

Comparison of personality traits of urban and rural altruistic adolescents of Ludhiana district of Punjab

■ Rachna Rani, Asha Chawla and Deepika Vig

Received: 17.12.2017; Revised: 08.04.2018; Accepted: 28.04.2018

■ **ABSTRACT :** The present study was aimed to compare the personality traits of urban and rural altruistic adolescents. The study was carried out in Government urban and rural schools of Ludhiana district. The total sample comprised 240 adolescents (120 urban and 120 rural) in the age group of 14-16 years belonging to low and middle socio-economic status. Socio-economic status scale (Aggarwal *et al.*, 2005), Altruism Scale (Rai and Singh, 2004) and 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (Kapoor, 1970) was used to collect the data. The findings revealed that urban adolescents with moderate altruism were found to have medium level of personality traits which showed that neither they were reserved, less intelligent and humble nor they were more intelligent, outgoing and assertive as compared to rural adolescents. Urban adolescents were found more emotionally stable and moralistic as compared to rural adolescents. More number of rural adolescents with high altruism were also found in medium level of personality traits as compared to urban adolescents.

See end of the paper for authors' affiliations

→
■ **Deepika Vig**

Department of Human
Development and Family Studies,
College of Home Science, Punjab
Agricultural University, Ludhiana
(Punjab) India

■ **KEY WORDS:** Adolescents, Altruism, Personality traits

■ **HOW TO CITE THIS PAPER :** Rani, Rachna, Chawla, Asha and Vig, Deepika (2018). Comparison of personality traits of urban and rural altruistic adolescents of Ludhiana district of Punjab. *Asian J. Home Sci.*, 13 (1) : 250-255, DOI: 10.15740/HAS/AJHS/13.1/250-255. Copyright@ 2018: Hind Agri-Horticultural Society.

Adolescence is a period in which rapid physical and emotional changes undergoes along with social development. It is the period of manifesting one's personality traits which determine his/her different behaviours. Altruistic behaviours are observed often in adolescence, which are obviously motivated by some personality traits. Hence, it is assumed that there would have some relationship between altruism and personality traits.

Altruism is the concern for the wellbeing of others without concern for one's self interest. August Comte, a French philosopher and sociologist firstly gave the term altruism. He transform the term from the Italian word

'altrui'. According to him altruism was selfless value for the welfare of others.

It can act as an energizing impact for reliable transformation in the society. A motivational quality to altruism has been observed in today's world. To act for apparently advanced commitments has the outcome of giving courage and determination to life in a world that is not always generous and benevolent. Altruists are often encouraging to give up their pays and experienced needs in the prospect that many a time the world will be a much advanced place. The altruistic deed achieves the altruist's life and motivates other people in the course of life. In a sense, the altruist may be completely paid for

displaying generosity on terms they ascertain, escalate and find that are suitable. An outward onlooker may not rely on that a mother who sacrifices has been rewarded for the kindness that her children receives from the respective mother, but that onlooker is not privy to all of the near evidence of her life that might show that some rewards have been received for all her plentiful efforts (Subhashini and Kalaimathi, 2013).

Altruism is a form of pro-social behaviour in which an individual will willingly support others at some cost to themselves (Cardwell *et al.*, 2002). According to Ervin (1978) 'Pro-social behaviours refer to behaviour helping another person's. A pro-social behaviour may be judged altruistic if it seems to have intentions to help another individual rather than to gain either material or community prizes. The power of altruistic thinker differs from individual to individual. According to Drebera *et al.* (2012), girls are more altruistic than boys. On the other hand, boy's behavioural characteristics are less important than those of girls in respect to altruism.

Personality is the set of psychological characteristics and appliance within the persons that are well-ordered and relatively enduring and that impetus his or her dealings with and variations to, the intra-psyche, physical and public surroundings (Larsen and Buss, 2005). Personality is what makes an individual is a distinctive individual and it is noticeable shortly after birth. It is a big device to bring out one's capabilities and powers for creating him awake of his/her identity and become more self-confident to face the external world. Personality may be among the factors contributing to individual differences in altruism. Personality relates seem to be more significant in clarifying altruistic actions when the bond between the performer and receiver is considered (Curry *et al.*, 2013).

Thus, early development of altruism defends youngsters beside expansion of rebellious tendencies and harsh manners. Therefore, the main aim of this study is to understand the various personality traits of urban and rural altruistic adolescents so that parents and adolescents can be motivated to adopt such positive traits.

