



Volume 1	Issue 2	August (2020)	DOI: 10.47540/ijsei.v1i2.19	Page: 63 – 68
----------	---------	---------------	-----------------------------	---------------

Prosocial Behaviours of Members from Student Voluntary Clubs in Sagaing University of Education

Yar Zar Chit

Department of Educational Psychology, Sagaing University of Education, Myanmar

Corresponding Author: Yar Zar Chit; Email: yarzar02@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Prosocial Behaviour; Student Club; Voluntary.

Received : 03 June 2020

Revised : 18 June 2020

Accepted : 08 August, 2020

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the prosocial behaviors of members from student voluntary clubs in Sagaing University of Education, Myanmar. A total of 200 BEd students who are members from six student voluntary clubs in Sagaing University of Education participated in this study. Descriptive research design and survey method were used. Findings revealed that mean percentage of emotional prosocial behavior is highest and that of anonymous prosocial behaviour is lowest. There were significant differences in students' altruistic and emotional prosocial behaviors as well as there was significant difference in their prosocial behaviors by gender at $\alpha = 0.05$ levels. However, there was no significant difference in students' prosocial behaviours by club type. It was also found that there were commonly positive high correlations between total prosocial behavior and each tendency at $\alpha = 0.05$ levels. This study hopes to give some ideas to promote students' prosocial behaviours.

INTRODUCTION

Most of the sociological theories highlighted that man is social animal. A man cannot live alone in his environment. Some-times, he needs helps from others. Sometimes, another needs from him. There are essential needs to be helpful, sympathetic and respectful with each other in the society. Therefore, prosocial behavior is also an important role in the society that enables people of different ages to live together peacefully and productively.

Prosocial behavior refers to the phenomenon of people helping each other with no thought of reward or compensation. Prosocial behaviors are actions or patterns of behavior rather than motivations (Feigl et al., 2014, cited in lay and Hoppmann, 2015).

Prosocial behaviour can come in many different forms, ranging from small acts of kindness, such as letting someone in a rush go ahead at the cashier, to more sustained acts, such as volunteering for a charitable organization and even to things one might take for granted, such as looking after one's grandchildren. The term prosocial behavior also covers a wide range of phenomena such as helping, sharing, self-sacrifice,

and norm observing. All these phenomena have one common characteristic-namely, that an individual action is toward protection, maintenance, or enhancement of well-being of an external social object: a specific person, a group, a society as a whole, a social institution or a symbolic being, for example, an ideology or system of morality (Reykowski, 1982, as cited in Klemola, 2013).

Some people make prosocial behavior but they are taking. They want to be honorable of other people. In contract, the term prosocial behavior means positive actions that benefit others, prompted by empathy, moral values, and a sense of personal responsibility rather than a desire for personal gain. Research on child development suggests that one of the most effective ways in which schools can encourage prosocial behavior is through school wide programs designed to teach and model social skills (as cited in Kidron and Fleischman, 2006).

It is clear that prosocial behavior is highly valued by teachers and school personnel, as well as by children themselves. In addition, prosocial behavior has received recent, increased attention by educators due, in part, to interest in promoting positive aspects of psychological functioning and

adjustment rather than treating maladaptive forms of classroom behavior once they occur. However, instructional programs and interventions that directly promote the development of prosocial behavior are rare and often difficult to implement, especially given other academic and disciplinary issues that also need to be addressed on a daily basis.

Therefore, this study focuses on the pre-service teachers in Sagaing University of Education, one of the instructional programs or teacher education programs in Myanmar. In this university, there are many student voluntary clubs organized by the students themselves who have same hobbies and same attitudes. Some clubs are service clubs (such as social service club, health care club) and some are study clubs (such as reading club, English language club). In this paper, prosocial behaviors of some students from these clubs were investigated.

