

Altruism among Iranian Families a Trend Study in Tehran

Saeedeh Amini

Department of Sociology, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Dehkade-ye Olampik, West Hemmat Highway, Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

Altruism is a voluntary action aiming to help others without reward expectation. In this type of action, the individual cares for others' interests rather than those of his own. This type of behaviour that goes beyond social norms falls into the sphere of morality. The frequency of such actions in society promises ethical behaviour. In this regard, the role of the family as one of the most important agents of socialisation is highlighted. This article seeks to examine altruism among the Iranian families and show its process of change over a decade (from 2005 to 2015). The findings of a longitudinal study were used to achieve this objective. This survey was done in 2005, for the first time, and was repeated in 2015, for the second time, in two developed and less developed regions of Tehran, using cluster sampling. The results show that the number of people showing altruistic actions declined by 7 percent between 2005 and 2015 (from 26 percent to 19.2 percent). The number of people having high altruistic attitudes was higher in 2005 compared to 2015 (90.9 percent versus 86.6 percent). Also, the number of people with high cultural capital was more in 2005 compared to 2015. Accordingly, altruism among Tehranian citizens has declined within a decade, while the economic and social capital has slightly increased. In both surveys, there is a noteworthy relationship between social capital and altruistic attitudes with altruistic actions, specifically regarding marital status.

Keywords: Altruistic action, altruistic attitude, cultural capital, economic capital, social capital

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 18 October 2017

Accepted: 01 February 2018

E-mail address:

saeedeh.amini280@gmail.com (Saeedeh Amini)

INTRODUCTION

Altruism is a voluntary action done to help others without the expectation of reciprocity or compensation. In this type of action, the individual places the interests of others before his or her own. The person who does altruistic actions goes beyond social

relations corresponding to social norms and social responsibilities into the realm of morality. Altruistic actions can be done in temporary and stable forms. In the first type, the person may have an accidental altruistic action, but in the second type, he or she acquires an altruistic worldview. These people create patterns, which are not based on social norms, but on beliefs and values that are intrinsic to the worldview. The scope of altruistic worldview is all humanity, not a small insider group.

According to Rushton (1981), a person who has an altruistic worldview internalises universal standards of justice, social responsibility, moral reasoning, and wisdom. He or she empathises with the pains of others. This gives the person an emotional and motivational perspective to the world. He or she is motivated to do things like helping the poor, providing peace for others, and saving others from adverse conditions (Anderson, 1989). Based on Daniel Batson's researches, helping others may have altruistic or selfish motivations (Batson, Fultz, Vanderplas, & Isen, 1983). Batson believes that the person who reacts to others' pain has selfish motives to alleviate his own pains.

Accordingly, altruistic actions help the individual committing the actions achieve peace rather than being focused on the needy person. Archer (1981) established a link between motivation, helping others, and sympathy. He believes a selfish desire to avoid others' negative judgments is a motivation for altruistic actions (Anderson, 1989). However, the altruistic action itself

is important regardless of many motives. In other words, the functions and consequences of altruistic actions are more important than the motives. The presence of these actions in the community promises moral behaviours, and the lack of them is a threat to social order. Family is one of the institutions that teaches these behaviours. Family as the primary institution of socialisation plays a key role in the development and institutionalisation of moral and altruistic actions. Therefore, successful family life increases the occurrence of such behaviours. Many studies confirm the above claim (Einolf, 2006; Wilson, 2000).

Some studies indicate that married people are more likely to perform altruistic actions than singles (Einolf, 2006). This seems to also be true for people having more children than those having no children (Einolf, 2006).

Accordingly, it is proved that the more nuclear a family, and the more people and children born in the family, the higher the probability that altruistic actions will occur. This paper is primarily aimed at examining the status of altruism among married, single, and divorced or widowed Tehranian people in the developed and underdeveloped regions, and explains altruism among these three groups.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

Altruism is a voluntary action done to help others without expectation of reciprocity or compensation. In this type of action, the individual places the interests of others before his or her own. The person who

does altruistic actions goes beyond social relations corresponding to social norms and social responsibilities into the realm of morality. Different theoretical approaches have investigated the concept of altruism from diverse perspectives.

Sociological Approach

Rational Actor Theories

Rational actor theories maintain that human beings are profit-driven by nature. Some theorists believe that altruistic actions are in fact self-interest. According to them, the purpose of helping others is social prestige. Some other rational choice theorists argue that people may not expect material rewards, but do gain internal emotional rewards by helping; the positive feeling of emotional solidarity with the helped person, and the avoidance of the emotional costs of feeling pity or guilt that would come with not helping (Einolf, 2006). Many rational actor theorists argue against the existence of pure altruism by pointing out that all helping behaviours bring the helper either a material or psychological reward, but Mansbridge (1990), working from a rational-actor perspective, argues that the mere existence of some reward does not render a helping behaviour non-altruistic. As Mansbridge points out, it would be surprising indeed if helping behaviours were not usually rewarded; since helping behaviour is beneficial to the functioning of a society, it is rational for societies to reward helping behaviour when it occurs (Schervish & Havens, 2002). Some rational

actor theorists try to explain altruistic behaviour through “identification theory”, which argues that altruistic acts are rational because altruistic people identify strongly with others. According to this theory, individuals who give to others are engaging in a rational, self-interested act, as they are giving to an extended version of themselves (Schervish & Havens, 2002).

