

Analyzing the prosocial tendency of students studying at physical education and sports department

Kürşat Yusuf Aytaç^{1a}, and Mehmet Kartal¹

¹Adıyaman University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Adıyaman, Turkey

Abstract. In this study, tendency of students studying at Physical Education and Sports department towards prosocial behavior was analyzed. Totally 139 students including 53 female and 86 male participated into the research. In order to collect data related to prosocial behaviors of students, “Positive Social Behaviors Tendency Scale” developed by Carlo and Randall [2] and adapted into Turkish by Kumru [7] was used. According to the obtained results, female students participated into the research were determined to have higher scores rather than the male students in terms of public, emotional, and urgency sub-dimensions of the prosocial behavior scale. In public sub-dimension of the scale, average scores of the groups including 25 and over and 17-20 years old were determined to be higher. In ANOVA test performed according to the mother age variable, significant differences were determined in terms of Hidden, Public, and Urgency sub-dimensions according to the gender variable ($p < 0,05$). In ANOVA test performed according to the sibling number variable of the students participated into the research, significant differences were determined in terms of gender variable in Public, Emotional, and Urgency sub-dimensions ($p < 0,05$).

Keywords: Prosocial Behavior; positive Social Behavior; physical education and sports; student

1 Introduction

Maintaining of social life in a peaceful coexistence depends upon individuals' establishing positive and balanced relationships. These positive behaviors are shaped within the society through different variables [5, pp638]. Within the scope of this shaping, positive social behaviour researches have tried to understand individuals' devoting themselves to helping for others even at the cost of their life or their own interest [11, pp33-72].

In recent years, the concept of prosocial behavior has been started to be used more frequently in the literature. This concept that is also called as positive interpersonal

^a Corresponding author: kyaytac@adiyaman.edu.tr

relationships includes all behaviors for the benefit of people. Prosocial behaviors are the ones that are acted for the benefit of others. These behaviors include several skills such as cooperation, solidarity, sharing, and empathy [1, pp240-242].

Sport that includes such perfect values existing in nature of human is an activity that is predominant for its social importance rather than the individual. The relation of sports with society goes back to primitive human communities. Sports that is qualified as physical activities used by these communities for their survival in their struggle against livings, nature, and people has become a social fact running as organized and systematic and participated by individuals at any age [9, pp50-53]. During the history, sports have been present in society in several forms and have a social and integrative role encouraging ethical values [12, pp23].

When the studies on the subject carried out in Turkey were analyzed, it could be said that the studies upon development of positive social behavior and factors affecting this development were limited [7, pp109-125]. In reference to this point, the purpose of this study was to analyze tendencies of undergraduate and postgraduate students studying at Physical Education and Sports department related to prosocial behavior.

1.2 Review of Literature

In social sciences, “prosocial behavior” is defined as a behavior based upon voluntariness and for the benefit of other [4, pp81-119]. According to another definition, “prosocial behaviors” include the behaviors such as solidarity and sharing that are for the benefit of others without personal benefits of individuals [6, pp281].

General positive social behaviors can be defined as the tendency of individual’s presenting positive social behaviors in general situations. In specific situations, positive social behaviors are defined as the tendency of individuals’ for helping in some specific situations (i.e.; picking up the thing fell on the floor, donating money). In definitions related to positive social behaviors, measurement of general positive social behavior was noticed to be limited; the reason for that was the presence of different positive behavior types and personal and situational association of each positive behavior type. In contrast to this, situational positive social behavior measurements have been accepted as more beneficial measurements for determining different social behavior types. Moreover, these measurements are also beneficial for answering the questions related to development and relationship of different positive social behavior types [2, pp31-44].

The studies that have been carried out recently upon human interaction in social sciences have not completely rejected the personal interest notion of Immanuel Kant who had specific studies and have emphasized other factors that will mostly contribute upon solidarity behavior. Empathy, social norms, and internalized values are included among these factors. All these are defined as the components of prosocial and solidarity behaviors [10, pp109-133]. Moreover, altruism and solidarity, organizational citizenship behavior, benevolence, voluntariness and cooperation are possible to be on the basis of prosocial behavior. What are the things that motive people to egoist or people-oriented behavior? For example, people have two choices in a situation such as finding a wallet on the street: Taking the wallet depending upon personal interest or submitting the wallet to its legal owner behaving for the interest of other people. The first type of behavior is expressed as egoist and the second type is expressed as prosocial behavior in social sciences. As in different disciplines, there can be different terms defining the same or similar behaviors in social psychology. Altruism as one of these can be expressed as a helping behavior to others including costs that are not balanced by a reward. And cooperation happens when two or more individuals help each other to serve the same purpose [14, pp56 -66].