The main aim of this study is to investigate the prosocial behaviors of members from student clubs in Sagaing University of Education. The specific objectives are as follows: (1) to explore the prosocial behaviors of club-members by six tendencies; (2) to compare the differences of club-members' pro-social behaviors according to club, club type, gender and grade; (3) To examine the inter-correlation among pro-social behavior tendencies.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sampling: The participants were taken from Sagaing University of Education by using the simple random sampling technique. Among the student voluntary clubs, six clubs were selected to be tested. They are Solar Star (Social Service), Health Care, Light Adjustment (Reading), English Language, Shan Ni Literature and University Christian Fellowship. Members from these clubs

meet in every weekend and do the activities. The participants were 200 students (90 males and 110 females).

Research Method: In this study, descriptive research design and survey method were used.

Instrument: Carlo and Randall's (2002) "Prosocial Tendencies Measure (PTM)" was used to assess the participants' prosocial behavioral tendencies. The PTM is a 21-item self-reported measure developed to estimate the tendencies of college students towards prosocial behavior. It was composed of six subscales: public, anonymous, dire, emotional, compliant, altruism. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which statements described themselves on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Data Collection Procedure: Firstly, some reference books and research papers were read for literature review. Then, research instrument was prepared. After modifying the instrument based on experts' reviews, the required data were collected. Participants completed the demographics section of the questionnaire followed by *Prosocial Tendencies Measure (PTM)*. After collecting required data, they were analyzed and wrote a report about research findings. After collecting the required data, quantitative data analyses were performed by using descriptive statistics and independent sample t-test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics of Students' Prosocial Behaviors by Tendencies: According to Table 1, mean percentage of emotional prosocial behavior is highest (82.4%) and that of anonymous prosocial behavior is lowest (68.2%). So, students commonly help others' emotional problems but they do not desire to help without knowing by others.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics for Students' Prosocial Behaviours

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Percentage
Altruistic	24.08	2.860	80.27%
Compliant	7.59	1.229	75.9%
Emotional	8.24	1.284	82.4%
Public	13.89	2.603	69.45%
Anonymous	13.64	1.954	68.2%
Dire	11.06	1.676	73.73%

Comparison of Male and Female Students' Prosocial Behaviors: To find out gender differences in students' prosocial behaviors, descriptive analysis was made. The means and standard deviations of male and female students were reported in table 2.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics for Students' Prosocial Behaviors by Gender

	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation
Altruistic	Male	23.53	2.938
	Female	24.52	2.728
Compliant	Male	7.47	1.192
	Female	7.68	1.256
Emotional	Male	8.04	1.340
	Female	8.39	1.220
Public	Male	13.66	2.199
	Female	13.63	1.739
Anonymous	Male	13.66	2.601
	Female	14.09	2.600
Dire	Male	10.86	1.618
	Female	11.23	1.712
Total	Male	77.21	7.195
	Female	79.54	6.977

Table 2 also showed that there was slight difference in mean scores by gender in students' prosocial behaviors. Again, to find out difference significantly, independent sample *t*-test was used. It was reported in Table 3. According to Table 3, it was found that there were significant differences in students' altruistic and emotional prosocial behaviors as well as there was significant difference

in their prosocial behaviors by gender at $\alpha = 0.05$ levels. So, female students favour voluntary helping and helping others under emotionally evocative circumstances than male students. Moreover, females are better in prosocial behaviour than males.

Table 3 Independent Sample *t*-test Results for Students' Prosocial Behaviors by Gender

Variable	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig:
Altruistic	-2.453	198	0.015
Compliant	-1.233	198	0.219
Emotional	-1.911	198	0.050
Public	0.102	198	0.919
Anonymous	-1.178	198	0.240
Dire	-1.566	198	0.119
Total	-2.312	198	0.022

Comparison of Students' Prosocial Behaviors by Each Club: Table 4 showed the comparison of students' prosocial behaviors by club. In altruistic, compliant, public and dire prosocial behaviours, mean scores of students from club 1 are highest and so they more help voluntarily, through some requests, in front of others and in emergency circumstances than others. However, in emotional

and anonymous prosocial behaviors, club 6 students' mean scores are highest and so they more help others' emotional problems and help without exploring their names than others. In the total mean scores, since club 1 students' mean scores are highest, it seems that they help mostly others among students (Mean=80.08).

