing to help in order to get help. Helping other without expecting any return is also observed in today's society. This selfless helping termed as altruism. It can be defined as "behavior motivated by concern for others or by internalized values, goals, and self-rewards rather than by the expectation of concrete or social rewards, or the desire to avoid punishment or sanctions," (Eisenberg et al., 1999). Altruistic individual assists primarily for moral or other oriented reasons without regard to external rewards or punishment (Carlo, 1991) <sup>1</sup>.

However, helping attitude depends not only on human genetics but also other psychosocial aspects of human such as personality (Oda, et al, 2014<sup>2</sup>, Dorothy and Martha, 2009<sup>3</sup>, Carlo et al, 2005<sup>4</sup>, Emmerik, Jawahar and Stone, 2004<sup>5</sup>), socio cultural variables (Karmakar and Ghosh, 2012<sup>6</sup>), frustration, situational influences, etc. which can be regarded as the affecting factors of altruism. Besides, categorical factors like locality, gender, family type, parents' educational level, class etc also may affect altruism of an individual. Girls are more altruistic than boys (Drebera et al, 2011<sup>7</sup> and Mandal & Mehera, 2016<sup>8</sup>). Urban students are more altruistic than rural students (Mandal and Mehera, 2016<sup>8</sup>). Educational level of parents facilitates the development of adolescent's altruistic behavior (Karmakar and Ghosh, 2012<sup>6</sup>). Adolescents from high income group exhibit higher altruistic behavior than from middle and low income group (Karmakar and Ghosh, 2012<sup>6</sup>).

Present study has been undertaken to examine the relationship of altruism of adolescent urban students with their personality traits.

#### Review of Literature

Emmerik, Jawahar and Stone (2004)<sup>5</sup> in a field study on the relationship between the Big Five personality factors and helping behaviors that occurs in the context of home, work place (organization) and larger society showed that Five Personality Factors were related to numbers of hours which were devoted to household activities and volunteerism, as well

as organizational citizenship behavior. Their study also reported that positive relationship existed between Conscientiousness and helping behavior that directly benefit the self (household activities) or may benefit the self (Organizational Citizenship Behavior) but, negative relationship existed between Conscientiousness and helping behaviors (Volunteerism) that are unlikely to benefit the self. Similarly, Introversion was positively but weakly related to household activities but negatively related to organizational citizenship behavior. Positive relationship existed between Openness to experiences and Volunteerism.

**Carlo et al (2005)<sup>4</sup>** studied about the impact of agreeableness, extraversion, and pro-social value motivation to volunteer, on volunteerism. The result showed that pro-social value motivation to volunteer partially mediated the relations between agreeableness and extraversion, and volunteering. Agreeableness had a significant direct effect on volunteering whereas extraversion was significantly indirectly related to volunteerism. In addition, extraversion and agreeableness exerted a joint effect on pro-social value motivation, which in turn, predicted volunteer behavior. The authors found that agreeableness was a relatively stronger predictor of both pro-social value motive and volunteerism than extraversion.

**Krebs et al (Online, 2006)<sup>9</sup>** examined the relationship among Role Taking Ability, Intelligent Quotient and Altruistic Behavior in Elementary School Children. It was observed from the study that there was a positive association between role-taking ability and naturally occurring altruistic behavior as well as teacher's rating of altruism. The correlation between role-taking and altruism was marginally significant with Intelligent Quotient.

**Dorothy and Martha (2009)<sup>3</sup>** reported that people who were high on altruism were high on two factors of big five personality traits namely, Extraversion and Agreeableness and that indicated Extraversion and Agreeableness to be essential traits for making up altruistic personality.

**Sanadhya, Sharma and Sushil (2010)<sup>10</sup>** designed a study on altruism of school going children belonging to joint as well as nuclear families. The study showed significantly higher altruistic behavioral traits in children from nuclear family than the children from joint family. Study also reported that boys' behavioral traits were less significant than girls'.