Monroe (1996) offers a more sophisticated version of this, arguing that the single distinguishing characteristic of altruistic individuals is a universalistic moral perspective. Monroe states that altruistic people view all humankind as members of their moral and social community. Whereas typical individuals consider themselves morally obligated only to help family members and close friends, altruists consider themselves to be morally obligated to help all people. Because altruists identify all human beings as an extension of their family or their “self”, their helping behaviours are a self-interested and rational action (Einolf, 2006, p. 13).

Social Exchange Theories

Social exchange theorists regard rewarding as a form of social exchange that facilitates social solidarity and creates a hierarchy of power. The most useful theory of gift-giving as social exchange is that of Blau (1964), who sees helping behaviour as a type of social exchange which both creates social solidarity and places an obligation upon the recipient of the help to reciprocate in the future (Einolf, 2006).

Collins and Hickman (1991), working from the standpoint of conflict theory, propose a similar theory of charitable action, arguing that participation in charitable activities is the primary means of “status legitimation” in societies that lack a single dominant religion. While the desire for prestige and power motivates some giving and helping behaviours, social exchange theory can point to another motivation for altruistic action, that of generalised reciprocal obligation. The term “generalised reciprocal obligation” describes the feeling that some individuals have that they are obligated to make a repayment for the good fortune that they have received in life. To these people, assets and good fortune are a blessing from God or society; since there is not a possibility of compensation to the source of this good, they try to help others to compensate for this blessing indirectly (Einolf, 2006).

Biological Approach

Altruistic behaviour can be argued to originate both at the beginning of the human lifespan and from the beginning of human history (Huneycutt, 2013). Rushton and Sorrentino (1981) define altruism as sympathetic instincts correlated with the evolutionary theory of Charles Darwin. Darwin’s theory “proposed that humans were biologically disposed to behave socially, cooperatively, and helpfully to one another” (Anderson, 1989; Rushton & Sorrentino, 1981).

In their book, *Super Cooperators: Altruism, Evolution, and Why We Need Each Other to Succeed*, Nowak and Highfield (2011) argue that cooperation was and is necessary for human survival. They propose that in addition to mutation, competition, and natural selection, cooperation was a major player in the evolution of man. Just as humans are wired to compete, humans are also wired to cooperate, and helping each other could therefore be something human beings are driven to do. The ability to cooperate is presented as a major reason human beings were able to survive in a variety of climates and compete with a variety of other species arguably more physically suited to survival (Huneycutt, 2013; Nowak & Highfield, 2011). Indeed, there is evidence to suggest cooperative and altruistic behaviour begins very early in life and appears to be intrinsically motivated (Huneycutt, 2013, p. 9).

Developmental psychologist Michael Tomasello argues that human altruistic behaviour is intrinsically motivated from infancy. Multiple trials observing infant helping behaviour found that neither the addition of tangible rewards or prompting from mothers increases the helping behaviours of infants, suggesting that such behaviour is intrinsically rewarding (Huneycutt, 2013).

According to some theorists, motivation to participate in altruistic activities, including volunteering, has been found to be higher when the participant takes part for intrinsic, rather than extrinsic, reasons. Warneken and

Tomasello (2008) found that the addition of extrinsic rewards for altruistic behaviour led infants to help less than they had when there was no reward (Huneycutt, 2013).

Another biological explanation of altruism states that a sacrifice done by altruism is not a sacrifice but an investment in a system of interdependence that maximises an altruist's genetic compatibility. Such behaviour challenges the theories claiming different species evolve because climate change maximises genetic adaptation. Efforts to link altruism with gene selection theory indicate that altruists maintain genetic compatibility by helping those who have a genetic link with them or are trying to preserve the species to which they belong (Edwards Wynne, 1962).

A limitation of these two approaches is that sometimes the people receiving help are genetically like the helper. Evolutionary research forms a useful background for this study, but is of limited use in explaining variations among individuals in the level of altruistic motivation or action. Since all human beings evolved from primate ancestors, evolutionary theories cannot explain why some individuals act differently from others, the focus of this dissertation (Einolf, 2006).

Psychological Approach

The psychological approach maintains that the biological basis for altruistic actions is not essential. Psychologists do not involve themselves with the survival of altruism in natural species. Several theories of social psychology seek to fill the void of biological

approaches. With an emphasis on social learning and the role of parents, they explain the difference in people's altruistic actions. According to the learning theory, people learn to help by getting a boost and seeing others help. Psychologists have examined the experiences of early childhood, particularly focusing on parenting styles and how moral norms are learned from parents, schools, religious institutions, and the community. These childhood experiences and influences motivate adult altruistic behaviour through the development of empathy, and through the development of internalised moral norms of helping (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1989; Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989; Lapsley, 1996).

