

## CONTENTS

<b>INDEX</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>EFFECTIVENESS OF CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH FOR LEARNING ACHIEVEMENT IN GEOGRAPHY AMONG IX CLASS STUDENTS.</b> Dr. Anuradha Pal, Dr. Shivpal Singh	<b>2</b>
<b>OPTIMIZATION OF HEALTH-CARE RESOURCES THROUGH GOAL PROGRAMMING.</b> Dr. Tarun Kumar Vashishth, Dr. Rajendra Kumar Singh, Mr. Rajeev Sharma	<b>11</b>
<b>A STUDY ON ALTRUISM OF SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENT IN MEERUT DISTRICT IN RELATION TO THEIR SOCIO- ECONOMIC STATUS AND SEX.</b> Mr. Rakesh Kumar Keshari	<b>17</b>
<b>GOING GREEN: WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO GREEN MARKETING.</b> Mr. Rajeev Kumar	<b>42</b>
<b>DIGITAL INDIA A PROGRAMME TO TRANSFORM INDIA</b> Ms. Shweta Sharma	<b>54</b>

# A STUDY ON ALTRUISM OF SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENT IN MEERUT DISTRICT IN RELATION TO THEIR SOCIO- ECONOMIC STATUS AND SEX

**Mr. Rakesh Kumar Keshari**

**Assistant Professor**

**Dewan institute of Management Studies (College of Education), Meerut, U.P., India**

## ABSTRACT

The present research study was design to investigate to the study of the problem related to altruism quality its contribution to schools, students in relation to the socio-economic status of the students in senior secondary school students. The data were collected from 310 students through questionnaire from different college students of University of Ch.Charan Singh University using the simple random sampling technique. For analysis, correlation, t-test was used. The findings revealed that different factors and academic performance are closely related of Altruism of Senior Secondary School Student.

**Keywords: Socio-Economic Status, Altruism quality, Student Background,**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The term altruism, benevolence, compassion empathy, fellow feeling, sympathy and love (despite distinctions among them) all that refer to behavior that has it's aim to produce, maintain or improve the physical or psychological welfare and integrity of another persons. The term describe the behavior that is directed in a positive way and is given the name of positive social behavior by Wispe (1978), who distinguishes ifs three principal forms altruism, sympathy and helping Research and theory about positive social behavior is bargaining perhaps this is response to the troubles of our times,perhaps to the tumult of the 1960 are perhaps to the realization that the behavioral scientist have been to long concerned largely with anti social behavior. Whatever is the reason Research on positive social behavior is increasing and to being rewarded. The American Association for the advancement of science awarded it's prestigious prize in 1968at Latane and Darley for their Work on by standard intervention and in 1969 to Zick Rubin for his study of romantic love. in the decade 1960-70 six major works on positive social behaviour produced by behavioural scientists:Gouldner (1960) contributed his classic article on reciprocity norms, Berkowitz (Berkowitz and Daniels 1963, Daniels and Berkowitz, 1963) established the

legitimacy of investing helping behaviour under the laboratory conditions ,Campbell (1965) ,had the temerity to use the philosophical term altruism in psychology, Aronfreed (1968) reported about sympathy in children and latane and Darley (1970) work unresponsive bystander captured the imagination of the behavioural science about the same time ,there were other important force stimulating interest in positive social behaviour .There was political activism for both students and their professors. These took place various experiments in communal living .The peace movement witnessed a resurgence. The humanistic philosophers made an impact and there occurred an increasing emphasis on cognitive psychology. By the end of 1960s, the names in the game underwent a change There has been studies of sympathy (e.g. Murphy}1937)and cooperation (e.g. Mead} 1937)}but now terms like aiding ,attraction ,charity, friendship, helping ,sharing and trust make their appreance in the literature of psychology. Altruism is the favorite term of the biologists .Wilson's (1975) work has revitalized and enlivened the term. The biologists have contributed one of the most important theoretical explanation for altruistic behavior. This is obviously a genetic explanation the fundamental of concern of the biologists is whether altruism can be explained by the natural selection. Wilson argues for the possibility of some kind of the genetic evolution of altruism because altruism is some way increases the genetic fitness of the species .Wilson's position holds the field. Anthropologists and psychologists disputes Wilson's genetic claim Campbell (1978) argues for the social evolution of the altruism. The factor of genetic competition for procreative opportunities cannot provide according to Campbell, the felicitous occasion for the progress of altruism. As against this criticism of Campbell of political scientists (Masters, 1978) maintains the natural selection can account for altruism because the traits that make for intra species dominance and reproductive success can include at least some forms of altruism .Anthropologists and philosophers have sought for the social bases of altruism. The concept of sympathy is the only serious explanatory contender, though perhaps, it is complimentary to the genetic explanation for the altruistic behaviour. It is interesting to note that even Darwin, the biologist used the concept of the sympathy but, it found it's way in to the behavioural sciences probably, through Hume and Adam Smith. But Cohen (1972) supports Campbell, for he believes that sympathy and altruism are culturally determined. He substantiates his belief from several cross cultural analysis for both phenomenons. In

