

## **Prosocial Behavior among University Students: A comparative study of Gender Groups**

**Sajjad Ahmed<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Saima Ambreen<sup>2</sup> & Dr. Muhammad Azam Tahir<sup>3</sup>**

### **Abstract**

*The present study attempts to investigate the differences on Prosocial Behavior among university students. The study also explored the influence of age and levels of education on prosocial behavior of students. A sample of 80 university students including both men (n=34) and women (n=45) their age ranged 17-35 were drawn. They are currently enrolled at BS, Masters, and M.Phil. at different universities of Quetta, including University of Balochistan, Sardar Bahadur Khan Womens' University, and Balochistan University of Technology Information and Management Sciences Quetta. Descriptive research design was followed and Prosocial Behavior Measure by Carlo (2002) was used to measure prosocial behavior. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and t-test were used for analysis. Results indicated non-significant mean differences on gender as well as age and level of education.*

**Key Words:** Prosocial Behavior; ANOVA; t-test; Gender; Age; & Level of Education

### **Introduction**

Prosocial behavior is a behavior in which one intends to help, care and benefit other people where there is no selfishness in showing such behavior (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). Altruistic prosocial behavior is the first type of prosocial behavior in which benefiting other people does not have personal

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Balochistan, Saryab Road, Quetta, Pakistan  
e-mail: sajjadj798@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Balochistan, Saryab Road, Quetta, Pakistan

<sup>3</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Balochistan, Saryab Road, Quetta, Pakistan

mean or when an individual cares other without any expectation (Carlo, 2006). In altruistic prosocial behavior expectation less behavior is shown. Compliant is the second type of prosocial behavior which means showing careful and helping behavior with children, those who ask from adults for help. The prosocial helping is not linked with preschool children rather it is found that elementary children are usually involved in prosocial behavior (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). When an individual help, cares the needy people in an emotional situation (Batson & Coke, 1981; Staub, 1978; & Hoffman, 1982). There is incoherent link between Empathy and prosocial behavior in childhood is found by (Underwood & Moore, 1892). People whose intentions are to have public attention, concertation and want approval, appreciation, respect and enhancement of self they usually show helping behavior in public (Bushmaster, Goldfarb & Cantrell, 1992).

Sympathy is linked with the help which is done in highly emotional situation. The fourth type is when people are highly motivated to help other for personal worth and approval is known as public prosocial behavior. Anonymous and Dire are two sub types of emotional prosocial behavior. Anonymous is a kind of behavior when people help other without any information. Whereas, the other type of emotional prosocial behavior is when one helps people in emergency condition is known dire prosocial behavior.

According to the findings of Snyder and Clary (2004) generativity is basically like prosocial behavior because in prosocial behavior donating, caring, volunteering and helping others, similarly in generative activities a person becomes productive for society in shape of helping caring, sharing, protecting and facilitating. Generativity which begins from middle of life is a huge issue for adults (Shin, & Cooney, 2006). According to Erikson (1959) "generativity is primarily the interest in establishing and guiding the next generation" creativity and productivity are also the part of generativity. In case of not fulfilling of this stage adult feel stagnant which is a sense that their life is useless have no value, mean, and are not able to be productive, generative and creative for society (McAdams & Logan, 2004).

Conversely end of generativity does not mean the end of generative behavior. Researches have been carried out with children that how they share their resources, findings suggest that children within their own group members share more resources than other group members (Olson & Spelke, 2008). As the findings of Olson and Spelke (2008) state that children of 3

years share more resources with their own friends and family than the strangers. Similarly, Kinzler, Dupoux, and Spelke (2012) found that 2.5-year-old children are more likely to share their toys with their own native language than the foreign language speaker. research states that children with age 3 to 5 share much resources with their own ethnic and gender than other gender and ethnic (Renno&Shutts, 2015).

Dutch children intend more offers of helping to their own friends than others (Sierskma, Thijs& Verkuyten, 2015). Misch, Over, and Carpenter (2015) investigated loyalty among 4 to 5 year-old children that they keep secret of their own minimal group friends. Various researches indicate the reasons that why individuals support or show prosocial behavior or favor their own group member than other group members. It may be due to the children's preference. Due to this, children prefer their own group members more than outer group members (Greenwald& Banaji, 1995; McAuliffe & Dunham, 2016). dislike to the outer group members is due to the influence of in-group members because they are considered as threat for their group members. Therefore, there is less chances of showing prosocial behavior with them. (Aboud, 2003; Brewer, 1999).