Wuthnow (1985) found that school clubs, community organisations, and religious organisations were all important in teaching moral norms of helping and recruiting young people to the actual practice of volunteer work (Einolf, 2006).

Researchers have argued about the importance of characteristics of parents and norms learned in childhood affecting altruistic behaviours in adulthood. Colby and Damon (1992) criticise the emphasis on characteristics of parents and childhood experiences, and state that the choices people make in adulthood, the self-reinforcing nature of altruistic behaviour, and the lifelong development of a moral orientation are more key factors than childhood experiences in determining altruistic behaviour. Wuthnow (1985) goes farther, postulating that nearly all people learn basic values of caring in childhood, and that service experiences in adolescence

and early adulthood are the determining factors in adulthood altruistic behaviour (Einolf, 2006).

However, Mustillo, Wilson and Lynch (2004) found that parental modelling of volunteering has a considerable influence on the volunteering habits of young adults, but not at later stages of life.

In other words, in the process of re-socialisation that usually follows the stage of adolescence, the role of institutions of socialisation, such as schools, media, and peer groups, are more important than family. In other words, the role of social networks is more prominent than family in the process of re-socialisation. People who participate in various social networks develop social awareness. These people have a higher social capital that increases the probability of altruistic actions. Wilson and Musick (1997) focused on the impact of social and cultural capital on altruistic actions. They define social capital as the access to social networks that help people learn charitable deeds and cultural capital as the skills and education of the person. Bourdieu worked on cultural and social capital while he believed the two are determined by economic capital (Einolf, 2006).

These are noteworthy points investigated in this paper. The authors examined the role of economic, social, and cultural capital and altruistic attitude on altruistic actions of three groups of people of Tehran: married, single, and divorced or widowed.

Hypotheses

There is a significant relationship between marital status and altruistic action.

There is a significant relationship between social capital and altruistic action based on marital status.

There is a significant relationship between altruistic attitude and altruistic action based on marital status.

There is a significant relationship between cultural capital and altruistic action based on marital status.

There is a significant relationship between economic capital and altruistic action based on marital status.

Validity and Reliability

In order to measure and evaluate the ultimate questionnaire, 30 primary questionnaires were distributed among respondents and pre-test was done; lastly, the outputs were examined and scales were finalized.

Construct and face validity were used to evaluate the validity and reliability of the research. Factors of the variables were identified using factor analysis and varimax rotation, consistent with and derived from theoretical discussions. The factor analysis determines validity and supports reliability of the research. Factor loadings, which show the correlation of each item with the desired factor or scale, are mentioned in the table of operational definition of variables. To determine face validity, viewpoints of several social scientists and teachers were asked, and the questionnaire was finalised after two pre-tests.

The population, sample size and sampling method

The population was selected based on the 2005 study of the index of development of twenty-two districts of Tehran, from men and women 18 years old and above, from regions 3 and 19 as the least and most developed districts of Tehran. The sample size was 419 and calculated using the Cochran formula. In 2015, the research was conducted with the same sample size and multi-stage cluster sampling in four stages as follows:

- First: Choosing two regions from existing districts of Tehran based on development index.
- Second: Selecting several apartment blocks from each district randomly based on a random numbers table.
- Third: Selecting households from the residents of each block from the list.
- Fourth: Choosing eligible people from the sample households.

Operational and Theoretical Definitions

Altruism is a voluntary action done to help others without expectation of reciprocity or compensation. In this type of action an individual places the interests of others before his or her own. The person who does altruistic actions goes beyond social relations corresponding to social norms and social responsibilities into the realm of morality. Generalised emotional attachment and generalised commitment are dimensions

of altruism. Items in the Likert scale would assess the 'scale.

Economic Capital

Economic capital describes financial resources possible to convert into cash and institutionalised in the form of property rights (Smith, 2001). Economic capital is the total assets that determine the economic power. This concept is investigated by asking about the income, house, and vehicle.

Social Capital

Social capital is the aggregate of the actual or potential resources linked to possession of a durable network of institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition (Bourdieu, 1986; Field, 2003). Putnam (2000), Effeh, and Fuches views on the dimensions of social capital, and three-dimensional association binds, consciousness, and generalised trust were considered. Items of the scale were assessed using a Likert scale.

Cultural Capital

Cultural capital is the aggregate of relationships and knowledge and privileges that the individual acquires in the process

¹In this article the likert scale number is 1=too high, 2=high, 3=moderate, 4=low, 5=too low. According to this scale, low number means high altruism or social capital, and so on. Moreover, in scales, for instance, if we had 4 items, the minimum was 4 and the maximum was 20. Accordingly, 4-10=high and too high, 11-13=moderate, and 14-20=low and too low.

of socialisation from family and formal education and helps to achieve or maintain a social status. Three forms, “objectified”, “embodied”, and “institutionalised” states, are considered for cultural capital. Questions in a Likert scale were used to measure the scale.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It is a survey; research and data were collected using questionnaires. The hypotheses were tested using one-way ANOVA and LSD test.