Prosocial behaviors are among the factors creating the basis for the socialization process of individuals. Prosocial behavior studies are noticed to be carried out more upon children and teenagers and in these studies, generally the role of variables such as gender, age, educational status, aggression, anti-social behavior and empathy upon the prosocial behavior have been analyzed [15, pp215-233].

2 Method

The research was a descriptive study on screening model. In the research, tendencies of undergraduate and graduate students studying at Physical Education and Sports department towards prosocial behavior were analyzed in terms of some variables. Totally 139 students including 53 female and 86 male participated into the research. In order to collect data related to socio-demographic qualifications of the participants in the research, "Personal Information Form" structured related to research variables was prepared. In order to collect data related to prosocial behaviors of students, "Positive Social Behaviors Tendency Scale" (PSBTS) including 6 sub-dimensions (public, emotional, altruist, obedient, hidden and urgency) that was developed by Carlo and Randall [2] and adapted into Turkish by Kumru [7] was used. The dependent variable of the research included prosocial behaviors (positive social behaviors in public, emotional, altruist, obedient, hidden and urgency situations) observed in undergraduate and graduate students studying at Physical Education and Sports department. The obtained data were analyzed using SPSS 15 version of statistical package program. When the scale was performed to 139 students studying at Physical Education and Sports department, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was 4033.063, internal consistency coefficient Cronbach Alpha value was 0.69, and KMO was found as 0.72. According to these values, the scale was valid and reliable.

3 Findings

Table 1. Independent samples T-test results in terms of gender of students participated into the research

	Gender	N	Average	SD	t	p
Public	Female	53	18,13	3,18	3,281	,001
	Male	86	16,13	3,64		
Emotional	Female	53	14,39	2,49	3,118	,002
	Male	86	13,00	2,60		
Urgency	Female	53	10,77	1,10	2,562	,011
	Male	86	10,02	1,94		

In Table 1, it was determined that 53 students were female and 86 students were male among the students participated into the research. Average of the female students participated into the research for the hidden sub-dimension of the scale was 13,24, score average of male students was 12,72; standard deviation value for female was 2,90 and for male 3,21. Similarly, average of the female students participated into the research for the public sub-dimension of the scale was 18,31, score average of male students was 16,13; standard deviation value for female was 3, 1 and for male 3,64. Average of the female students participated into the research for the altruist sub-dimension of the scale was 17,39, score average of male students was 17,16; standard deviation value for female was 2,17 and for male 3,06. In another variable, average of the female students participated into the research for the emotional sub-dimension of the scale was 14,39, score average of male students was 13,00; standard deviation value for female was 2,60 and for male 3,61. Average of the female students participated into the research for the obedient sub-

dimension of the scale was 14,05, score average of male students was 14,15; standard deviation value for female was 2,61 and for male 3,03. Finally, average of the female students participated into the research for the urgency sub-dimension of the scale was 10,77, score average of male students was 12,02; standard deviation value for female was 1,10 and for male 1,94.

Table 2. Kruskal Wallis in terms of public sub-dimension

	Age	N	Total average	X ²	p
Public	17-20	69	72,66	3,495	,174
	21-24	51	62,64		
	25 and over	19	80,11		
	Total	139			

When the table above was analyzed, the participants who had the highest public score were 25 and over, and 17-20 years old, respectively.