■ RESEARCH METHODS

Locale of the study :

The study was carried out in the Government schools of Ludhiana district of Punjab. Two urban and two rural schools were randomly selected by using simple random

sampling procedure.

Selection of the sample :

The total sample comprised 240 adolescents (120 urban and 120 rural) in the age group of 14-16 years, equally distributed over gender. Adolescents were selected on the basis of low and medium socio-economic status.

Collection of data :

The Principals of the selected schools were personally approached by the researcher to get approval for the conduct of the study. The objectives and relevance of study was discussed with them. The selected rural and urban adolescents were approached in their schools only. They were asked to provide honest responses and were assured that their identification would kept confidential and information provided by them would be used exclusively for the purpose of research work. Distribution of the questionnaire was used to collect the information from the adolescents. The questionnaires were given to each subject in the class and were asked to fill the questionnaire here only. The questionnaire was translated into vernacular Punjabi for the easy comprehension of the respondents

Research instruments :

Following instruments were used for collecting information from the adolescents:

Socio-economic status scale :

Socio economic scale developed by Aggarwal *et al.* (2005) was used to measure the socio-economic status of the respondents. It measures various characteristics of the respondents and their families like monthly income, parent's education, parent's occupation, family size etc.

Altruism scale :

Altruism Scale developed by Rai and Singh (2004) was used to measure the altruistic behaviour of adolescents across various levels *i.e.*, low, moderate, high and very high. The scale consists of 30 items and each item of the scale has three alternative responses, *i.e.*, altruistic, neutral and egoistic. A score of two for altruistic, one for neutral and zero for egoistic is awarded to each item of the scale. The maximum score is 60 and the

minimum is zero. As no respondent was found in the categories of very low, low and very high altruistic, therefore, only two categories were considered for further data analysis.

The sixteen personality factor questionnaire (16PF):

16 PF Questionnaire developed by Cattell (1967) but its Indian version was adapted by Kapoor (1970) was used to assess the personality traits of the adolescents. This test measures sixteen primary factors of personality in 187 statements. These primary factors include (A) Reserved vs. Outgoing (B) Less intelligent vs. More intelligent (C) Affected by feeling's vs. Emotionally stable (E) Humble vs. Assertive (F) Sober vs. Happy go lucky (G) Expedient vs. Conscientious (H) Shy vs. Venturesome (I) Tough-minded vs. Tender-minded (L) Trusting vs. Suspicious (M) Practical vs. Imaginative (N) Forthright vs. Shrewd (O) Placid vs. Apprehensive (Q1) Conservative vs. Experimenting (Q2) Group- dependent vs. Self-sufficient (Q3) Undisciplined self-conflict vs. Control (Q4) Relaxed vs. Tense. The scoring was done with help of two scoring keys, A&B. The raw scores were converted into sten scores.

Statistical analysis :

Suitable statistical tools were used to analyse the data. Data was analyzed using frequencies, percentages, z- test.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This Table 1 showed that in case of 'Reserved vs. Outgoing' personality trait 23.33 per cent of urban adolescent with moderate altruism were found significantly ($Z=2.36$; $p<0.05$) in the medium level more than rural adolescents (10.83%). In contrast to this rural adolescents (65.00%) with high altruism were found significantly ($Z=2.86$; $p<0.05$) more in medium level than urban adolescents (50.83%). Which indicated that maximum number of urban and rural adolescents were neither reserved nor outgoing. More number of rural adolescents with high altruism were found in medium level as compared to urban adolescents.

In personality trait of Less intelligence vs. More intelligence urban adolescents with moderate altruism were found significantly ($Z=4.46$; $p<0.05$) more (22.5%) in medium level as compared to rural adolescents

(3.33%). Whereas in case of high altruism more number (58.33%) of the rural adolescents were found significantly ($Z=2.55$; $p<0.05$) in medium level as compared to urban adolescents (45.00%). Urban adolescents (6.67%) with high altruism significantly ($Z=2.13$; $p<0.05$) were found more intelligent as compare to rural adolescents (1.67%). This means adolescents had medium level of intelligence. Maximum of rural adolescents with high altruism were found in medium level of intelligence as compared to urban adolescents.

In personality trait 'Effected by Feelings vs. Emotionally Stable' 6.67 per cent of urban adolescent with moderate altruism were found significantly ($Z=2.61$; $p<0.05$) more emotionally stable as compared to rural adolescents (0.83%). Whereas rural adolescents with high altruism were found significantly ($Z=2.47$; $p<0.05$) more (67.5%) in medium level as compared to urban adolescents (55.83%). This showed that majority of rural adolescents with high altruism were found in medium level who were neither effected by feelings nor they were emotionally stable and urban adolescents were emotionally stable as compared to rural adolescents.