recent years altruistic behavior has come to be one of the central concerns of social psychology. Evidence of the concern is the inclusion of the chapter on this topic in recent social psychological text books like those of Baron. Byrnes and Griffitt (1974), Berkowitz (1972,1975), Freidman, Carl Smith and Sear(1974),and Middle Brook, (1974) .Dozens of impelled studies ,of pro social behavior have been carried out both in laboratory and in the field .Pre- social behavior is one of the few areas of social psychology where research has been conducted mostly in the field. The increasing popularity of the study of altruism is due to its theoretical and practical importance. Theoretically, investigation of the conditions which entails self sacrifice should (until scaling techniques are used) provide crude estimates about the nature of reinforcement, their strength and limitation. For example, social approval is effective and material goods ineffective in changing an individual's willingness to sacrifice. Practically, in clinical Psychology the therapeutic use of the generalized reinforcers may lose its value (Bryan and London,1970).The study of altruism is particularly, important for understanding socialization process. (Ruhton, 1976). The emergence of the present techno secular mode of civilization red uses the chances of flourishing of altruism. Therefore, the study of the condition of altruism becomes important for conducting the affair of life. Actually altruism is indispensable for the survival of society and human.

## 2. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The term altruism has not been widely used by behavioral scientists for two reasons, Firstly, self -sacrificial bravery is an extreme form of behavior with low rates of occurrence even in warfare. Secondly, the study of altruism creates problems for the behavioral scientists. It is a wrong paradigm for him. Since the rise of Adam Smith, the behavioral sciences have preferred an exchange model of social interaction grounded in psychological hedonism in which model altruism is hard to handle ,biologists ,however, have found the term useful they originally used the term to refer heroic altruism, often self-destructive ,directed towards the well-being of others (Wispe,1978). More recently they begun to use the term to refer to behavior the counteracts the effect of individual's selection as altruistic. The behavioral scientist means by altruism any unselfish behavior, together directed .Both the biologists and behavioral scientists focus on the welfare of the other person(s) however, two distinctions are worth nothing .First, the term altruism seems to be a generic term for

other directed behavior and there are many synonyms for such behavior .Secondly, altruism refers to actions that have at least the potential for the extreme self-sacrifice .The self-sacrifice may be self-annihilating or merely inconvenient . In short, behavior designated as altruistic, must be directed to the wellbeing of others and must involve at least some nontrivial self-sacrifice. Pro social behavior is defined by Bar-Tal (1976) as voluntary behavior that is carried out to benefit another without anticipation of external rewards and is performed under two circumstances of external rewards and is performed under two circumstances (a) the behaviors is done for its own end, and (b) the behavior is done as an act of restitution. These conditions limit prosodies behavior to two forms altruism and restitution. While there are differences about the precise definition of altruism, there is general agreement that altruistic behavior must be carried out volunteering, must aim to benefit another and must be carried out without anticipation of reward. The difference arises about further specification of altruistic behaviors. Thus Midlarsky (1968) takes altruism to be a sub-category of aiding referring to helpful action which incur some cost to be individual but bring either very little or nothing by way of gain, relative to the magnitude of the investment. Bryan and Test (1969) take altruism to mean those acts ~here in individual's sharing or sacrifice is a positive reinforce for no apparent social or material gain. Walester and Piliavin (1972) hold that altruistic behaviors is generally thoughts of as behaviors that benefits another rather than the self, when something is done out of the goodness of one's hearts. Aronfreed (1970) and Cohen(1972) stipulate empathy as an essential conditions for altruistic behavior leads(1973) presents three conditions for altruistic behavior; (i) it must be treated as an end in itself, (ii) it must be elicited voluntarily, and (iii) it must be judged by others as doing good. An examination of these various definitions reveal that all the definitions agree that a person carrying out an altruistic act should not accept any external rewards. The disagreement lies about the self-rewards in the form of feeling of satisfaction, pride or joy on the performance of the particular act Rosenhan (1972) and Walester and Pilivavin (1972) object to self-rewards as being a part of the altruistic behavior the inclusion of the self-reward In the definition tautological. Moreover, there are difficulties in identifying self-rewards. It is, therefore, necessary to distinguish helping behavior carried out because of internal rewards and with out external rewards. Bar-Tal is, inclined to include the possibilities of self-rewards in



altruistic behavior. Macauley and Berkowitz (1972) have defined altruism as behavior carried out anticipation of rewards from external sources. To this definition Bar-Tal adds an extra condition, namely that behavior must be voluntary, and done for its own sake .A more detailed description of the altruistic behavior comes from Walster and Pilliavin's analysis of behavior of good Samaritan's actions are (a) not in response to social pressures or moral obligations,(b) costly to himself, and (c) gratuitous as he receives nothing for himself .It seems to mean action that is freely directed toward the well being of other persons. Ronald Cohen (1972) refers to the altruistic paradox which arises from the fact that mankind individually and collectively can be both cruel and kind of one and the same time .Man himself may be good or bad and capable of empathy and kindness, but as a member of a social system,he is some times forced to carry out inhuman as well as humane acts. In it's optimistic mode (man is good) as in the rousseauesque or Marxian tradition man is essentially good and capable of kind, and noble thoughts and acts. However,sometimes,he gets caught in bad societies (or relation of production) that create bestial,selfish and inhuman behavior .The opposite and pessimistic mode (man is bad) runs in a line from Machiavelli to Hobbes to Freud this mode man is said posses basically animistic and bestial qualities that must be controlled by a society and its laws or else he would become worse than an animal of prey .It is interesting that both these modes use comparative materials from mother cultures to prove the soundness of their arguments.