According to data obtained, 52.5 percent of respondents in 2005 and 51 percent in 2015 were female. 47.8 percent of respondents in 2005 and 49 percent in 2015 were male. The age range of respondents in 2005 was from 17 to 89 years old and in 2015 from 17 to 81. Age was categorised into three groups: 17-29 (young), 30-50 (middle-aged), and 51-89 (old). In the 2005 sample, 44.2 percent of respondents were 17 to 29 years old, 35.6 percent were 30 to 50 years old, and 2.20 percent were 51 to 89. In the 2015 sample, 36.8 percent of respondents were 17 to 29 years old, 51.4 percent were 30 to 50 years old, and 12 percent were 51 to 89 years old. In the 2005 sample, 39.3 percent were single, 57.3 percent were married, and 3.4 percent were divorced or widowed. In the 2015 sample, 32.7 percent were single, 65 percent were married, and 2.3 percent divorced or widowed.

The educational status of 34.6 percent of the respondents in 2005 was bachelor’s degree. In 2015, 42.3 percent of the respondents had a bachelor’s degree, which was the most frequent answer among respondents. In the 2005 sample, 41.1 percent of the respondents were employed, 6.24 percent were housewives, 16.4 percent were students, 8.9 percent were retired, 8.7 percent were unemployed, and 0.2 percent of respondents marked the option “none”. In the 2015 sample, 44.6 percent of respondents were employed, 28 percent were housewives, 15.3 percent were students, 6.6 percent were retired, 5.3 percent were unemployed, and 0.3 percent marked the option “none”.

In the 2005 sample, among 170 employed respondents, 15.5 percent had education jobs, 5.9 percent had technical jobs, 22.6 percent had administrative jobs, 1.2 percent had farming and gardening jobs, 13.1 percent were workers, 8.3 percent had high ranking jobs, and 2 people did not mention their jobs. In the 2015 sample, among 170 employed respondents, 8.9 percent had education jobs, 22.2 percent had technical jobs, 8.27 percent had administrative jobs, 11.2 percent were shopkeepers, 15.4 percent were workers, and 10.1 percent had high ranking jobs.

Final Description of the Main Indicators

Table 1
Distribution of participants in terms of the main indicators

Variables	Low		Moderate		High		Total	
	2005	2015	2005	2015	2005	2015	2005	2015
1. Altruistic Action	41.7	50.9	32.4	29.9	26	19.2	408	395
2. Altruistic Attitude	0	0	9.1	13.4	90.9	86.6	397	396
3. Social Capital	29.2	27.1	65.7	67.4	5.1	5.5	353	328
4. Cultural Capital	81.6	73	16.5	25.4	1.9	1.6	369	337
5. Economic Capital	65.1	62.2	26.6	29	8.3	8.8	338	217

Results of the two surveys show that the number of people performing altruistic actions has declined by 7 percent from 2005 to 2015 (26 percent in 2005 and 19.2 percent in 2015). The number of people having high altruistic attitudes in 2005 was more than that of 2015 (90.9 percent versus 86.6 percent). Also, the number of people with high social and economic capital in 2015 is slightly higher than that of 2005, while the number of people with high cultural

capital in 2005 was more than that of 2015. Accordingly, altruism among Tehranian citizens has declined within a decade, while the economic and social capital has slightly increased.

Statistical Relationships

First hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between marital status and altruistic action.

Table 2
Altruistic action and marital status

Independent variables		Low		Moderate		High		Chi-square test	MEANS	F-TEST
		Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent			
Marital status 2005	Single	86	54.4	46	29.1	26	16.5	20.33	13.57	F=10.49 Sig=0.000
	Married	78	33.3	83	35.5	73	31.2	Cramer's V=0.16	11.97	
	Divorced or widowed	6	42.9	3	21.4	5	35.7	Sig=0.000	11.93	
Marital status 2015	Single	79	61.2	28	21.7	22	17.1	11.00	9.9	F=5.55 Sig=0.000
	Married	120	47.1	84	32.9	51	20	Cramer's V=0.16	10.9	
	Divorced or widowed	2	22.2	5	55.6	2	22.2	Sig=0.027	12.4	

Data from Table 2 shows that there is a significant difference between altruistic behaviours of the respondents based on their marital status in both surveys. Based on data from both surveys, altruism among single people is lower than married and widowed or divorced people. The findings of both surveys show that in a period of ten years, altruism among married and unmarried people has declined, although more severely for married than singles. The rate of married people having high altruism has dropped from 31.2 percent to 20 percent, from 2005 to 2015, and the percentage of married people having low altruism has risen from 33.3 percent to 47.1

percent. According to chi-square test in two surveys (2005-2015), altruistic action and marital status are not independent of each other and there is correlation between them. One-way ANOVA testing shows that the hypothesis is confirmed at a 99 percent confidence level. Sheffeh & LSD post-hoc show that altruism of single and married people is different significantly but there is no significant difference between them and divorced or widowed people.

Second hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between social capital and altruistic action based on marital status.