Similarly, sometimes children perform such act for making them agony and depart them from their group (Buttelmann & Bohm, 2014; Benozio & Diesendruck, 2015). There are stresses on the influence of moral rules and social norms by theatrical perspectives on children's prosocial behavior (Killen & Verkuyten, 2017; Killen& Rutland, 2011). In accordance of children expectation that their own group members are more likeable, care able and helper for them, than other group members there for they consider cooperation and care, being available and feel energetic to assist them. Similarly, researchers have found that children do not think to harm their own group members because they become intrinsically motivated to benefit, care, help and cooperate with them (Rhodes& Chalik, 2013). Killen and Verkuyten (2017) state children have sense of their in-group norms. Dehumanization is tendency in which human beings have no or less human characteristics due to that out group member's prosocial activities automatically reduce (Haslam, 2006; Leyens, Paladino, Rodriguez-Torres, Vaes, Demoulin, Rodriguez-Perez,& Gaunt, 2000). It is stated in a theory of social psychology that those who are dehumanize members of out-group are less likely to help and care

and become beneficial for others rather such people are harmful for others (Bandura, 2000).

This research was designed to study the Prosocial Behavior of university students. The goal of this study was twofold. (1) to assess gender, differences in prosocial behavior of university students. (2) to assess influence age and level of education differences on prosocial behavior of university students.

### **Method**

This research is mainly aimed to explore the gender differences in prosocial behavior on university students.

### **Participants**

Eighty participants were selected from three different universities of Quetta, Balochistan. Including men ( $n=35$ ) and women ( $n=45$ ).

### **Instrument**

Prosocial behavior PTM is authored by Carlo, (2002). Students self-report their prosocial behavior by responding to 23 questions. PBM is composed of 6 sub scales: Altruism (5 items), Public (4), Emotional (4), Compliant (2), Anonymous(5), Dire(3). Participants were asked to rate the degree to which statements described themselves on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (does not describe me at all) to 5 (describes me greatly)

### **Procedure**

Students were invited to fill the questionnaire of prosocial behaviors. Students were from various education level BS ( $n=31$ ), Master( $n=34$ ) and M. Phil( $n=15$ ). Age of the participants ranged from 17 to 35 years old, with the men 43.75% and women 56.25%. The assessment was conducted in classrooms after informed consents were obtained from the Head of Department, class teachers and the participants. Responses were recorded on Questionnaire and later on Spss data sheet for further analysis.

### **Results**

To explore the prosocial behavior of the university students several analyses were conducted. To assess gender differences on t-test was conducted. Similarly, to assess age and level of education on Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run.

**Table 1**

*Differences in Mean of University Students from two Gender groups on their score of Prosocial Behavior (N=80).*

Scale	no of items	Men(n=35)		Women(n=45)		t (78)	p	CI 95%		Cohen's d
		M	SD	M	SD			LL	UL	
Prosocial behavior	23	66.17	10.32	70.05	12.502	-1.481	.143 (N.S)			5.196

Note. N. S= non-significant

Results revealed in Table 1 shows non-significant different in score of university students on prosocial behavior. this means that none of the gender group showed influenced of prosocial behavior.

**Table2**

*Analysis of variance (ANOVA) showing MeanDifference of University Students fromAge groups on their scores of Prosocial Behaviors(N=80).*

Group	n	Mean	SDFp		
17-21	26	66.346	10.252	.994	.400
22-26	39	67.974	12.921	(N.S)	
27-31	11	72.909	11.768		
32-35	04	68.3500	3.000		

Note. N. S= non-significant

The table 2represents the difference among the various age groups on Prosocial Behavior. By ANOVA analysis result revealed non-significant difference in score of University Students on prosocial behavior. This means that none of the age group showed influence of prosocial behavior.

**Table 3**

*Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) showing Mean Difference of University Students from Levels of Education on their scores of Prosocial Behaviors(N=80).*

Program of study	n	Mean	SDFp		
12	23	63.347	9.261	3.182	.029
14	08	63.875	12.548		
16	34	71.235	12.548		
18	15	71.866	9.920		

Note: Significant; \* =<, 05.