Secondary education becomes the middle layers in the edifice of the entire education system of country .It covers the middle age and important period of life this period prepares for future citizen of country. As we find Muzaffar Nagar is most criminal district of Asian Countries.It makes clear that the atrocities anomie and demon values are not only in Uttar Pradesh rather all over India becomes a matter of discussion .The most important factor of today threaten to our country is indiscipline. Hardly a day passes when we do not hear that the students are taking law into their hands at a naught against their authority. Strikes become their normal tool. All these led some elder people to think that the modern student especially secondary school student are pampered and spoiled other wise, it would not have been as we find today.The secondary school students are more selfish during the period of adolescent.

Socio-economic-status is considered as an important variable in social science research .It has been and is being included quite often as a variable in studies in psychology, sociology, education and other social science streams. Socio economic is considered as an indicator of

social and economic position .Sometimes it refers to the socio that means the level way the people fit into the community in which they live. It reflects how well they are educated, have jobs etc. Economic condition refers to the financial position of the people with in the society and includes how much they regularly earn, whether own house and the assets owned etc.From the above discussion it is very clear that altruistic value is an Indispensable for senior school student being this period is a preparation 'of the life and personality as a whole. This schooling also affected by socio-economic condition of student .Being a resident of Meerut the researcher is very much interested to know the reality of altruism rather than the sweeping arguments sponsored by different researchers and thinkers and educationists all along. Hence, the study is justified for M.Phil. dissertation.

### **3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

As the researcher very much interested to study the problem related to altruism quality its contribution to schools ,students in relation to the socio-economic status of the students and with preliminary investigation the researcher finds not a single study in Meerut District on altruism in Senior secondary school students which is the need of the hour; the researcher is fascinated to tread on the unthread path the study is entitled as “**A STUDY ON ALTRUISM OF SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENT IN MEERUT DISTRICT IN RELATION TO THEIR SOCIO- ECONOMIC STATUS AND SEX**”

#### **1.18 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The Objectives of the study as follows

- (i) To study altruism of senior secondary school student in relation to their socio-economic-student in Meerut District.
- (ii) To compare the altruism of high social-economic status, medium socio-economic status, and low social-economic status in regards to their sex.
- (iii) To find out the difference on altruism among the senior secondary school student in Meerut district.
- (iv) To suggest remedial measures for on altruism and its improvement.

#### **1.19 HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY**

**Ho-1** : "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of high socio-economic status and having very high altruism senior secondary school student and

girls of high socio-economic status and having very high altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Ho-2 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of high socioeconomic-status and having high altruism senior secondary school student and girls of high socio-economic- status and having high altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Ho-3 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of high socio economic-status and having medium altruism senior secondary school student and girls of high socio-economic status and having medium altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Ho-4 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of high socio-economic-status and having low altruism senior secondary school student and girls of high socio-economic- status and having low altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Ho-5 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of high socio, economic-status and having very low altruism senior secondary school student and girls of high socio-economic status and having very low altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Ho-6 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio-economic-status and having very high altruism senior secondary school student and girls of medium socio-economic- status and having very high altruism in senior secondary school student" .

**Ho-7 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio-economic-status and having high altruism senior secondary school student and girls of medium socio-economic- status and having high altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Ho-8 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio-economic-status and having medium altruism senior secondary school student and girls of medium socio-economic- status and having medium altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Ho-9 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio-economic-status and having low altruism senior secondary school student and girls of medium socio-economic- status and having low altruism in senior secondary



school student"

**Ho-10 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio-economic-status and having very low altruism senior secondary school student and girls of medium socio-economic- status and having very low altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Ho-11 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of low socioeconomic-status and having very high altruism senior secondary school student and girls of low socio-economic- status and having very high altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Ho-12 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of low socio economic-status and having high altruism senior secondary school student and girls of low socio-economic- status and having high altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Ho-13 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference on boys of socio economic-status and having medium altruism senior secondary school student and girls of low socio-economic- status and having medium altruism in senior secondary school student.