Table 3
Impact of social capital on altruistic action based on marital status

Marital status	Social capital								Spearman Correlation & Kendall's tau-b			
	Low		Moderate		High		Total		2005	2015		
	2005	2015	2005	2015	2005	2015	2005	2015				
Single	Low	Frequency	40	22	32	39	1	3	73	64	Sp: 0.19 Sig=0.029	Sp: 0.16 Sig=0.097
		Percentage	63.5	73.3	51.6	54.2	16.7	60.0	55.7	59.8		
	Moderate	Frequency	17	6	14	17	5	2	36	25	Tau b: 0.18 Sig=0.019	Tau b: 0.15 Sig=0.061
		Percentage	27.0	20.0	22.6	23.6	83.3	40.0	27.5	23.4		
	High	Frequency	6	2	16	16	0	0	22	18		
		Percentage	9.5	6.7	25.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	16.8	16.8		
Total	Frequency	63	30	62	72	6	5	131	107			
	Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			
Married	Low	Frequency	38	33	27	69	2	2	67	104	Sp: 0.34 Sig=0.000	Sp: 0.18 Sig=0.007
		Percentage	45.2	58.9	26.5	48.3	10.5	15.4	32.7	49.1		
	Moderate	Frequency	33	14	40	48	2	3	75	65	Tau b: 0.32 Sig=0.000	Tau b: 0.17 Sig=0.009
		Percentage	39.3	25.0	39.2	33.6	10.5	23.1	36.6	30.7		
	High	Frequency	13	9	35	26	15	8	63	43		
		Percentage	15.5	16.1	34.3	18.2	78.9	61.5	30.7	20.3		
Total	Frequency	84	56	102	143	19	13	205	212			
	Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			

Table 3 (continue)

Marital status			Social capital								Spearman Correlation & Kendall's tau-b	
			Low		Moderate		High		Total		2005	2015
			2005	2015	2005	2015	2005	2015	2005	2015		
Divorced or widowed	Low	Frequency	5	0	1	2	0	0	6	2	Sp: 0.33 Sig=0.287	Sp: -0.76 Sig=0.135
		Percentage	62.5	0.0	25.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	50.0	40.0		
	Moderate	Frequency	1	1	1	1	0	0	4	2	Tau b: 0.32 Sig=0.221	Tau b: -0.72 Sig=0.000
		Percentage	12.5	50.0	25.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	40.0		
	High	Frequency	2	1	2	0	0	0	2	1		
		Percentage	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	20.0		
	Total	Frequency	8	2	4	3	0	0	12	5		
		Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0		
Total	Low	Frequency	83	55	60	110	3	5	146	170	Sp: 0.29 Sig=0.000	Sp: 0.16 Sig=0.003
		Percentage	53.5	62.5	35.7	50.5	12.0	27.8	42.0	52.5		
	Moderate	Frequency	51	21	55	66	7	5	113	92	Tau b: 0.27 Sig=0.000	Tau b: 0.15 Sig=0.003
		Percentage	32.9	23.9	32.7	30.3	28.0	27.8	32.5	28.4		
	High	Frequency	21	12	53	42	15	8	89	62		
		Percentage	13.5	13.6	31.5	19.3	60.0	44.4	25.6	19.1		
	Total	Frequency	155	88	168	218	25	18	348	324		
		Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		

The data from two surveys shows that in 2005, 83.3 percent of singles with high social capital had moderate altruism while 16.7 percent of singles with high social capital had low altruism. Also in 2005, 78.9 percent of married people with high social capital had high altruism, 10.5 percent moderate, and 10.5 percent had low altruism. In 2015, 60 percent of singles with high social capital had low altruism and 40 percent of them had moderate altruism.

Also in 2015, 15.4 percent of married people with high social capital had low altruism, 23 percent had moderate altruism, and 61.5 percent had high altruism. Based on the results of both surveys, altruistic action was significantly related to social capital according to marital status.

Third hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between altruistic attitude and altruistic action based on marital status.