Table 3. ANOVA in terms of number of siblings

		Sum of Squares	df	Average of Squares F		Sig.
Public	Inter-group	449,929	2	224,965	22,889	,000
	Intra-group	1336,661	136	9,828		
	Total	1786,590	138			
Emotional	Inter-group	128,222	2	64,111	10,425	,000
	Intra-group	836,383	136	6,150		
	Total	964,604	138			
Urgency	Inter-group	71,124	2	35,562	14,542	,000
	Intra-group	332,574	136	2,445		
	Total	403,698	138			

In ANOVA test performed according to the variable of sibling numbers of students participated into the research, significant differences were determined according to the variable of gender in public sub-dimension ($p < 0,05$). Moreover, in ANOVA test performed according to the number of siblings variable, significant differences were determined according to the gender variable in emotional sub-dimension ($p < 0,05$). In ANOVA test performed according to the number of siblings variable, significant differences were determined according to the gender variable in urgency sub-dimension of the scale ($p < 0,05$).

Table 4. Kruskal Wallis in emotional sub-dimension

	Number of Siblings	N	Sum of Averages	X ²	p
Emotional	2	4	6,50	10,654	,005
	3	20	71,40		
	4 and over	115	71,97		
	Total	119			

In emotional sub-dimension, the participants who had 4 and over and 3 siblings had higher emotional scores, respectively, according to number of siblings.

Table 5. Kruskal Wallis in sub-dimension of secret in income status

	Income Status	N	Sum of averages	X ²	p
Hidden	Minimum and below	73	64,16	19,441	,000
	850-1500	35	90,09		
	1501-2150	20	46,70		
	2151-2700	11	87,18		
Hidden	Total	139			

When the table above was analyzed, the ones that had the highest hidden sub-dimension score were 850-1500 and 2151-2700, respectively.

Table 6. Kruskal Wallis in sub-dimension of public in income status

	Income Status	N	Sum of averages	X ²	p
Public	Minimum and below	73	61,99	11,989	,007
	850-1500	35	68,74		
	1501-2150	20	92,63		
	2151-2700	11	86,05		
	Total	139			

When the table above was analyzed, the ones that had the highest public sub-dimension score were 1501-2150 and 2151-2700, respectively.

Table 7. ANOVA in terms of mother’s age

		Sum of Squares	df	Average of Square F	Sig.	
Hidden	Inter-group	129,149	2	64,574	7,325	,001
	Intra-group	1198,981	136	8,816		
	Total	1328,129	138			
Public	Inter-group	209,786	2	104,893	9,047	,000
	Intra-group	1576,804	136	11,594		
	Total	1786,590	138			
Urgency	Inter-group	46,162	2	23,081	8,780	,000
	Intra-group	357,536	136	2,629		
	Total	403,698	138			

In ANOVA test performed according to the variable of mothers’ age of students participated into the research, significant differences were determined according to the variable of gender in public sub-dimension ($p < 0,05$). Moreover, in ANOVA test performed according to the mothers’ age variable, significant differences were determined according to the gender variable in public sub-dimension ($p < 0,05$). In ANOVA test performed according to mothers’ age variable, significant differences were determined according to the gender variable in urgency sub-dimension of the scale ($p < 0,05$).

4 Discussion and Conclusion

In this research in which totally 139 students including 53 female and 86 male students participated, females were noticed to have higher scores rather than the males in public, emotional and urgency sub-dimensions of prosocial behavior scale according to t-test

results in terms of gender. Çekin [16] mentioned that prosocial behavior tendency of female students had higher scores rather than the males according to t-test results in terms of gender variable in his research titled as “A quantitative analysis upon prosocial behavior tendency of İmam Hatip high school students.”

Carlo and Randall [2] mentioned that female students had more tendency of having different viewpoints, being emphatic and displaying more prosocial behavior rather than the males. When positive social behavior scores were considered, Sünbül [13] stated in his study titled as “The role of some personal variables and protective factors in predicting the positive social behaviors in teenagers,” that positive social behavior tendencies of females were relatively more than the males according to gender variable.” This result was associated with the research results.

Lampridis and Papastylianou [3] stated in their study in which they analyzed the prosocial behavior tendencies of Greek students that females had a relatively more positive approach to present prosocial tendency rather than the males. The effect of gender upon prosocial behaviors proved that positive social behavior tendencies of females had higher scores as revealed in other studies in the literature [i.e. 16, 2, 3, 13], there have also been studies in the literature that proved no difference between the genders [5].