If we see the results in personality trait of 'Humble vs. Assertive' urban adolescent (23.33%) with moderate altruism were found significantly ($Z=2.59$; $p<0.05$) more in medium level as compared to rural adolescents (10.00%). In contrast to this rural adolescents (65.00%) with high altruism were found significantly ($Z=4.51$; $p<0.05$) in medium level more than urban adolescents (41.67%). 20.83 per cent of urban adolescents with high altruism significantly ($Z=2.13$; $p<0.05$) were found more assertive as compared to rural adolescents (10.83%). Urban adolescents with high altruism were found more assertive as compared to rural adolescents.

In personality trait of 'Sober vs. Happy go lucky' 10.83 per cent of the urban adolescents with moderate altruism were found significantly ($Z=2.16$; $p<0.05$) more sober as compared to rural adolescents (4.17%). Whereas, rural adolescents (40.83%) with high altruism significantly ($Z=2.03$; $p<0.05$) sober. This means that rural boys were found more reserved in nature as compared to rural girls.

In case of personality trait of 'Expedient vs. Conscientious' across all the levels of altruism and personality trait non-significant differences were observed in the proportion of urban and rural adolescents. Urban adolescents (4.17%) with moderate altruism were

Table 1 : Comparison of personality traits of urban and rural adolescents across various levels of altruism (n=240)						
Personality traits	Moderate altruism		Z value	High altruism		Z value
	Urban	Rural		Urban	Rural	
	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)		
Reserved vs. Outgoing						
Low (Reserved)	3 (2.5)	3 (2.5)	0.00	12 (10)	9 (7.5)	0.75
Medium	28 (23.33)	13 (10.83)	2.36*	61 (50.83)	78 (65.00)	2.86*
High (Outgoing)	5 (4.170)	7 (5.83)	0.65	11 (9.17)	10 (8.33)	0.25
Less intelligence vs. More intelligence						
Low (Less intelligence)	8 (6.67)	16 (13.33)	1.90	22 (18.33)	25 (20.83)	0.54
Medium	27 (22.5)	4 (3.33)	4.46*	54 (45.00)	70 (58.33)	2.55*
High (More intelligence)	1 (0.83)	3 (2.5)	1.10	8 (6.67)	2 (1.67)	2.13*
Effectuated by feelings vs. Emotionally stable						
Low (Effectuated by feelings)	1 (0.83)	5 (4.17)	1.81	7 (5.83)	6 (5.00)	0.31
Medium	27 (22.5)	17 (14.17)	1.34	67 (55.83)	81 (67.5)	2.47*
High (Emotionally stable)	8 (6.67)	1 (0.83)	2.61*	10 (8.33)	10 (8.33)	0.00
Humble vs. Assertive						
Low (Humble)	3 (2.5)	2 (1.67)	0.49	9 (7.5)	6 (5.00)	0.88
Medium	28 (23.33)	12 (10.00)	2.59*	50 (41.67)	78 (65.00)	4.51*
High (Assertive)	5 (4.17)	9 (7.50)	1.21	25 (20.83)	13 (10.83)	2.36*
Sober vs. Happy go lucky						
Low (Sober)	13 (10.83)	5 (4.17)	2.16*	36 (30)	49 (40.83)	2.03*
Medium	21 (17.5)	16 (13.33)	0.41	46 (38.33)	46 (38.33)	0.00
High (Happy go lucky)	2 (1.67)	2 (1.67)	0.00	2 (1.67)	2 (1.67)	0.00
Expedient vs. Conscientious						
Low (Expedient)	5 (4.17)	3 (2.5)	0.79	7 (5.83)	9 (7.5)	0.57
Medium	26 (21.67)	20 (16.67)	0.56	68 (56.67)	71 (59.17)	0.50
High (Conscientious)	5 (4.17)	0 (0)	2.48*	9 (7.5)	17 (14.17)	1.84
Shy vs. Venturesome						
Low (Shy)	2 (1.67)	1 (0.83)	0.79	3 (2.5)	4 (3.33)	0.42
Medium	32 (26.67)	19 (15.83)	1.81	76 (63.33)	91 (75.83)	3.13*
High (Venturesome)	2 (1.67)	3 (2.5)	0.49	5 (4.17)	2 (1.67)	1.26
Tough-minded vs. Tender-minded						
Low (Tough-minded)	9 (7.5)	6 (5)	0.88	37 (30.83)	30 (25)	1.14
Medium	23 (19.17)	15 (12.5)	1.01	42 (35)	62 (51.67)	3.10*
High (Tender-minded)	4 (3.33)	2 (1.67)	0.40	5 (4.17)	5 (4.17)	0.00
Trusting vs. Suspicious						
Low (Trusting)	3 (2.5)	2 (1.67)	0.49	8 (6.67)	16 (13.33)	1.90
Medium	32 (26.67)	19 (15.83)	1.81	65 (54.17)	79 (65.83)	2.41*
High (Suspicious)	1 (0.83)	2 (1.67)	0.63	11 (9.17)	2 (1.67)	2.82*
Practical vs. Imaginative						
Low (Practical)	4 (3.33)	2 (1.67)	0.90	9 (7.5)	3 (2.5)	1.95
Medium	25 (20.83)	16 (13.33)	1.18	60 (50)	78 (65)	3.01*
High (Imaginative)	7 (5.83)	5 (4.17)	0.65	15 (12.5)	16 (13.33)	0.21
Forthright vs. Astute						
Low (Forthright)	5 (4.17)	2 (1.67)	1.26	25 (20.83)	20 (16.67)	0.92
Medium	23 (19.17)	17 (14.17)	0.59	49 (40.83)	66 (55)	2.66*
High (Astute)	8 (6.67)	4 (3.33)	1.30	10 (8.33)	11 (9.17)	0.25