**Michael and Roelofs (March 2011)<sup>11</sup>** undertook an experiment to identify heterogeneity preferences in accordance with personality, gender, status, giving and taking for altruism. The result showed that the gender-effect on giving was explained collectively by various personality factors. Women, high status treatment individuals, and individuals in giving language treatment gave less and were also less sensitive to the price giving.

**Huber and MacDonald (2011)<sup>12</sup>** explored the relations between altruism, empathy and spirituality. The result indicated that there were a significant positive relation of empathy to non-religious

spiritual cognitions, religiousness and spiritual experiences and negative association with existential well-being. There was a strong relationship between altruism and spiritual experiences as well as spiritual cognitions. Non-religious spiritual cognitions and spiritual experiences were observed as the most potent predictors of both empathy and altruism respectively.

**Oda et al (2014)<sup>2</sup>** in their study entitled "Personality and altruism in daily Life" investigated the relationship between the Big-Five personality traits and the frequency of altruistic behaviors toward various recipients like family members, friends or acquaintances, and strangers in daily life. Result showed that only personality trait extraversion was related to altruistic behavior towards all types of recipients whereas conscientiousness, agreeableness and openness –the other three personality traits were related to the helping behavior performed towards family members, friends/acquaintances and strangers respectively. Only trait neuroticism was not correlated with the altruism toward all types of recipients.

### Objectives of the Study

1. To measure the altruism of the urban adolescent students with the help of an Altruism Scale adapted and Standardized by the investigators.
2. To measure personality characteristics of the students with the help of a Big Five Personality Inventory developed and Standardized by the investigator.
3. To measure the impact of altruism on each personality character.
4. To find out sex-wise differences if any, in the altruism and each personality characters.

### Null Hypotheses

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>1</sub>

No significant gender difference exists in respect of Altruism and its indicators, of urban adolescent students.

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>2</sub>

No significant gender difference exists in respect of

1. Imagination
2. Aesthetics
3. Emotionality
4. Adventurousness
5. Intellectual Curiosity
6. Liberalism
7. Entire Openness to Experiences, of urban adolescent students.

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>3</sub>

No significant gender difference exists in respect of

1. Self Efficacy
2. Orderliness
3. Dutifulness
4. Achievement Striving
5. Self-Discipline
6. Deliberation
7. Entire Conscientiousness, of urban adolescent students.

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>4</sub>

No significant gender difference exists in respect of

1. Friendliness
2. Gregariousness
3. Assertiveness
4. Activity level
5. Excitement Seeking
6. Cheerfulness
7. Entire Extraversion, of urban adolescent students.

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>5</sub>

No significant gender difference exists in respect of

1. Trust
2. Morality
3. Altruism
4. Compliance
5. Modesty
6. Sympathy
7. Entire Agreeableness, of urban adolescent students.

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>6</sub>

No significant gender difference exists in respect of

1. Anxiety
2. Anger
3. Depression
4. Self-Consciousness
5. Immoderation
6. Vulnerability
7. Entire Neuroticism, of urban adolescent students.

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>7</sub>

There exists significant impact of Altruism of Urban adolescent Students on

1. Imagination
2. Aesthetics
3. Emotionality
4. Adventurousness
5. Intellectual Curiosity
6. Liberalism
7. Entire Openness to Experiences, of urban adolescent students.

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>8</sub>

There exists significant impact of Altruism of Urban adolescent Students on

1. Self Efficacy
2. Orderliness
3. Dutifulness
4. Achievement Striving
5. Self-Discipline
6. Deliberation
7. Entire Conscientiousness, of urban adolescent students

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>9</sub>

There exists significant impact of Altruism of Urban adolescent Students

1. Friendliness
2. Gregariousness
3. Assertiveness
4. Activity level
5. Excitement Seeking

6. Cheerfulness

7. Entire Extraversion, of urban adolescent students

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>10</sub>

There exists significant impact of Altruism of Urban adolescent Students on

1. Trust
2. Morality
3. Altruism
4. Compliance
5. Modesty
6. Sympathy
7. Entire Agreeableness, of urban adolescent students.