**Ho-14 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of low socioeconomic-status and having low altruism senior secondary school student and girls of low socio-economic- status and having low altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Ho-15 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of very low socio-economic-status and having altruism senior secondary school student and girls of low socio-economic- status and having very low altruism in senior secondary school student"

## **1.20 SCOPE AND DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY**

The delimitation of the study as follows:

- (i)** The study is delimited to Meerut district of Uttar Pradesh only.
- (ii)** The study is delimited to senior secondary school student of Meerut district of Uttar Pradesh.
- (iii)** The study is delimited to both the sexes of senior secondary school student in Meerut of Uttar Pradesh.
- (iv)** The study is delimited to sample of 210 out of which 105 will be of boys and 105 girls

and will be selected through random sampling method

## 21 OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF THE TERMS

- **Altruism:** Altruism refers to the principle of putting the care of others above one's own welfare
- **Senior Secondary School Student:** Senior Secondary school student refers to the student reading in the senior secondary school student as per the rules, regulation, norms and standard by the Uttar Pradesh Senior secondary Board, Allahabad.
- **Socio-Economic-Status:** Socio economic status refers to social and economical position of a person that determines its possessor, apart from his personal attribute or social services, a degree of respect, prestige and influence who have been assigned different role in a group of community.

## POPULATION

The entire group from which population has been taken is known as population, A population consists of objects, person, attributes, qualities, behavior or dominate objects such as cities families, opinion of electorates of nation and the like. The population of the present study consists of all the students of Meerut District reading in Higher Secondary both boys and girls.

## SAMPLE

Sample is a relatively small group of students or objects selectively chosen from the population which represents all the characteristics of the population in it from the research point view. It is neither possible nor desirable to conduct the study of the entire population. Thus, selection of sample is not only desirable, rather it is necessary. The initial sample of this study consisted of 310 students from the different colleges of Ch. Charan Singh University. The sample was chosen from Western Uttar Pradesh,

### 10. Method of Sampling

In this proposed study the sample was based on the stratified random sampling.

### 11. Research Methodology

The proposed study was based on survey method. All description of the present study including findings and implications were written in detailed form.

### 12. Tools Used

The following tools are adopted for the study

- Altruism scale for student
- Socio- Economic scale

### 13.Presentation of data

The tools prepared as per the description in the previous chapter where administered to a sample of 300 School Student (150 Boys and 150 Girls) of Meerut District. The research in course of data collection visited the Intermediate Colleges and administered the tools and obtained through the head of institution in respect of all the sampled Intermediate Colleges Student on whom the tools was administered and they were all taken for analysis and interpretation.

### 14.Testing of Hypothesis

The Hypothesis were tested through ‘t’ test to know the significance difference between two means as follows.

HSES	high socio economic-status
MSES	Medium socio economic-status
LSES	Low socio economic-status
VHA	very high altruism
HA	high altruism
MHA	Medium altruism
LA	Low altruism
VLA	very Low altruism

**Ho-1:** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of high socio economic-status and having very high altruism senior secondary school student and girls of high socio-economic- status and having very high altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Table:1**

Sl	Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SE D	df	't'/2 value	Table Value	N/S / HS
1	Altruism	HSES boys having VHA	10	55	3.13	3.18	1.18	18	-1.69	0.10 Level 1.73	NS
		HSES girls having VHA	10	57	2.90					0.05 Level 2.10	

**Ho-2 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of high socioeconomic-status and having high altruism senior secondary school student and girls of high socio-economic- status and having high altruism in senior secondary school student"

Sl	Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SED	df	't'/z value	Table Value	N/S / HS
1	Altruism	HSES Boys having high altruism	10	41.6	4.71	4.41	1.94	18	-0.52	0.10 Level 1.73	NS
		HSES girls having high altruism	10	42.6	3.58					0.05 Level 2.10	

**Table:2**

**Ho-3 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of high socio economic-status and having medium altruism senior secondary school student and girls of high socio-economic- status and having medium altruism in senior secondary school student"

Sl	Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SED	df	't'/2 value	Table Value	N/S / HS
1	ALTRUISM	HSES Boys Having M A	10	28.3	4.05	3.39	1.49	18	1.95	0.10 Level 1.73	S
		HSES Girls Having M A	10	25.4	2.06					0.05 Level 2.10	

**Table:3**

**Ho-4 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of high socioeconomic-status and having low altruism senior secondary school student and girls of high socio-economic- status and having low altruism in senior secondary school student

**Table:4**

Sl	Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SED	df	't'/2 value	Table Value	N/S / HS
1	Altruism	HSES Boys Having LA	10	21.5	3.83	3.45	1.52	18	2.69	0.10 Level 1.73	S
		HSES Girls Having LA	10	17.4	2.62					0.05 Level 2.10	

**Ho-5 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of high socio, economic-status and having very low altruism senior secondary school student and girls of high socio-economic- status and having very low altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Table:5**

S I	Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SED	df	't'/2 value	Table Value	N/S / HS
1	Altruism	HSES Boys Having VLA	10	5.2	0.69	0.89	0.39	18	4.10	0.10 Level 1.73	HS
		HSES Girls Having VLA	10	6.8	.097					0.05 Level 2.10	



**Ho-6 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio-economic-status and having very high altruism senior secondary school student and girls of medium socio-economic- status and having very high altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Table:6 .**