Contd.... Table 1

Contd.... Table 1

Self-assured vs. Apprehensive						
Low (Self-assured)	2 (1.67)	3 (2.5)	0.49	12 (10)	10 (8.33)	0.49
Medium	29 (24.17)	16 (13.33)	1.90	53 (44.17)	64 (53.33)	1.72
High (Apprehensive)	5 (4.17)	4 (3.33)	0.37	19 (15.83)	24 (20)	0.94
Conservative vs. Experimenting						
Low (Conservative)	4 (3.33)	4 (3.33)	0.00	10 (8.33)	11 (9.17)	0.25
Medium	27 (22.5)	16 (13.33)	1.54	56 (46.67)	72 (60)	2.58*
High (Experimenting)	5 (4.17)	3 (2.5)	0.79	18 (15)	14 (11.67)	0.84
Group dependent vs. Self-sufficient						
Low (Group dependent)	3 (2.5)	2 (1.67)	0.49	4 (3.33)	8 (6.67)	1.30
Medium	26 (21.67)	16 (13.33)	1.36	60 (50)	62 (51.67)	0.31
High (Self-sufficient)	7 (5.83)	5 (4.17)	0.65	20 (16.67)	27 (22.5)	1.27
Undisciplined vs. Controlled						
Low (Undisciplined)	4 (3.33)	2 (1.67)	0.90	5 (4.17)	5 (4.17)	0.00
Medium	27 (22.5)	18 (15)	0.14	66 (55)	81 (67.5)	2.63*
High (Controlled)	5 (4.17)	3 (2.5)	0.19	13 (10.83)	11 (9.17)	0.47
Relaxed vs. Tense						
Low (Relaxed)	4 (3.33)	3 2.5	0.42	18 (15)	11 (9.17)	1.53
Medium	29 (24.17)	19 15.83	1.29	63 (52.5)	81 (67.5)	3.10*
High (Tense)	3 (2.5)	1 0.83	1.10	3 (2.5)	5 (4.17)	0.79

* indicates significance of value at P=0.05 level

found significantly ($Z=2.48$; $p<0.05$) more conscientious. It was noted that none of the rural adolescent was found moralistic. Mandal and Mehra (2017) reported that significant differences were found between the students of medium altruistic group and low altruistic group. The study indicated that three personality traits namely, conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness were essential for construction of altruistic personality of rural adolescent students as regression equations confirmed the ability of altruism of rural adolescent students to predict those traits.

It was found that in both personality traits of 'Shy vs. Venturesome' and 'Tough minded vs. Tender minded' in all the levels of altruism and personality trait non-significant differences were found except, 75.83 per cent and 51.67 per cent of rural adolescents with high altruism were found significantly ($Z=3.13$; $p<0.05$, $Z=3.10$; $p<0.05$) more in medium level of both the traits, respectively.