<sup>0</sup>H<sub>11</sub>

There exists significant impact of Altruism of Urban adolescent Students on

1. Anxiety
2. Anger
3. Depression
4. Self-Consciousness
5. Immoderation
6. Vulnerability
7. Entire Neuroticism, of urban adolescent students

### Variables

The following variables were considered for the present investigation

1. Altruism of urban adolescent students
2. Personality Traits of urban adolescent students
3. Gender (Boy and Girl)

### Methodology

#### Research Method

Descriptive method incorporated with survey technique was taken for this investigation.

#### Sample

A sample of 400 urban adolescent students (age 15+) comprising equal numbers of boys and girls from two schools for boys and two schools for girls in urban area respectively was selected for the study.

#### Research Tools

Altruism Scale ( $r=.83$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ) adopted and standardized by the investigator was used to measure the altruism of the urban adolescent students. That scale was adopted from Roy and Ghosh who adopted with some modifications of the original scale of Eisenberg et al. There are five dimensions in altruism scale, which are represented by ten situations in total taking two for each. Each situation has five alternative responses which are to be valued by 1 to 5.

Big Five Personality Inventory ( $r=.78$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ) adopted from Paul Costa, Jr and Robert Mc Cares' Neo FFI was used to measure the personality traits of the students. The adopted scale has five domains namely, Openness to Experiences, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism. Each domain is divided into six facets each of which is represented by two statements, each having five alternative parts to be chosen. The scoring is 1 to 5.

#### Procedure

Four urban schools- two for boys and two for girls in Birbhum district were randomly selected from the list of urban schools in that district. Then from

each school a random selection of 100 adolescent secondary students (age 15+ years) was done. Then altruism scale and Big Five Personality Inventory was administered on the selected students of each school to obtain the values of their altruism and Big Five Personality Traits respectively.

The data obtained were subjected to descriptive and inferential statistics. t-tests were followed to test the null hypotheses  $H_1$  to  $H_6$ . And to test the null hypothesis  $H_7$  to  $H_{11}$  Correlation Coefficients of altruism with each of Big Five Personality traits, and its facets were calculated.

**Analysis of Data**

**Inferential Analysis**

**Significance of Sex-wise Differences between the Mean Scores of the Adolescent Students in AS and in BFPI (with Respect to Big Five Personality Traits)**

**Table-1: Showing the t-values along with other Relevant Measures for the Sex-wise Differences in Altruism as well as Its Indicators**

Statistics Indicators	N		Mean		SD		SE <sub>D</sub>		t-Value	
	Boy	Girl	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Cooperation	200	200	5.49	6.74	1.51	1.53	.152		8.193*	
Help	200	200	5.34	6.42	1.46	1.61	.154		6.990*	
Sharing	200	200	5.04	6.40	1.41	1.64	.153		8.885*	
Emotional	200	200	5.18	6.02	1.52	1.58	.155		5.427*	
Restitution	200	200	5.02	6.36	1.47	1.66	.157		8.554*	
Altruism	200	200	26.06	31.92	5.43	5.74	.559		10.480*	

\*Significant at .01 level

Table-1 reveals that all the t-values are significant at .01 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis  $H_1$  i.e., no significant difference exists between Boy-and Girl-Urban Students in respect of altruism and its indicators is rejected. This implies that Boy- and Girl-

Urban students differ in respect of Cooperation, Help, Sharing, Emotional Comfort, Restitution and Total altruism. Mean values in the table indicate that for all the cases the difference goes in favor of girls.