The table 3 represents the mean differences among the students from various levels of education on Prosocial Behavior. Results revealed significant ( $p .05$ ) difference in score of University Students from four levels of education on prosocial behavior. This means that levels of education may show influence on display of prosocial behavior.

### **Discussion**

Prosocial behavior is a behavior in which one intends to help, care and benefit other people where there is no selfishness in showing such behavior (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). When an individual performs actions of benefiting for other in this case prosocial behavior occurs (Twenge, Baumeister, Dewell, Ciarocco, & Bartels, 2007). Results of the current study are drawn by applying t-test and ANOVA analysis. For knowing the mean differences of university students from two Gender groups of prosocial behavior t-test analysis was run. The results indicated non-significant difference. Analysis of variance was executed to analyze age group differences towards prosocial behavior. Age groups consist of 17-21 ( $n=26$ ,  $M= 66.346$ ), 22-26 ( $n=39$ ,  $M= 67.974$ ), 27-31 ( $n=11$ ,  $M= 72.909$ ), 32-35 ( $n=04$ ,  $M=68.350$ ). Results on Age groups depict non-significant differences but levels of education indicated significant differences on prosocial behavior.

Moreover, the First objective of current study is to assess gender differences on prosocial behavior. Non-significant results are found in gender differences by running t-test analysis.

The research findings of Xinyuan, Laura, Padilla-walker, Michael, and Brown (2017) indicate increase prosocial behavior among women in comparison to men. Another research was conducted with adolescents aged 11 and 14 years. Men adolescents have age 11 and 12 showed little increase and age 13 men little decreased towards prosocial behavior but age 14 relatively slight increase. Similarly, another research finding show that women have higher level of prosocial behavior than men (Carlo, Crockett, Randall, & Roesch, 2007). The findings of Nielson, Padilla-Walker, and Holmes (2017) suggest that increase in prosocial behavior among women adolescents can be societal pressure whereas boys does not have such pressure there for they show less prosocial behavior. Comparing the findings of current study and studies done earlier have inconsistent similarity. Therefore, it can be concluded that difference between the results is due to sample size and type of population.

Likewise, the second objective of current study is to assess the influence of age and levels of education on prosocial behavior. Results on various age groups depict non-significant differences whereas levels of education indicated significant differences on prosocial behavior. The research conducted by Carlo, Eisenberg, Troyer, Switzer, and Speer (1991) with children show different behavior in low or high emotional situation due to individual differences. The findings of Eisenberg and Fabes (1998) found that the prosocial helping is not linked with preschool children rather it is found that elementary school children are found involved in prosocial behavior. Similarly, an others research neglects the findings of prior researches done with elementary aged students arguing that children with age 3 to 5 share much resources with their own ethnic and gender than other gender and ethnic groups (Renno & Shutts, 2015). Research conducted with preschoolers' empathy showed positive relationship on prosocial behavior by measuring their empathy through picture/story measures (Underwood & Moore, 1982).

The purpose of various other studies reporting here is to examine the consistency of prosocial behavior in cross- cultures on gender groups, age groups and levels of education. So the results of current study and researches mentioned are in consistent. The reason can be of sample size, age groups, levels of education, population and research design. Although results of current study with limited sample are encouraging, Further researches can be done by enlarging the sample size maintaining equality of gender groups for more generalized results.

### **References**

- Aboud, F. E. (2003). The formation of in-group favoritism and out-group prejudice in young children: are they distinct attitudes? *Dev Psychol*, 39, 48-60.
- Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *J Moral Educ*, 31, 101-119 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0305724022014322>.
- Batson, D., & Coke, J.E. (1981). Empathy: A source of altruistic motivation for helping? *In J.P.*