Table 4 Mean Comparisons of Prosocial Behaviors by Each Club

Club		Altruistic	Compliant	Emotional	Public	Anonymous	Dire	Total
Club 1	Mean	24.52	7.80	8.26	14.00	14.14	11.36	80.08
	Std. Deviation	3.512	1.178	1.306	2.259	2.119	1.914	8.470
Club 2	Mean	24.20	7.60	8.17	13.48	13.35	10.92	77.72
	Std. Deviation	2.857	1.172	1.196	1.867	2.271	1.421	5.918
Club 3	Mean	24.27	7.77	7.97	13.77	14.30	11.23	79.30
	Std. Deviation	2.912	1.357	1.752	1.851	2.667	1.569	8.956
Club 4	Mean	24.33	7.40	8.37	13.57	13.23	11.00	77.90
	Std. Deviation	1.918	.968	.999	2.096	3.350	1.742	6.099
Club 5	Mean	23.10	6.81	7.67	12.86	14.05	10.19	74.67
	Std. Deviation	3.048	1.470	1.197	1.315	2.974	1.209	5.580
Club 6	Mean	23.38	7.76	8.83	13.76	14.38	11.24	79.34
	Std. Deviation	2.060	1.154	.889	1.806	2.527	1.786	5.219

Comparison of Students' Prosocial Behaviors by Club Type: The six clubs can be grouped into two types: service and study clubs. According to Table 5, it was found that there was no significant difference in students' prosocial behaviors by club

type at $\alpha = 0.05$ level. Although service clubs should help better others than study clubs, their services were same with those of study clubs.

Table 5 Independent Sample *t*-test Results for Students' Prosocial Behaviours by Club Type

Club Type	Mean	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig:
Service Clubs	79.03	0.972	198	0.332
Study Clubs	78.05			

Behaviors by Grade: Table 6 showed the comparison of students' prosocial behaviors by grade. First year students' mean scores in altruistic, second year students in compliant and anonymous, and fifth year students in emotional, public and dire

prosocial behaviors were highest among grades. In the total mean scores, since first year students' mean scores are highest, they help mostly to promote the well-being of others among students (Mean=79.09).

Table 6 Mean Comparisons of Students' Prosocial Behaviors by Grade

Grade		Altruistic	Compliant	Emotional	Public	Anonymous	Dire	Total
First Year	Mean	24.96	7.65	8.54	13.80	13.26	10.87	79.09
	N	46	46	46	46	46	46	46
	Std. Deviation	2.898	1.159	1.187	1.857	2.728	1.681	7.509
Second Year	Mean	23.43	7.69	7.86	13.80	14.49	11.60	78.86
	N	35	35	35	35	35	35	35
	Std. Deviation	2.747	1.132	1.353	2.311	2.020	1.499	6.916

Third Year	Mean	24.84	7.51	7.97	13.49	13.86	11.05	78.73
	N	37	37	37	37	37	37	37
	Std. Deviation	3.329	1.387	1.536	2.050	3.057	2.027	9.406
Fourth Year	Mean	23.19	7.44	8.13	13.27	14.31	10.83	77.17
	N	48	48	48	48	48	48	48
	Std. Deviation	2.878	1.367	1.214	1.759	2.460	1.655	6.353
Fifth Year	Mean	23.97	7.68	8.65	13.94	13.59	11.09	78.91
	N	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
	Std. Deviation	1.696	1.065	.950	1.858	2.536	1.401	4.987

Intercorrelations among Prosocial Behavior Tendencies: Table 7 pointed out that there were commonly positive high correlations between total

prosocial behavior and each tendency at $\alpha = 0.05$ levels. Moreover, there were intercorrelations among prosocial behaviour tendencies.