**Table-2: Showing the t-values along with other Relevant Measures for the Sex-wise Differences in Openness as well as its Facets**

Statistics Facets	N		Mean		SD		SE <sub>D</sub>		t-Value	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boy	Girls
Imagination	200	200	5.37	5.38	1.85	1.89	.187		.80	
Aesthetics	200	200	4.98	6.15	1.42	2.03	.175		6.653*	
Emotionality	200	200	4.60	5.56	1.63	1.54	.159		6.109*	
Adventurousness	200	200	5.42	5.12	1.73	1.88	.181		1.717	
Intellectual Curiosity	200	200	5.86	4.98	1.60	1.69	.165		5.342*	
Liberalism	200	200	5.42	5.29	1.60	3.46	.269		.483	
Openness	200	200	31.68	32.48	5.14	5.25	.473		1.754	

\*Significant at .01 level

Table-2 shows that the t-values 6.653, 6.109 and 5.342 are significant at .01 level. Therefore, the null hypotheses  $H_2$  (ii),  $H_2$  (iii) and  $H_4$  (v) i.e., no significant difference exists between Boy- and Girl-Urban Students in respect of Aesthetics, Emotionality and Intellectual Curiosity are rejected. Alternatively, it

can be stated that Boy and Girl urban students differ in respect of Aesthetics, Emotionality and Intellectual Curiosity. The mean values in the table indicate that the differences go in favor of Girl students in case of Aesthetics and Emotionality but in favor of boys in case of Intellectual Curiosity.

**Table-3: Showing the t-values along with other Relevant Measures for the Sex-wise Differences in Conscientiousness as well as its Facets**

Statistics Facets	N		Mean		SD		SE <sub>D</sub>		t-Value	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Self Efficacy	200	200	5.42	5.48	2.03	2.01	.202		.297	
Orderliness	200	200	5.41	5.56	1.78	1.75	.177		.849	
Dutifulness	200	200	5.63	5.25	1.41	1.21	.131		4.715*	
Achievement	200	200	5.79	5.48	1.69	1.86	.178		1.774	
Self-Discipline	200	200	5.18	5.39	1.70	1.70	.170		1.235	
Deliberation	200	200	5.08	5.39	1.72	1.73	.172		1.773	
Conscientiousness	200	200	32.51	33.54	4.55	4.34	.445		2.317*	

\*Significant at .01 level

**Table-3** shows that the t-values **4.715** and **2.317** are significant at .01 level. Therefore, the null hypotheses  $H_2$  (iii) and  $H_2$  (vii) that is, no significant difference exists between Boy-and Girl-Urban Students in respect of Dutifulness and entire Conscientiousness are rejected. Alternatively, it can

be stated that Boy-and Girl-students differ in respect of Dutifulness and Conscientiousness. The mean values in the table indicate that the difference goes in favor of boys in case of Dutifulness but in favor of Girls in case of entire Conscientiousness.

**Table-4: Showing the t-values along with other Relevant Measures for the Sex-wise Differences in Extraversion as well as its Facets**

Statistics	N		Mean		SD		SE <sub>D</sub>		t-Value	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Friendliness	200	200	6.42	6.27	1.65	1.62	.164		.886	
Gregariousness	200	200	6.20	6.78	1.60	1.45	.153		3.794*	
Assertiveness	200	200	6.69	6.48	1.48	1.54	.151		1.421	
Activity Level	200	200	6.90	6.58	1.43	1.46	.145		9.120*	
Excitement-Seeking	200	200	6.12	4.62	1.57	1.52	.154		9.757*	
Cheerfulness	200	200	6.26	5.58	1.58	1.47	.152		4.428*	
Extraversion	200	200	38.58	35.30	6.82	6.72	.677		4.846*	

\*Significant at .01 level

All the t-values except **.886** and **1.421** in the above table are significant at .01 level and indicate the rejection of null hypotheses  $H_4$  (ii),  $H_4$  (iv),  $H_4$  (v),  $H_4$  (vi),  $H_4$  (vii), which means that significant differences exist between Boy- and Girl- Urban students in respect of Gregariousness, Activity Level,

Excitement-Seeking, Cheerfulness and entire Extraversion. Further from the mean values it can be stated that Boy students scored better than Girl students in Activity level, Excitement Seeking, Cheerfulness and entire Extraversion but lesser in Gregariousness.