S I	Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SED	df	't'/2 value	Table Value	N/S / HS
1	altruism	MSES boys having VHA	10	56	4.89	5.34	2.35	18	-1.48	0.10 Level 1.73	NS
		MSES girls having VHA	10	59.5	5.22					0.05 Level 2.10	

**Ho-7 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio-economic-status and having high altruism senior secondary school student and girls of medium socio-economic- status and having high altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Table:7**

S I	Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SED	df	't'/2 value	Table Value	N/S / HS
1	altruism	MSES boys having High altruism	10	37	1.18	4.24	1.84	18	-3.74	0.10 Level 1.73	NS
		MSES girls having High altruism	10	44	3.54					0.05 Level 2.10	

**Ho-8 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio-economic-status and having medium altruism senior secondary school student and girls of medium socio-economic- status and having medium altruism in senior secondary school student"

Table:8

S	Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SED	df	't'/2 value	Table Value	N/S / HS
1	Altruism	MSES boys having MA	10	30	2.45	3.61	1.59	18	-0.63	0.10 Level 1.73	NS
		MSES girls having MA	10	31	4.17					0.05 Level 2.10	

**Ho-9 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio-economic-status and having low altruism senior secondary school student and girls of medium socio-economic- status and having low altruism in senior secondary school student"

Table:9

S	Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SED	df	't'/2 value	Table Value	N/S / HS
1	altruism	MSES boys having LA	10	17	2.32	2.33	1.03	18	-1.94	0.10 Level 1.73	NS
		MSES girls having LA	10	19	2.09					0.05 Level 2.10	

**Ho-10 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio-economic-status and having very low altruism senior secondary school student and girls of medium socio-economic- status and having very low altruism in senior secondary school student"

Table:10

S	Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SED	df	't'/2 value	Table Value	N/S / HS
1	altruism	MSES boys having Very LA	30	4.3	1	1.16	0.58	18	-3.33	0.10 Level 1.73	NS

		<b>MSES girls having Very L A</b>	30	6	1.18					0.05 Level 2.10	
--	--	-----------------------------------	----	---	------	--	--	--	--	-----------------	--

**Ho-11 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of low socioeconomic-status and having very high altruism senior secondary school student and girls of low socio-economic- status and having very high altruism in senior secondary school student"

S	Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SED	df	't'/2 value	Table Value	N/S / HS
1	Altruism	LSES boys having VHA	10	54.4	2.42	2.85	1.25	18	-4.48	0.10 Level 1.73	NS
		LSES girls having VHA	10	60	2.97					0.05 Level 2.10	

Table:11

**Ho-12 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of low socio economic-status and having high altruism senior secondary school student and girls of low socio-economic- status and having high altruism in senior secondary school student"

Table:12

Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SED	df	't'/2 value	Table Value	N/S / HS
LSES boys having VHA	LSES boys having HA	10	41	2.97	3.49	1.54	18	-2.59	0.10 Level 1.73	NS
	LSES girls having HA	10	45	3.63					0.05 Level 2.10	

**Ho-13 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference on boys of Low socio economic-status and having medium altruism senior secondary school student and girls of low socio-economic- status and having medium altruism in senior secondary school student.

**Table:13**

Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SED	df	't'/z value	Table Value	N/S / HS
Altruism	LSES boys having MA	10	29	3.19	3.59	1.58	18	-1.89	0.10 Level 1.73	NS
	LSES girls having MA	10	32	3.60					0.05 Level 2.10	

**Ho-14 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of low socio-economic-status and having low altruism in senior secondary school student and girls of low socio-economic- status and having low altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Table:14**

Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SED	df	't'/2 value	Table Value	N/S / HS
Altruism	LSES boys having LA	10	18	2.05	2.18	0.96	18	-1.04	0.10 Level 1.73	NS
	LSES girls having LA	10	19	2.09					0.05 Level 2.10	

**Ho-15 :** "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of low socio-economic-status and having very low altruism in senior secondary school student and girls of low socio-economic- status and having very low altruism in senior secondary school student"

**Table:15**

Variable	Group	Total Number of Cases	Mean	SD	Pooled SD	SED	df	't'/2 value	Table Value	N/S / HS
Altruism	LSES boys having VLA	10	5	.77	1.22	.53	18	-1.88	0.10 Level 1.73	NS
	LSES girls having VLA	10	6	1.48					0.05 Level 2.10	

## **15 MAIN FINDING**

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 1**

It is found clear from the 't' table of Henry E. Garrette that the critical value of 't' with 18 degree of freedom at 0.05, 0.01, 0.10 level of significance is 2.10, 1.73. Our computed value of 't' i.e. -1.69 is quite smaller than the critical table value 2.10, 1.73 and hence is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys to high socio economic status and having very high socio economic status and having very high attributes senior secondary school student and girls of high socio economic status and having very high altruism in senior secondary school student cannot be rejected and result of which, the given difference in sample means being insignificant, can only be attributed to some chance factors or sampling fluctuation.