- Benozio, A., Diesendruck, G. (2015). Parochialism in preschool boys' resource allocation. *Evol Hum Behav*, 36, 256-264 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.12.002>.
- Brewer, M.B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: in-group love or outgroup hate? *J Soc Issues*, 55, 429-444 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00126>.
- Bushmaster, D., Goldfarb, J., & Cantrell, D. (1992). Self-presentation when sharing with friends and non-friends. *J. Early Adolescent*, 12, 61-79.425
- Buttelmann, D., Bohm, R. (2014). The ontogeny of the motivation that underlies in-group bias. *Psychol Sci*, 25, 921-927 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797613516802>.
- Carlo, G., Crockett, L. J., Randall, B. A., & Roesch, S. C. (2007). A latent growth curve analysis of prosocial behavior among rural adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 17(2), 301e324. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2007.00524.x>.
- Carlo, Gustavo, Randall, & Brandy, A. (2002). "The Development of a Measure of Prosocial Behaviors for Late Adolescents" *Faculty Publications, Department of Psychology*. 70.<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/psychfacpub/70>
- Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R.A. (1998). Prosocial development. In *Handbook of Child Development, vol. 4: Social, Emotional and Personality Development*, ed. N. Eisenberg and W. Damon, 701-78. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Erikson, E. H. (1959). *Identity and the life cycle*. New York, NY: International Universities Press, Inc. generativity development and parent-child relationships across the lifespan. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 30(5): 410-421. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0165025406071489>.
- Greenwald, A.G., & Banaji, M.R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychol Rev*, 102, 4-27. 29.
- Haslam, N. (2006). Dehumanization: an integrative review. *Pers Soc Psychol Rev*, 10:252-264 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1003\\_4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_4). 36.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1982). The measurement of empathy. In C.E. Izard (Ed.), *Measuring emotions in infants and children* (pp. 279-296). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



- Killen, M., & Verkuyten, M. (2017). The importance of social-cognitive development and the developmental context for group dynamics. *Group Process Intergr Relate*:1-12.
- Kinzler, K.D., Dupoux, E., & Spelke E.S. (2012). 'Native' objects and collaborators: infants' object choices and acts of giving reflect favor for native over foreign speakers. *J Cogn Dev*, 13:67-81 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15248372.2011.567200>.
- Leyens, J.P., Paladino, P.M., Rodriguez-Torres, R., Vaes, J., Demoulin, S., Rodriguez-Perez, A., & Gaunt, R. (2000). The emotional side of prejudice: the attribution of secondary emotions to in groups and outgroups. *Pers Soc Psychol Rev*, 4, 186-197.
- McAdams, D. P., & Logan, R. L. (2004). What is generativity? In E. de St. Aubin, D. P.
- McAuliffe, K., & Dunham, Y. (2016). Group bias in cooperative norm enforcement. *Phil Trans R Soc B*, 371, 1-9 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0073>
- Misch, A., Over, H., & Carpenter, M. (2016). I won't tell: young children show loyalty to their group by keeping group secrets. *J Exp Child Psychol*, 142, 96-106 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2015.09.016>
- Nielson, M. G., Padilla-Walker, L., & Holmes, E. K. (2017). How do men and women help? Validation of a multidimensional measure of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Adolescence*, 56, 91-106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.02.006>.
- Olson, K.R., & Spelke, E.S. (2008). *Foundations of cooperation in preschool children*. *Cognition*, 108:222-231 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.12.003>.
- Renno, M.P., & Shutts, K. (2015). Children's social category-based giving and its correlates: expectations and preferences. *Dev Psychol*, 51, 533-543 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038819>.
- Rhodes, M., & Chalik, L. (2013). Social categories as markers of intrinsic interpersonal obligations. *Psychol Sci*, 6:999-1006 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797612466267>.
- Shin-an, J., & Cooney, T. M. (2006). Psychological well-being in mid to late life: The role of generativity development and parent-child relationships across the lifespan. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 30(5), 410-421. [10.1177/0165025406071489](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0165025406071489).

- Sierksma, J., Thijs, J., & Verkuyten, M. (2015). In-group bias in children's intention to help can be over powered by inducing empathy. *Br J Dev Psychol*, 33, 45-56 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111>
- Snyder, M., & Clary, E. (2004). *Volunteerism and the generative society*. In E. de St. Aubin, D. P.
- Staub, E. (1978). *Positive social behavior and morality: Social and personal influences (Vol. 1)*. New York: Academic.
- Twenge, J.M., Baumeister, R.F., DeWall, C.N., Ciarocco, N.J., Bartels, J.M. (2007). Social Exclusion Decreases Prosocial Behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(1), 56 – 66.
- Underwood, B., & Moore, B. (1982). Perspective-taking and altruism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91, 143-173.
- Xinyuan F. U., Laura. M., Padilla-Walker., Michael. N., & Bown. (2017). adolescents' self-esteem and prosocial behavior toward strangers, friends and family. *Journal of Adolescence*, 57, 90-98