**Table-5: Showing the t-values along with other Relevant Measures for the Sex-wise Differences in Agreeableness as well as its Facets**

Statistics	N		Mean		SD		SE <sub>D</sub>		t-Value	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Trust	200	200	6.24	6.22	1.82	1.86	.184		.109	
Morality	200	200	5.54	6.22	1.79	1.77	.178		3.822*	
Altruism	200	200	5.28	6.38	1.19	1.15	.117		9.408*	
Compliance	200	200	5.64	6.58	1.67	1.82	.175		5.380*	
Modesty	200	200	5.12	4.78	1.90	2.09	.197		1.727	
Sympathy	200	200	5.60	6.56	1.60	1.93	.178		5.462*	
Agreeableness	200	200	33.42	36.74	6.31	6.14	.623		5.346*	

\*Significant at .01 level

**Table-5** indicates that the t-values in respect of Morality, Altruism, Compliance, Sympathy and entire Agreeableness are significant at .01 level, which lead to the rejection of null hypotheses  $H_5$  (ii),

$H_5$  (iii),  $H_5$  (iv),  $H_5$  (vi), and  $H_5$  (vii), Further, the mean values indicate that Girl students scored higher than Boy students in respect of Morality, Altruism, Compliance, Sympathy and total Agreeableness.

**Table-6: Showing the t- values along with other Relevant Measures for the Sex-wise Differences in Neuroticism as well as its Facets**

Statistics	N		Mean		SD		SE <sub>D</sub>		t-Value	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Anxiety	200	200	4.56	4.59	1.73	1.78	.175		.142	
Anger	200	200	5.11	4.32	1.60	1.38	.150		5.239*	
Depression	200	200	4.44	3.16	1.61	0.99	.134		9.661*	
Self	200	200	4.42	4.66	1.30	1.50	.147		1.635	
Immoderation	200	200	4.44	3.39	1.63	1.55	.159		2.860*	
Vulnerability	200	200	4.07	3.96	1.56	1.66	.161		.684	
Neuroticism	200	200	27.05	24.68	3.98	3.70	.384		6.180*	

\*Significant at .01 level

**Table-6** indicates significant gender differences in Neuroticism and each of its facets except Anxiety and Self-Consciousness. It means the null hypotheses  $H_6$  (ii),  $H_6$  (iii),  $H_6$  (v) and  $H_6$  (vii)

are rejected. Further, the mean values infer that Boy students are more Angry, Depressed, Immoderate, and Neurotic than Girl Students.

**Table-7: Showing the Correlations of Altruism with Openness and each of its Facets**

	Imagination	Aesthetics	Emotionality	Adventurousness	Intellectual Curiosity	Liberalism	Openness
<b>r</b>	.006	.183	.131	-.043	-.154	-.091	-.004
<b>N</b>	400	400	400	400	400	400	400
<b>p</b>	.455	.000	.004	.195	.001	.034	.466

**Table-7** represents the correlations of altruism with openness as well as each of its facets. Correlation of altruism with each of aesthetics, emotionality, intellectual curiosity and liberalism are significant at either .01 or .05 level. Therefore, we reject the null hypotheses  $H_7$  (ii),  $H_7$  (iii) and  $H_7$  (v) and  $H_7$  (vi) which indicates that altruism has significant positive impact on aesthetics and emotionality but significant

negative impact on intellectual curiosity and liberalism. Other correlations of altruism with respect to Imagination, Adventurousness and entire Openness are insignificant which leads to the acceptance of null hypotheses  $H_7$  (i),  $H_7$  (iv), and  $H_7$  (vii). This implies that there exists no impact of altruism on the facets- imagination and adventurousness as well as entire Openness.