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 2**

It is found clear from the 't' table of Henry E. Garrette that the critical value of 't' with 18 degree of freedom at 0.05, 0.01, 0.10 level of significance is 2.10, 1.73. Our computed value of 't' i.e. -0.52 is quite smaller than the critical table value 2.10, 1.73 and hence is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significance difference in boys to high socio economic status and having very high attributes senior secondary school student and girls of high socio economic status and having very high altruism in senior secondary school student cannot be rejected and result of which, the given difference in sample means being insignificant, can only be attributed to some chance factors or sampling fluctuation.

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 3**

Here the researches have to use a one tailed test because he has every reason to believe that his treatment will produce an effect in the positive direction only. Therefore, referred the 't' table with  $N_1 + N_2 - 2$  is 18 degrees of freedom and locate the 't' value under the column 0.10, 0.05, 0.01 level of confidence for determining the critical value of 't' = 0.05 level consequently at 5%, 1%, 10% level of significance the critical value of 't' i.e. 1.95 crosses 1.73. Hence, it is taken as significant at the 0.05%, 0.10, 0.01 Level. As a result, with 0.10 level of confidence, we can reject the null hypothesis that i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of high socio economic status and having



medium altruism senior secondary school student and girls of high socio economic status and having medium altruism in senior secondary school student and girls of high socio economic status and having medium altruism in senior secondary school student.

#### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 4**

Here the researcher has to use a one tailed test because he has every reason to believe that his treatment will produce an effect in the positive direction only. Therefore, refer the 't' table with  $N_1 + N_2 - 2$  is 18 degrees of freedom and locate the 't' value under the column 0.10, 0.05, 0.01 level of confidence for determining the critical value of 't' = 0.05 level consequently at 5%, 1%, 10% level of significance the critical value of 't' i.e. 2.10, 2.88, 1.73 our computed value of 't' i.e. 2.69 crosses. Hence, it is taken as significant at the 0.05, 0.10, 0.01 Level. As a result, with 0.05 level of confidence, we can reject the null hypothesis that i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of high socio economic status and having low altruism senior secondary school student and girls of high socio economic status and having medium altruism in senior secondary school student and girls of high socio economic status and having low altruism in senior secondary school student.

#### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 5**

Here the researcher has to use a one tailed test because he has every reason to believe that his treatment will produce an effect in the positive direction only. Therefore, refer the 't' table with  $N_1 + N_2 - 2$  is 18 degrees of freedom and locate the 't' value under the column 0.10, 0.05, 0.01 level of confidence for determining the critical value of 't' = 0.05 level consequently at 5%, 1%, 10% level of significance the critical value of 't' i.e. 2.10, 2.88, 1.73 our computed value of 't' i.e. 4.10 crosses 2.88. Hence, it is taken as significant at the 0.05, 0.10, 0.01 Level. As a result, with 0.01 level of confidence, we can reject the null hypothesis that i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of high socio economic status and having low altruism senior secondary school student and girls of high socio economic status and having medium altruism in senior secondary school student and girls of high socio economic status and having low altruism in senior secondary school student.

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 6**

It is found clear from the 't' table of Henry E. Garrette that the critical value of 't' with 18 degree of freedom at 0.05, 0.01, 0.10 level of significance is 2.10, 1.73. Our computed value of 't' i.e.- 1.48 is quite smaller than the critical table value 2.10, 1.73 and hence is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio economic status and having very high altruism Senior Secondary School student and girls of medium socio economic status and having very altruism in senior secondary school student can not be rejected and result of which, the given difference in sample means being insignificant, can only be attributed to same chance factors or sampling fluctuation.

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 7**

It is found clear from the 't' table of Henry E. Garrette that the critical value of 't' with 18 degree of freedom at 0.05, 0.01, 0.10 level of significance is 2.10, 1.73, 2.88. Our computed value of 't' i.e. -3.74 is quite smaller than the critical table value 2.10, 1.73, 2.88 and hence is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio economic status and having very high altruism Senior Secondary School student and girls of medium socio economic status and having very altruism in senior secondary school student can not be rejected and result of which, the given difference in sample means being insignificant, can only be attributed to same chance factors or sampling fluctuation.

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 8**

It is found clear from the 't' table of Henry E. Garrette that the critical value of 't' with 18 degree of freedom at 0.05, 0.01, 0.10 level of significance is 2.10, 1.73, 2.88. Our computed value of 't' i.e. -0.63 is quite smaller than the critical table value 2.10, 1.73, 2.88 and hence is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio economic status and having very high altruism Senior Secondary School student and girls of medium socio economic status and having very altruism in senior secondary school student can not be rejected and result of which, the given difference in sample means being insignificant, can only be attributed to same chance factors or sampling fluctuation.

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 9**

It is found clear from the 't' table of Henry E. Garrette that the critical value of 't' with 18 degree of freedom at 0.05, 0.01, 0.10 level of significance is 2.10, 1.73, 2.88. Our computed value of 't' i.e. -1.94 is quite smaller than the critical table value 2.10, 1.73, 2.88 and hence is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio economic status and having very low altruism in Senior Secondary School student and girls of medium socio economic status and having very altruism in senior secondary school student can not be rejected and result of which, the given difference in sample means being insignificant, can only be attributed to same chance factors or sampling fluctuation.

