



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

Email: yarzar02@gmail.com

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 behaviour is highest and that of anonymous prosocial behaviour is lowest. There were significant differences in students' altruistic and emotional prosocial behaviours as well as there was significant difference in their prosocial behaviours 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 behaviour and each tendency at $\alpha = 0.05$ levels. This study hopes to give some ideas to promote students' prosocial behaviours.

Keyword: Prosocial Behaviour; Student Club; Voluntary.

Introduction

Most of the sociological theories highlighted that man is social animal. A man cannot live alone in his environment. Sometimes, 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 behaviour is also an important role in the society that enables people of different ages to live together peacefully and productively.

Prosocial behaviour refers to the phenomenon of people helping each other with no thought of reward or compensation. Prosocial behaviours are actions or patterns of behaviour 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 behaviour 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 behaviour but they are taking. They want to be honorable of other people. In contract, the term prosocial behaviour 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 behaviour is through school wide programs designed to teach and model social skills (as cited in Kidron and Fleischman, 2006).

It is clear that prosocial behaviour is highly valued by teachers and school personnel, as well as by children themselves. In addition, prosocial behaviour 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 behaviour once they occur. However, instructional programs and interventions that directly promote the development of prosocial behaviour 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 behaviours 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 pro-social behaviors of club-members by six tendencies; (2) To compare the differences of club-members' pro-social behaviours according to club, club type, gender and grade; (3) To examine the intercorrelation 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 partici-

pants 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 behavioural tendencies. The PTM is a 21-item self-reported measure developed to estimate the tendencies of college students towards prosocial behaviour. 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 Behaviours by Tendencies: According to Table 1, mean percentage of emotional prosocial behaviour is highest (82.4%) and that of anonymous prosocial behaviour 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 Behaviours: To find out gender differences in students' prosocial behaviours, 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 Behaviours 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 behaviours. 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 behaviours as well as there was significant difference in their prosocial behaviours 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 Behaviours 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 Behaviours by Each Club: Table 4 showed the comparison of students' prosocial behaviours 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 behaviours, 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 Behaviours 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 Behaviours 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 behaviours 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 | | | |

Comparison of Students' Prosocial Behaviours by Grade: Table 6 showed the comparison of students' prosocial behaviours 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 behaviours 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 Behaviours 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 Behaviour Tendencies: Table 7 pointed out that there were commonly positive high correlations between total prosocial behaviour and

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

Table 7 Intercorrelation Results Among Prosocial Behaviour 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 behaviours of members from student voluntary clubs in Sagaing University of Education. Therefore, to study the students' prosocial behaviours, descriptive statistics of students' prosocial

behaviours, comparison of students' prosocial behaviours 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 favour voluntary helping and helping others under emotionally evocative circumstances than male students. Moreover, females are better in prosocial behaviour than males.

Besides, 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 behaviours, 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 behaviours 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 behaviours 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 behaviours 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 profor late adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 31*(1), 31-44.
- Kidron, Y., & Fleishman, S. (2006). Research matters: Promoting adolescents, prosocial behaviour. *Journal of Educational Leadership, 63*(7), 90-91.
- Klemola, A. (2013). Motivations behind prosocial 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.