**Table-8: Showing the Correlations of Altruism with Conscientiousness and each of its Facets**

	Self Efficacy	Orderliness	Dutifulness	Achievement Striving	Self Discipline	Deliberation	Conscientiousness
<b>r</b>	-.041	.027	.632	-.070	-.015	-.029	.138
<b>N</b>	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
<b>p</b>	.207	.292	.000	.081	.383	.280	.000

**Table-8** represents the correlations of altruism with Conscientiousness as well as each of its facets. Correlation of altruism with each of Dutifulness and entire Conscientiousness are significant at .01 level. Therefore, we reject the null hypotheses  $H_8$  (iii) and  $H_8$  (vii). This indicates that altruism has an impact on Dutifulness as well as entire Conscientiousness. Other correlations of altruism with respect to Self-

Efficacy, Orderliness, Achievement Striving, Self Discipline and Deliberation are insignificant indicating the acceptance of null hypotheses  $H_8$  (i),  $H_8$  (ii),  $H_8$  (iv),  $H_8$  (v) and  $H_8$  (vi). This implies that there exists no impact of altruism on Self Efficacy, Orderliness, Achievement Striving, Self-Discipline and Deliberation.

**Table-9: Showing the Correlations of Altruism with Extraversion and each of its Facets**

	Friendliness	Gregariousness	Assertiveness	Activity Level	Excitement Seeking	Cheerfulness	Extraversion
<b>r</b>	.393	.516	.365	.187	.108	.264	.416
<b>N</b>	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
<b>p</b>	.000	.000	.000	.000	.015	.000	.000

**Table-9** represents the correlations of altruism with extraversion as well as each of its facets. Correlations of altruism with entire Extraversion, and each of its facets are significant either at .01 or .05 level. This

indicates the rejection of the null hypotheses  $H_9$  (i) to  $H_9$  (vii), implying that altruism has significant impact on Extraversion and all of its facets.

**Table-10: Showing the Correlations of Altruism with Agreeableness and each of its Facets**

	Trust	Morality	Altruism	Compliance	Modesty	Sympathy	Agreeableness
<b>r</b>	.502	.524	.948	.545	-.036	.441	.748
<b>N</b>	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
<b>p</b>	.000	.000	.000	.000	.233	.000	.000

**Table-10** represents the correlations of altruism with entire Agreeableness as well as each of its facets. Correlations of altruism with entire Agreeableness, and each of its facets except Modesty are significant at .01 level. Therefore, we reject the null hypotheses  $H_{10}$  (i),  $H_{10}$  (ii),  $H_{10}$  (iii),  $H_{10}$  (iv),  $H_{10}$  (vi) and  $H_{10}$

(vii) The correlation of altruism with Modesty is not significant which leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis  $H_{10}$  (v). These indicate that altruism has positive influence on entire Agreeableness and each of its facets, except Modesty.

**Table-11: Showing the Correlations of Altruism with Neuroticism and each of its Facets**

	Anxiety	Anger	Depression	Self Consciousness	Immoderation	Vulnerability	Neuroticism
<b>r</b>	-.025	-.132	-.194	-.041	-.027	.012	-.124
<b>N</b>	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
<b>p</b>	.307	.004	.000	.206	.298	.408	.006

**Table-11** represents the correlations of altruism with Neuroticism as well as each of its facets. Correlation of altruism with Anger, Depression, and entire Neuroticism are significant at .01 level. This implies that altruism has negative impact on Anger and Depression and entire Neuroticism. Therefore, we

reject the null hypotheses  $H_{11}$ (ii),  $H_{11}$ (iii) and  $H_{11}$ (vii). Other correlations of altruism with respect to Anxiety, Self Consciousness, Immoderation and Vulnerability are not significant which leads to the acceptance of null hypotheses  $H_{11}$  (i),  $H_{11}$  (iv),  $H_{11}$  (v) and  $H_{11}$  (vi). It implies no impact of altruism on

E: ISSN No. 2349-9443

each of Anxiety, Self-Consciousness, Immoderation and Vulnerability exists.

#### Summary and Conclusion

The study examines the relationship between altruism and Big Five Personality Traits of urban adolescent students. A sample of 400 adolescent students (age 15+) in urban area was selected from four schools (two for boys and two for girls). Following main points were obtained from the study.