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 10**

It is found clear from the 't' table of Henry E. Garrette that the critical value of 't' with 18 degree of freedom at 0.05, 0.01, 0.10 level of significance is 2.10, 1.73, 2.88. Our computed value of 't' i.e. -3.33 is quite smaller than the critical table value 2.10, 1.73, 2.88 and hence is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio economic status and having very low altruism in Senior Secondary School student and girls of medium socio economic status and having very altruism in senior secondary school student can not be rejected and result of which, the given difference in sample means being insignificant, can only be attributed to same chance factors or sampling fluctuation.

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 11**

It is found clear from the 't' table of Henry E. Garrette that the critical value of 't' with 18 degree of freedom at 0.05, 0.01, 0.10 level of significance is 2.10, 1.73, 2.88. Our computed value of 't' i.e. -4.48 is quite smaller than the critical table value 2.10, 1.73, 2.88 and hence is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio economic status and having very low altruism in Senior Secondary School student and girls of medium socio economic status and having very altruism in senior secondary school student can not be rejected and result of which, the given difference in sample means being insignificant, can only be attributed to same chance factors or sampling fluctuation.

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 12**

It is found clear from the 't' table of Henry E. Garrette that the critical value of 't' with 18 degree of freedom at 0.05, 0.01, 0.10 level of significance is 2.10, 1.73, 2.88. Our computed value of 't' i.e. -2.59 is quite smaller than the critical table value 2.10, 1.73, 2.88 and hence is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio economic status and having very low altruism in Senior Secondary School student and girls of medium socio economic status and having very altruism in senior secondary school student can not be rejected and result of which, the given difference in sample means being insignificant, can only be attributed to same chance factors or sampling fluctuation.

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 13**

It is found clear from the 't' table of Henry E. Garrette that the critical value of 't' with 18 degree of freedom at 0.05, 0.01, 0.10 level of significance is 2.10, 1.73, 2.88. Our computed value of 't' i.e. -1.89 is quite smaller than the critical table value 2.10, 1.73, 2.88 and hence is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of medium socio economic status and having very low altruism in Senior Secondary School student and girls of low socio economic status and having very altruism in senior secondary school student can not be rejected and result of which, the given difference in sample means being insignificant, can only be attributed to same chance factors or sampling fluctuation.

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 14**

It is found clear from the 't' table of Henry E. Garrette that the critical value of 't' with 18 degree of freedom at 0.05, 0.01, 0.10 level of significance is 2.10, 1.73, 2.88. Our computed value of 't' i.e. -1.04 is quite smaller than the critical table value 2.10, 1.73, 2.88 and hence is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of low socio economic status and having low altruism in Senior Secondary School student and girls of low socio economic status and having low altruism in senior secondary school student can not be rejected and result of which, the given difference in sample means being insignificant, can only be attributed to same chance factors or sampling fluctuation.

## ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF TABLE 15

It is found clear from the 't' table of Henry E. Garrette that the critical value of 't' with 18 degree of freedom at 0.05, 0.10 level of significance is 2.10, 1.73. Our computed value of 't' i.e. -1.88 is quite smaller than the critical table value 2.10, 1.73 and hence is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis i.e. "There would not have been any statistically significant difference in boys of low socio economic status and having very low altruism Senior Secondary School student and girls of low socio economic status and having low altruism in senior secondary school student can not be rejected and result of which, the given difference in sample means being insignificant, can only be attributed to same chance factors or sampling fluctuation.

## 5.2 CONCLUSION:

Do age and gender play a role in people's taste altruism? Past researchers have found conflicting evidence, where sometimes men are fairer and sometimes women are. In this study I examined the behavior of boys and girls, and young and old across different choices with varying prices of altruism. I find that, depending on price, either sex can be more altruistic for the grade school and high school students. In college, girls are more altruistic regardless of cost, although they are much more so when the price of giving is low. For the senior secondary school class, when the price of giving is high, men are more altruistic, but when the price is low, women's level of altruistic approaches that the men's. This is not true in the youngest age group, where neither sex is significantly price sensitive. In other words, men's taste for altruistic is more price sensitive than women's, and their demand curves are more elastic in the senior secondary class, but the reverse is true for the other two age groups. The men's demand curve for altruistic cross the women's demand curve from below in the college class, and the women's curve is always lower in the high school group. These results are confirmed by my interactive variable coefficient for age price. Looking at age, I notice an increase in altruistic followed by a decrease. The sixth grade class gave very little, and half of their class kept all of their income. Moving to the high school class, there was a significant increase in altruistic. This brought me to the conclusion that altruistic is learned between the end of grade school and the end of high school. However, in the college age group there is another decline in altruistic, bringing the level of sharing back down to the original level seen in the grade school class. This may be



due to the use of extra credit points rather than money. There findings imply a few things. One is that there is a systematic different in the way men and women decide to share. The price of sharing does have an effect on both sexes in the 12<sup>th</sup> grade and colleges classes, and economists other than myself have reached these results also. However, my experiment is the first including children in this analysis. In 12<sup>th</sup> grade the men are more price sensitive than women, and the opposite is true in college. Secondly, age plays a role in altruistic, as the levels of sharing definitely varied throughout the age groups in the experiment. Other variables included had less of an impact on subject's decision to share. While number of siblings was important in the sixth grade class, it was of little relevance in the other age groups. Height and weight also played an insignificant role in the subject's decisions. Other included variable were not significant in the choices of either sex, or any age group.