Table 4
Altruistic attitudes and altruistic action based on marital status

Marital status	Altruistic action		Altruistic attitude								Spearman Correlation & Kendall's tau-b	
			Not agree		Not agree/ Agree		Agree		Total			
			2005	2015	2005	2015	2005	2015	2005	2015	2005	2015
Single	Low	Frequency	1	-	1	21	23	57	25	78	Sp: 0.11 Sig=0.159	Sp: 0.16 Sig=0.065
		Percentage	16,7	-	8,3	75.0	17,2	57.0	16,4	60.9		
	Moderate	Frequency	2	-	1	5	41	23	44	28	Tau b: 0.11 Sig=0.142	Tau b: 0.16 Sig=0.039
		Percentage	33,3	-	8,3	17.9	30,6	23.0	28,9	21.9		
	High	Frequency	3	-	10	2	70	20	83	22		
		Percentage	50,0	-	83,3	7.1	52,2	20.0	54,6	17.2		
Total	Frequency	6	-	12	28	134	100	152	128			
	Percentage	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			
Married	Low	Frequency	0	-	3	12	69	106	72	118	Sp: 0.09 Sig=0.155	Sp: 0.13 Sig=0.831
		Percentage	0.0	-	17,6	50.0	32,5	46.5	31,3	46.8		
	Moderate	Frequency	1	-	6	7	75	76	82	83	Tau b: 0.09 Sig=0.138	Tau b: 0.13 Sig=0.833
		Percentage	100.0	-	35,3	29.2	35,4	33.3	35,7	32.9		
	High	Frequency	0	-	8	5	68	46	76	51		
		Percentage	0.0	-	47,1	20.8	32,1	20.2	33,0	20.2		
Total	Frequency	1	-	17	24	212	228	230	252			
	Percentage	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			
Divorced or widowed	Low	Frequency	-	-	-	0	5	2	5	2	-	Sp: 0.00 Sig=1.00
		Percentage	-	-	-	0.0	35,7	25.0	31,3	22.2		
	Moderate	Frequency	-	-	-	1	3	4	3	5	-	Tau b: 0.00 Sig=1.00
		Percentage	-	-	-	100.0	21,4	50.0	35,7	55.6		
	High	Frequency	-	-	-	0	6	2	6	2		
		Percentage	-	-	-	0.0	42,9	25.0	33,0	22.2		
Total	Frequency	-	-	-	1	14	8	14	9			
	Percentage	-	-	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			
Total	Low	Frequency	1	-	4	33	97	165	102	198	Sp: 0.11 Sig=0.026	Sp: 0.16 Sig=0.07
		Percentage	14,4	-	13,8	62.3	26,9	49.1	25,8	50.9		
	Moderate	Frequency	3	-	7	13	119	103	129	116	Tau b: 0.11 Sig=0.022	Tau b: 0.09 Sig=0.06
		Percentage	42,9	-	24.1	24.5	33,1	30.7	32,6	29.8		
	High	Frequency	3	-	18	7	144	68	165	75		
		Percentage	42,9	-	62,1	13.2	40	20.0	41,7	19.3		
Total	Frequency	7	-	29	53	360	336	396	389			
	Percentage	100.0	-	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			

In 2015, 57 percent of single people with “Agree” on altruistic attitudes had low altruistic actions, 23 percent had moderate altruistic actions, and 20 percent had high altruistic actions.

Generally, in 2005, 27 percent of people with “Agree” position on altruistic attitudes had low altruistic actions, 33 percent had moderate and 40 percent had high altruistic action. Also, generally in 2015, 49 percent

of people with “Agree” altruistic position had low altruistic actions, 31 percent had moderate and 20 percent had high altruistic action. Statistical tests suggest a significant relationship between altruistic attitude and altruistic action in both surveys.

Fourth hypothesis: there is a significant relationship between cultural capital and altruistic action based on marital status.

Table 5
Cultural capital and altruistic action based on marital status

Marital status	Altruistic action		Cultural Capital								Spearman Correlation & Kendall's tau-b		
			Low		Moderate		High		Total		2005	2015	
			2005	2015	2005	2015	2005	2015	2005	2015			
Single	Low	Frequency	39	8	34	8	11	0	84	16	Sp: -0.13 Sig=0.880	Sp: -0.17 Sig=0.378	
		Percentage	60.0	47.1	51.5	61.5	73.3	0.0	57.5	53.3			
	Moderate	Frequency	18	4	19	3	3	0	40	7	Tau b: -0.12 Sig=0.872	Tau b: -0.16 Sig=0.346	
		Percentage	27.7	23.5	28.8	23.1	20.0	0.0	27.4	23.3			
	High	Frequency	8	5	13	2	1	0	22	7			
		Percentage	12.3	29.4	19.7	15.4	6.7	0.0	15.1	23.3			
	Total	Frequency	65	17	66	13	15	0	146	30			
		Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0			
	Married	Low	Frequency	50	14	15	1	1	1	66	16	Sp: -0.90 Sig=0.213	Sp: -0.23 Sig=0.219
			Percentage	37.0	51.9	30.0	100.0	10.0	100.0	33.8	55.2		
Moderate		Frequency	43	5	18	0	5	0	66	5	Tau b: -0.83 Sig=0.194	Tau b: -0.22 Sig=0.131	
		Percentage	31.9	18.5	36.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	33.8	17.2			
High		Frequency	42	8	17	0	4		0	63			
		Percentage	31.1	29.6	34.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	32.3	27.6			
Total		Frequency	135	27	50	1	10	1	195	29			
		Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			
Divorced or widowed		Low	Frequency	2	1	2	0	0	0	4	1	Sp: 0.22 Sig=0.513	Sp: 0.50 Sig=0.667
			Percentage	.6	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.4	33.3		
	Moderate	Frequency	2	1	1	1	0	0	3	2	Tau b: 0.209 Sig=0.451	Tau b: 0.50 Sig=0.221	
		Percentage	.6	50.0	25.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	66.7			
	High	Frequency	3	0	1	0	0	0	4	0			
		Percentage	42.9	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.4	0.0			
	Total	Frequency	7	2	4	1	0	0	11	3			
		Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0			
	Total	Low	Frequency	91	23	51	9	12	9	154	33	Sp: 0.007 Sig=0.895	Sp: -0.15 Sig=0.256
			Percentage	44.0	50.0	42.5	60.0	48.0	60.0	43.8	53.2		
Moderate		Frequency	63	10	0	4	8	4	109	14	Tau b: 0.007 Sig=0.893	Tau b: -0.14 Sig=0.213	
		Percentage	30.4	21.7	0.0	26.7	32.0	26.7	31.0	22.6			
High		Frequency	53	13	0	2	5	0	89	15			
		Percentage	25.6	28.3	0.0	13.3	20.0	0.0	25.3	24.2			
Total		Frequency	207	46	120	15	25	1	352	62			
		Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			