1. Girls scored higher than boys in altruism and all of its indicators.
2. Girls scored higher than boys in respect of the three facets of Openness namely, Aesthetics, Emotionality and Intellectual Curiosity.
3. Boy students were more conscientious than girl students, though girl students scored higher than boy students in Dutifulness-- one of the traits of Conscientiousness. Other traits of Conscientiousness did not reveal gender differences.
4. Gender differences were also observed in Extraversion and all of its facets except Friendliness and Assertiveness. Differences went in favor of girl students with respect to Gregariousness only.
5. Girl students scored higher than boy students in Morality, Altruism, Compliance, Sympathy and Entire Agreeableness, whereas boy students scored better than girl students in Modesty only.
6. In case of Neuroticism and its facets, gender differences revealed that Girl students possessed lower level of Anger, Depression, Immoderation and entire Neuroticism than boy students.
7. Though, altruism had no impact on Openness, some of its facets like Aesthetics, Emotionality, Intellectual Curiosity and Liberalism, of urban students were influenced a little by altruism.
8. Positive impact of altruism on Dutifulness and entire Conscientiousness was obtained.
9. Altruism was observed to have influences on Extraversion and all of its facets of urban students.
10. Agreeableness and its all facets of urban students except modesty were influenced by their altruism.
11. Negative impact of altruism on Anger, Depression and entire Neuroticism were found for adolescent urban students.

Present research reveals that altruism plays an important role in constructing Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Agreeableness –the three of Big Five Personality Traits of urban adolescent students. Therefore, school and home should take the responsibility of imparting moral and value education to the adolescent students, through proper creation of ambience, accurate interaction, cooperation among themselves and friendly behavior, which will not only bring progress in their altruism via moral development and enhancing empathetic feelings, but also manifest their personality to the higher levels. This will make the society healthier.

#### References

1. Carlo, G., et al (1991). *The altruistic personality: In what contexts is it apparent?* *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 61(3), 450-458.

# Asian Resonance

2. Oda et al (2014). *Personality and Altruism in daily Life. Personality and Individual Difference*, 56, 206-09.
3. Tait, D. J., & C.M Whiteman (2009). *Personality Traits of Altruistic People: Empathy and Big Five Factors. Dissertation. Online: [http://hdl.Handle.net/1842/3547](http://hdl.handle.net/1842/3547).*
4. Carlo, G., et al (2005). *The interplay of traits and motives on volunteering: agreeableness, extraversion and prosocial value motivation. Faculty Publications, Department of Psychology, University of Nebraska – Lincoln.*
5. Emmerik, I.H., I.M. Jawahar, and T.H.Stone (2004). *The Relationship between Personality and Discretionary Helping Behaviors. Psychological Report*, 95(1), 355-65.
6. Karmakar, R. and A. Ghosh (2012). *Altruistic Behaviors of Adolescent in Different Regions in India. Journal of Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 38 (1). 44-53.
7. Drebera, A., et al "In Bloom: Gender Differences in Preferences Among Adolescents". *Social Science Research Network*, 35(734), 88-97, Jul. 2012, [Online].
8. Mandal, M.B., and C. Mehera. (2016). *A Study on Altruism and Interest in Literature at Higher Secondary Level. American Journal of Educational Research*, 4 (9) 689-694, Newark.
9. Krebs and Sturup (1982). *Role-Taking Ability and Altruistic Behaviour in Elementary School Children. Journal of Moral Education.*[Online, 2006], <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0305724820110204>.
10. Rashmi, S., D.K. Sharma and C.S. Sushil (2010). *A Comparative Study of Altruism Among the Boys and Girls of Joint and Nuclear Families. Journal of Mental Health and Human Behavior*, 15 (2), 88-90,
11. Michael, V.S., and M.R.Roelofs (2011) *Heterogeneous Preferences for Altruism: Gender and Personality, Social Status, Giving and Taking. Experimental Economics*. 14(4), 490-506. [Online, Mar 2011] DOI: 10.1007/s10683-011-9278-4.
12. Hubber, J.T., D. A. MacDonald (2011). *An Investigation of the Relations Between Altruism, Empathy, and Spirituality. Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 52(2).