In conclusion, there was variables that help predict altruistic tendencies. While gender age are the most obvious, price also plays a large role, while income surprisingly does not. These factors can be indicators of how to predict future behavior in following experiments or to predict behavior in real life.

Someone has Rightly Remarked:

**“what we have done for ourselves alone dies with us;  
what we have done for others and the world and is immortal”**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Batson, C. D., & Shaw, L. L., (1991).** Evidence for Altruism: Toward a Pluralism of Pro-social Motives. *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol. 2.

**Batson, C. D., (1991).** *The Altruism Question: Toward a Social-Psychological Answer.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

**Batson, C. D., Van Lange, P. A. M., Ahmad, N., & Lishner, D. A. (2003).** Altruism and helping behaviour. In M. A. Hogg & J. Cooper (Eds.), *Sage handbook of social psychology.* London: Sage Publications

**Nowak MA (2006).** Five rules for the evolution of cooperation. *Science* 314: 1560-1563.[4]

Fehr, E. & Fischbacher, U. (23 October 2003). The nature of human altruism. In *Nature*, 425, 785- 791.

**Comte, Auguste, *Catechisme positif (1852)* or *Catechism of Positivism*, tr. R. Congreve, (London: Kegan Paul, 1891)**

**Knox, Trevor, *The Volunteer's Folly and Socio-Economic Man: Some Thoughts On Altruism, Rationality, and Community*, *Journal of Socio-Economics* 28 (1999), 475-492**

**Thomas Jay, *Science of Love: The Wisdom of Well-Being.* (Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press, 2004). ISBN 978-1932031706**

**Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, *The Philosophy of Poverty (1847)***

**Oliner, Samuel P. and Pearl M. *Towards a Caring Society: Ideas into Action.* West Port, CT: Praeger, 1995.**

*The Evolution of Cooperation*, Robert Axelrod, Basic Books, ISBN 0-465-02121-2

***The Selfish Gene*, Richard Dawkins (1990)**, second edition-includes two chapters about the evolution of cooperation, ISBN 0-19-286092-5

**Robert Wright, *The moral animal*, Vintage, 1995, ISBN 0-679-76399-6.**

**Madsen, E.A., Tunney, R., Fieldman, G., Plotkin, H.C, Dunbar, R.I.M., Richardson, J.M., & McFarland, D. (2006)** Kinship and altruism: A cross-cultural experimental study. *British Journal of Psychology.*

**Wedekind, C and Milinski, M.** Human Cooperation in the simultaneous and the alternating Prisoner's Dilemma: Pavlov versus Generous Tit-for-tat. *Evolution*, Vol. 93, pp. 2686-2689, April 1996.

Monk-Turner, E., Blake, V., Chniel, F., Forbes, S., Lensey, L., Madzuma, J.: Gender Issues, **Helping Hands: A Study of Altruistic Behavior**, Fall 2002, pp. 65-70.

**Batson, C. D. (2002).** Addressing the altruism question experimentally. In S. G. Post, L. G. Underwood,

**J. P. Schloss, & W. B. Hurlbut (Eds.),** Altruism and altruistic love: Science, philosophy, and religion in dialogue. New York: Oxford University Press.

**Batson, C. D.(2006).**Not all self-interest after all: Economics of empathy-induced altruism. In D. De Cremer, M. Zeelenberg, & J. K. Murnighan (Eds), *Social psychology and economics* (pp. 281- 299). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

**Bordens, K. S. and Horowitz,I. A. (2001)** Social Psychology; *Altruism* (pp. 434-444). Philadelphia: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

**Cardwell, M., Clark, L., and Meldrum, C. (2002)** Psychology; *For A2 Level* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Collins Publishing.

**Carlo, G., Okun, M. A., Knight, G. P., & de Guzman, M. R. T. (2005).** The interplay and motives on volunteering: agreeableness, extraversion and prosocial value motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38, 1293-1305.

**Carlson, N.R., Martin, G.N. and Buskist, W. (2004).** Psychology ( 2<sup>nd</sup>ed.). Essex: Pearson Publishing.

**Herzog, A. R., & Morgan, J. N. (1993).** Formal volunteer work among older Americans. In S.A.

**Bass, F. G. Caro, & Y. P. Chen (Eds.),** *Achieving a productive aging society* (pp. 119-142). Westport Connecticut: Auburn House

**Isen, A. M., Daubman, K. A., & Nowicki, G. P. (1987).** Positive affect facilitates creative problem solving. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 1122-1131.