Results of the two surveys show there is not a significant relationship between cultural capital and altruistic action based on marital status. *Fifth hypothesis:* there is a significant relationship between economic capital and altruistic action based on marital status.

Table 6
Economic capital and altruistic action based on marital status

Marital status	Altruistic action	Economic capital								Spearman Correlation & Kendall's tau-b		
		Low		Moderate		High		Total		2005	2015	
		2005	2015	2005	2015	2005	2015	2005	2015			
Single	Low	Frequency	23	23	32	14	13	5	68	42	Sp: -0.03 Sig=0.710	Sp: -0.07 Sig=0.533
		Percentage	59.0	54.8	57.1	60.9	54.2	55.6	57.1	56.8		
	Moderate	Frequency	10	7	20	6	6	2	36	15	Tau b: -0.03 Sig=0.721	Tau b: -0.07 Sig=0.529
		Percentage	25.6	16.7	35.7	26.1	25.0	22.2	30.3	20.3		
	High	Frequency	6	12	4	3	5	2	15	17		
		Percentage	15.4	28.6	7.1	13.0	20.8	22.2	12.6	23.0		
	Total	Frequency	39	42	56	23	24	9	119	74		
		Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		
Married	Low	Frequency	43	46	22	15	5	4	70	65	Sp: -0.05 Sig=0.496	Sp: 0.09 Sig=0.302
		Percentage	38.4	50.5	31.0	37.5	31.3	44.4	35.2	46.4		
	Moderate	Frequency	32	30	28	17	4	4	64	51	Tau b: -0.04 Sig=0.496	Tau b: 0.08 Sig=0.292
		Percentage	28.6	33.0	39.4	42.5	25.0	44.4	32.2	36.4		
	High	Frequency	37	15	21	8	7	1	65	24		
		Percentage	33.0	16.5	29.6	20.0	43.8	11.1	32.7	17.1		
	Total	Frequency	112	91	71	40	16	9	199	140		
		Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		
Divorced or widowed	Low	Frequency	4	1	2	0	0	0	6	1	Sp: -0.37 Sig=0.268	-
		Percentage	66.7	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	54.5	100.0		
	Moderate	Frequency	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	Tau b: -0.32 Sig=0.229	
		Percentage	16.7	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	0.0		
	High	Frequency	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	0		
		Percentage	16.7	0.0	25.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	27.3	0.0		
	Total	Frequency	6	1	4	0	1	0	11	1		
		Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0		
Total	Low	Frequency	70	70	56	29	18	9	144	108	Sp: 0.00 Sig=0.913	Sp: 0.02 Sig=0.742
		Percentage	44.6	52.2	42.7	46.0	43.9	50.0	43.8	50.2		
	Moderate	Frequency	43	37	49	23	10	6	102	66	Tau b: 0.00 Sig=0.917	Tau b: 0.02 Sig=0.740
		Percentage	27.4	27.6	37.4	36.5	24.4	33.3	31.0	30.7		
	High	Frequency	44	27	26	11	13	3	83	41		
		Percentage	28.0	20.1	19.8	17.5	31.7	16.7	25.2	19.1		
	Total	Frequency	157	134	131	63	41	18	329	215		
		Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		

According to data from both surveys, there is not a significant relationship between altruistic action and economic capital based on marital status.

CONCLUSION

Altruism is a voluntary action aiming to help others without expectation of reward. In this type of action, the individual cares for others' interests rather than those of his or her own. This type of behaviour goes beyond social norms and social relations of social responsibility and falls into the sphere of morality. In other words, a person behaving pro-socially puts himself in another person's shoes. The frequency of such actions in the society promises ethical behaviour, and the lack of it is a threat to social order. In this regard, the role of the family as one of the most important agents of socialisation is highlighted. Children mimic many right and wrong behaviours of their parents in observational learning. Therefore, parents with altruism have children with such behaviours. The main conclusion of this article is:

Results of the two surveys show that the number of people having altruistic actions has declined by 7 percent from 2005 to 2015. The number of people with high altruistic attitudes in 2005 was more than that of 2015. It shows that the gap between morals and ethics has been increased in that decade. The decrease of altruistic actions threatens social order. The increase of egoism, instrumental rationality and bureaucratisation of human relationships have influenced caused the declining altruistic actions.