In case of personality trait of 'Trusting vs. Suspicious' no significant differences in moderate altruism were found in the proportion of urban and rural adolescents. Whereas, rural adolescents (65.83%) with high altruism were found significantly ($Z=2.41$; $p<0.05$) in medium level as compared to urban adolescents

(54.17%). However, 9.17 per cent of urban adolescents with high altruism were found significantly ($Z=2.82$; $p<0.05$) more suspicious as compared to rural adolescents (1.67%). This indicated that mostly rural adolescents with high altruism were found in medium level of this personality trait. Which showed neither they were trusting nor they were hard to fool.

It was observed that in personality traits like 'Practical vs. Imaginative' across all the levels of altruism and personality trait non-significant differences were observed in urban and rural adolescents except 65.00 per cent of the rural adolescents with high altruism were found significantly ($Z=3.01$; $p<0.05$) more in medium level as compared to urban adolescents (50.00%). Which depicted they were not practical as well as imaginative because they had medium level of this trait.

In personality traits like 'Forthright vs. Astute' (55.00%), 'Conservative vs. Experimenting' (60.00%), 'Undisciplined vs. Controlled' (67.5%) and 'Relaxed vs. Tense' (67.5%) rural adolescents with high altruism were found significantly ($Z=2.66$; $p<0.05$), ($Z=2.58$; $p<0.05$), ($Z=2.63$; $p<0.05$), ($Z=3.10$; $p<0.05$) in medium level more than urban adolescents. Rural adolescents showed these personality traits in medium level as compared to urban adolescents.

Conclusion :

It concluded from the study that urban adolescents with moderate altruism were found in medium level of personality traits. Which showed that neither they were reserved, less intelligent and humble nor they were outgoing, more intelligent and assertive as compared to rural adolescents. In case of rural adolescents with high altruism were found in medium level of these traits which means neither they were found reserved, less intelligent, affected by feelings, humble, shy, tough-minded, trusting, forthright, conservative, undisciplined, controlled, relaxed nor were outgoing, more intelligence, emotionally stable, assertive, venturesome, tender-minded, suspicious, astute, experimenting and tense as compared to urban adolescents. Whereas, urban adolescents were found more emotionally stable and moralistic as compared to rural adolescents.

Recommendations :

Schools play an important role in the shaping of personality of the students. The school curriculum should include useful sessions in classes to shape personality and increase altruistic behaviour in adolescents. Reinforcement plays an important role in improving their overall personality traits whether adolescents were belong to rural as well as urban area.

Authors' affiliations:

Rachna Rani and Asha Chawla, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Home Science, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana (Punjab) India

■ REFERENCES

Aggarwal, O.P., Bhasin, S.K., Sharma, A.K., Chhabra, P.,

Aggarwal, K. and Rajoura, A. (2005). New instrument (Scale) for measuring the socio-economic status of a family :preliminary study. *Indian J. Commu. Med.*, **30**: 34-42.

Cardwell, M., Clarck, L. and Meldrum, C. (2002). *Psychology*: Collins Publishing.

Cattell, R.B. (1967). The 16 P F Cattell comprehensive personality interpretation manual: Savoy, I L: The institute for personality and ability testing.

Curry, O., Roberts, S.G.B. and Dunbar, R.I.M. (2013). Altruism in social networks: Evidence for a kinship premium. *British J. Psychol.*, **104** : 2083-2095.

Drebera, A., Essenb, E.V. and Ranehill, E. (2012). In Bloom: gender differences in preferences among adolescents. *J. Economic. Behav. Org.*, **36** : 180-199.

Kapoor, S.D. (1970). Indian adaptation of 16 P.F Questionnaire. National Psychological Corporation, Agra.

Larsen, R.J. and Buss, D.M. (2005). Domains of knowledge about human nature. *J. Personality Psychol.*, **2**: 45-52.

Mandal, Mukul Baran and Mehera, Chitrallekha (2017). Personality characteristics of rural altruistic adolescent students at secondary level. *Internat. Education & Res. J.*, **3** (2) : 9-13.

Rai, S.N. and Singh, S. (2004). *Altruism Scale (ALTS)*. National Psychological Corporation.

Subhashini, T. and Kalaimathi, D.H. (2013). Relationship between altruism and personality type among higher secondary school students- A survey. *Indian J. Res.*, **2** : 55-56.

■ WEBLIOGRAPHY

Ervin, S. (1978). Retrieved from: <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/>

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ 13th Year of Excellence ★ ★ ★ ★ ★