Table 7 Intercorrelation Results Among Prosocial Behavior Tendencies

	Altruistic	Compliant	Emotional	Public	Anonymous	Dire	Total
Altruistic	1	.338**	.480**	.400**	.063	.347**	.757**
Compliant		1	.362**	.218**	-.012	.337**	.506**
Emotional			1	.348**	.158*	.465**	.695**
Public				1	.042	.323**	.624**
Anonymous					1	.107	.452**
Dire						1	.642**
Total							1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

CONCLUSION

The main aim of this study is to investigate the prosocial behaviors of members from student voluntary clubs in Sagaing University of Education. Therefore, to study the students’ prosocial behaviors, descriptive statistics of students’ prosocial behaviors, and comparison of students’ prosocial behaviors by gender, club, club type and grade, and intercorrelation among prosocial behavior tendencies were analyzed.

According to the findings of the research, the students commonly help others’ emotional problems but they do not desire to help without knowing by others. Again, it was found that female students favor voluntary helping and helping others under emotionally evocative circumstances than

male students. Moreover, females are better in prosocial behavior than males.

Besides, in altruistic, compliant, public and dire prosocial behaviors, mean scores of students from club 1 are highest and so they more help voluntarily, through some requests, in front of others and in emergency circumstances than others. However, in emotional and anonymous prosocial behaviors, club 6 students’ mean scores are highest and so they more help others’ emotional problems and help without exploring their names than others. In the total mean scores, since club 1 students’ mean scores are highest, it seems that they help mostly others among students. However, it was found that there was no significant difference in students’ prosocial behaviors by club type. Although service clubs should help better others

than study clubs, their services were same with those of study clubs.

Moreover, first year students' mean scores in altruistic, second year students in compliant and anonymous, and fifth year students in emotional, public and dire prosocial behaviors were highest among grades. In the total mean scores, since first year students' mean scores are highest, they help mostly to promote the well-being of others among students.

Prosocial (helping) behavior has been theoretically and empirically linked to a number of positive personal and socio-emotional variables including perspective taking, moral judgment, empathic responding, emotion regulation, positive emotionality, and positive peer and parental relationships. Furthermore, prosocial behavior in children has been linked to a number of positive academic areas including school readiness (Bierman et al., 2009). In contrast, a lack of prosocial behavior has been associated with poor social adjustment, such as peer rejection. While it is clear that prosocial behavior is important for appropriate prosocial development and relationships, little is understood regarding the complex processes and mechanisms leading to the absence of presence of prosocial behavior (Lockwood et al., 2014).

According to this study, although there are many students who participate in service clubs and study clubs, they need to be really voluntary helper motivated primarily by concern for needs and welfare of another. Therefore, the following suggestions would be given.

1. Teachers should encourage students to participate in social activities and voluntary services in and out of the university in their leisure time.
2. Teachers should appreciate students who help others and participate in social welfare activities and occasionally should highlight the altruistic behaviors with others.
3. Male students should be encouraged and guided to help others and to participate in social activities.
4. Some appropriate prosocial programs and social service clubs should be systematically developed in the university campus.

REFERENCES

- Bierman, K. L., Torres, M. M., Domitrovich, C. E., Welsh, J. A., & Gest, S. D. (2009). Behavioral and cognitive readiness for school: Cross-domain associations for children attending Head Start. *Social Development*, 18(2), 305-323.
- Carlo, G., & Randall, B. A. (2002). The development of a measure of pfor late adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31(1), 31-44.
- Kidron, Y., & Fleishman, S. (2006). Research matters: Promoting adolescents, pro-social behaviour. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 63(7), 90-91.
- Klemola, A. (2013). Motivations behind pro-social behaviour. Retrieved from <https://www.thesesus.fi/bistream/handle/10024/64454/K1wmolaArto.pdf?sequence=1>
- Lay, J.C., & Hoppman, C.A. (2015). Altruism and prosocial behaviour. Retrieved from <http://www.researchgat.net/publication/28358352>
- Lockwood, P. L., Seara-Cardoso, A., & Viding, E. (2014). Emotion regulation moderates the association between empathy and prosocial behavior. *PloS One*, 9(5), doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0096555.