Also, the number of people with high social and economic capital in 2015 is slightly higher than that of 2005, while the number of people with high cultural capital in 2005 is more than that of 2015. Accordingly, altruism among Tehranian citizens has declined within a decade, while the economic and social capital has slightly increased.

Based on data from both surveys, altruism among single people is lower than married and widowed or divorced people. This result is similar to the findings of some researches like Wilson and Musick (1997), Rotolo (2000), and Einolf (2006). This seems to also be true for people having more children than those having no children (Smith, 2001).

The findings of both surveys show that in a period of ten years, altruism among married and unmarried people has declined, although more severely for married than singles.

The rate of married people having high altruism dropped between 2005 and 2015, while the percentage of married people having low altruism has risen in this decade. The data from two surveys show that in 2005, 83.3 percent of singles with high social capital had moderate altruism. 16.7 percent of singles with high social capital had low altruism. 78.9 percent of married people with high social capital had high altruism, 10.5 percent had moderate altruism, and 10.5 percent had low altruism.

In 2015, 60 percent of singles with high social capital had low altruism and 40 percent had moderate altruism. 15.4

percent of married people with high social capital had low altruism, 23 percent had moderate altruism, and 61.5 percent had high altruism. Based on the results of both surveys, altruistic action was significantly related to social capital according to marital. According to Putnam (2000) social networks and associations encourage charitable and philanthropic activities. This networks reinforce empathy and consider the welfare and comfort of others. In his view, the active people in these networks more than nonactives allocate their money and time to charity affairs. Generally, in 2005, 27 percent of people with “Agree” altruistic attitudes had low altruistic actions, 33 percent had moderate and 40 percent had high altruistic action. Also, generally in 2015, 49 percent of people with “Agree” altruistic attitudes had low altruistic actions, 31 percent had moderate and 20 percent had high altruistic action. Statistical tests suggest the significant relationship between altruistic attitude and altruistic action in both surveys.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, V. L. (1989). *Gender difference in altruism: a psychological study of non-jewish german holocaust rescuers* (Doctoral dissertation), B. A. University of Northern Colorado. Retrieved from www.proquest.com
- Batson, D. C., Fultz, J. Q., Vanderplas, M., & Isen, A. M. (1983). Influence of self-reported distress and empathy on egoistic versus altruistic motivation to help. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(3), 706-718.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1992). *Some do care: Contemporary lives of moral commitment*. New York: Free Press.
- Collins, R., & Neal, H. (1991). Altruism and culture as social products. *Voluntas*, 2(2), 1-15.
- Edwards Wynne, V. C. (1962). *Animal dispersion in relation to social behavior*. London: Oliver and Boyd.
- Einolf, J. C. (2006). *The roots of altruism: a gender and life course perspective* (Doctoral Dissertation), University of Virginia. Retrieved from www.Proquest.com
- Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1998). Prosocial Development. In W. Damon & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (Vol. 3). New York: Wiley.
- Eisenberg, N., & Mussen, P. H. (1989). *The roots of prosocial behaviour in children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eisenberg, N., Reykowski, J., & Staub, E. (Eds.). (1989). *Social and moral values: individual and societal perspectives*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Field, J. (2003). *Social capital*. Routledge.
- Huneycutt, A. (2013). *Altruistic action and relationship satisfaction: exploring possible benefits of volunteering and altruism on couple relationships* (Doctoral Dissertation), California School of Professional Psychology, Alliant International University. Retrieved from www.Proquest.com

- Lapsley, D. K. (1996). *Moral psychology*. Boulder, Colorado: West view Press.
- Mansbridge, J. (Ed.). (1990). *Beyond self interest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Monroe, K. S. (1996). *The heart of altruism: perception of common humanity*. Princeton University Press.
- Mustillo, S., Wilson, J., & Lynch, S. M. (2004). Legacy volunteering: a test of two theories of intergenerational transmission. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(2), 530-541.
- Nowak, M., & Highfield, R. (2011). *Super cooperators: Altruism, evolution and why we need each other to succeed*. New York: Free Press.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and Schuster.
- Rotolo, T. (2000). Town heterogeneity and affiliation: a multilevel analysis of voluntary association membership. *Sociological Perspective*, 43(2). Retrieved from www.sage.com
- Rushton, J. P., & Sorrentino, R. M. (1981). Altruism and helping behavior: An historical perspective. In J. P. Rushton & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), *Altruism and helping behavior: social personality and developmental perspectives*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Schervish, P. G., & Havens, J. (2002). The boston area diary study and the moral citizenship of care. *Voluntas*, 13(1), 47-71.
- Smith, Ph. (2001). *Cultural theory*. Madlen: Blakwell Publishers Inc.
- Warneken, F., & Tomasello, M. (2008). Extrinsic rewards undermine altruistic tendencies in 20-month-olds. *Developmental Psychology*, 44(6), 1785-1788.
- Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 215.
- Wilson, J., & Musick, M. (1997). Who cares? Towards an integrated theory of volunteer work. *American Sociological Review*, 62(5), 694-713.
- Wuthnow, R. (1985). *Learning to care: Elementary kindness in an age of indifference*. New York: Oxford University Press.