When the relationship of sibling was considered, the researches revealed that emotional, thinking and comprehending skills were more developed in children who were expected to take time with younger siblings and respond to their needs [4]. In parallel to this definition, number of siblings’ variable created a significant difference upon students’ level of prosocial behavior tendency. Çekin [16] mentioned in his research that as the number of siblings increased, the tendency towards prosocial behavior increased, as well. This finding was associated with this research.

The researchers who analyzed the effect of socio-economic level of families upon prosocial behavior tendencies revealed that helping and sharing behaviors of children raised in families with lower income were more than the children raised in families with higher income [8]. Monthly average income of families created a significant difference upon the tendency towards prosocial behavior as proved in scientific studies. In his research, Çekin [16] emphasized that student with lower monthly income average had higher prosocial behavior tendency rather than the ones with higher monthly income average. This result was associated with the findings of this research.

Consequently, it was determined in this research that prosocial behavior tendencies of the female students participated into the research were relatively more than the tendencies of male students in terms of gender variable, as the number of siblings increased, increase at prosocial behavior tendency was also observed, and individuals with lower monthly income presented more prosocial behavior tendency rather than the ones with higher monthly income.

References

1. Bayhan, P. S., & Artan, İ., Çocuk gelişimi ve eğitimi. İstanbul: Morpa Kültür Yayınları, (2004).
2. Carlo G., & Randall B. A., The development of a measure of prosocial behaviors for late adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31(1), 31-44, (2002).
3. Lampridis, E., & Papastylianou, D., Prosocial behavioural tendencies and orientation towards individualism–collectivism of Greek young adults, *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, doi: 10.1080/02673843.2014.890114, (2014).
4. Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P.A. (1987). The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviours, *Psychological Bulletin*, 101, 91–119, (2014).

5. Hastings, P.D., Utendale, W.T. & Sullivan, C., The socialization of prosocial development. Grusec, J. E. and Hasting, P.D. (Edt.) Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Chapter:25, p.638-664, (2006).
6. Hoffmann, M. L., Development of prosocial motivation: Empathy and guilt.Eisenberg, N. (Edt.) The Development of Prosocial Behavior. Chapter 11, New York: Academic Press, (1982).
7. Kumru, A., Carlo, G., & Edwards, P. C., Olumlu sosyal davranışların ilişkisel, kültürel, bilişsel ve duyuşsal bazı değişkenlerle ilişkisi. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 54, 109-125, (2004).
8. Lefebvre, P., & Merrigan, P., Family background, family income, maternal work and child development. Working Paper, 78, Department of Economics, Québecà Montréal University, (1998).
9. Mechikoff, R. A. & Estes, S. G., A history and philosophy of sport and physical education, From ancient civilizations to modern world. (Third Ed), USA: McGrawHill, (2002).
10. Staub, E., Promoting Positive Behavior in Schools, in Other Educational Settings, and in the Home”, In J.P. Rushton, & R.M. Sorrentino (Eds.). Altruism and Helping Behavior: Social, Personality and Developmental Perspectives Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, (1981).
11. Staub, E., The roots of goodness: The fulfillment of basic human needs and the development of caring, helping and nonaggression, inclusive caring, moral courage, active by standership, and altruism born of suffering. In G. Carlo & C.P. Edwards (Eds.), Moral motivation through the lifespan (Vol. 51), Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, (2005).
12. Spivey, N., The ancient Olympics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, (2004).
13. Sünbül, Z., Ergenlerde olumlu sosyal davranışları yordamada koruyucu faktörler ve bazı kişisel değişkenlerin rolü, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, (2012).
14. Twenge, J. M., Baumeister, R. F., Dwall, N. C., Ciarocco, N. J., & Bartels, M. J. Social Exclusion Decreases Prosocial Behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92, 56-66, (2007).
15. Yıldız, S., Taştan B. İ., & Yıldırım, F., Kişilik tipi ile olumlu sosyal davranış arasındaki ilişki: Marmara Üniversitesi öğrencileri üzerinde bir araştırma”, Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 26 (1), 215-233, (2012).
16. Çekin, A., İmam hatip lisesi öğrencilerinin prososyal davranış eğilimleri üzerine nicel bir inceleme. Journal of International Social Research 6., 28, (2013).