

---

## PSYCHOSOCIAL FACTORS AS A PREDICTOR OF PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR: THE CASE OF ARSINEGELLE PREPARATORY SCHOOL STUDENTS

---

<sup>1</sup>Million DesalegnTassew, <sup>2</sup>Honelign BirhanuTadesse

<sup>1</sup>Lecturer, <sup>2</sup>Sponsorship program officer

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, WolaitaSodo University, Ethiopia

<sup>2</sup>Children's Fund of Canada, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

---

### ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to investigate psychosocial factors that facilitate Pro-social Behavior among ArsiNegelle Preparatory school Students. The research employed correlational research design of quantitative method to analyze the data that were gathered using Pro-social Tendency Measure (PTM), Religious Orientation Scale (ROS), Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ) and Questionnaire of Cognitive and Affective Empathy (QCAE) scales as research instruments. Out of 1170 grade eleven and twelve students, 299 (male=203 and female=96) students were selected as sample through stratified systematic random sampling technique using list of students taken from the school records. Generally, in this study religious leaders were recommended to further teach about pro-social behaviors to their congregations as result of the correlation indicated that religiosity score was positively and significantly correlated with overall pro-social, emotional, altruism, dire, public complaint. Parents were also encouraged to incorporate importance of pro-social behavior in their set of standards, rules and regulations in their child rearing practices as the result of Pearson correlation revealed that authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles were positively and significantly correlated to overall pro-social behavior. Moreover, students were recommended to exercise sense of empathy to the community with whom they are living since the result of Pearson correlation indicated that empathy was positively and significantly correlated with over-all pro-social behavior, altruism, dire, emotional and complaint pro-social behavior types. Finally, religiosity was the most predicting variable of pro-social behavior, followed by authoritative, permissive (negatively), authoritarian and empathy respectively.

**Key words:** - Pro-social behavior, religiosity, parenting styles and empathy

---

### INTRODUCTION:

Helping, pro-social behavior and altruism constitute related concepts that designate significant aspects of interpersonal situations influencing interpersonal relationships in many respects. Some use only the term "pro-social behavior", others focus on "altruistic behaviour", and others use terms alternately. The terms "helping behavior," "pro-social behavior," and "altruism" are frequently used interchangeably when discussing the construct of pro-social involvement. Although these terms are closely interrelated, they may be distinguished from each other for analytic purposes (Bierhoff, 2002).

Macaulay and Berkowitz (1970) defined altruism as 'behavior carried out to benefit another without anticipation of rewards from external sources'. According to Smith and Mackie (2000), altruism is any form of voluntary act intended to favor another without expectation of a reward particularly, a kind of selfless help, which is based on pure desire to help others.

Research studies in this area all look at different factors and how they affect the helping behavior. From the evaluation of several studies, it appears that the main factors influencing pro-social behavior are demographic characteristics, religion, and parenting style. Researchers have adopted different positions as to what factors are important and influence pro-social behavior and at one point, many believed that dispositional factors were not as important as social factors (Eisenberg, 2005).

Across many different cultures and nationalities, belief in God and the afterlife predicts moral attitudes towards specific moral behavior, for example adultery or cheating on taxes. (Atkinson & Bourrat, 2011). And there is at least some evidence that religiosity impacts pro-social behavior by internalized pro-social values.

Scholars have long asserted that religion is associated with pro-social behaviors, that is behaviors which are costly to oneself but benefit others. Recent empirical studies indeed show a positive relationship between religiosity and pro-social behaviors. In a three-person public goods game and a dictator game, Ahmed (2009) found that imams-in-training (religious subjects) are more cooperative and more altruistic in the respective games compared to social science students at a local college in India. Similarly, Bonner, Koven and Patrick (2003) found that religiosity is positively correlated with pro-social behavior. They suggested that this was because people's religious beliefs may help them feel more personally fulfilled and worthy, leading them to participate in activities that heighten their levels of self-actualization, including pro-social behavior.

Some excellent reviews on religion and pro-sociality have been written, and offer important organization and insight into the topic. Although the subject itself is not new, it never seems to get old. Studies on the effect of religion on pro-sociality are a favorite subject in the psychology of religion, and many studies have been conducted in the last few years (Batson, 1993).

Most of the environmental research on individual differences in pro-social behavior has focused on parental influences. Longitudinal studies showed that children's pro-social behavior is predicted by parenting style. Pro-social behavior increases when parents are warm, supportive, responsive, and sensitive to their children's needs. In contrast, less pro-social behavior is found among children whose parents are authoritarian, strict, or punitive (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998).

Increasing concern among parents, schools, community leaders and policy makers regarding youth violence means that efforts to promote positive behaviors in teens are being welcomed. Given that most religions have teachings that emphasize care and compassion for others, religiosity (defined here as commitment to, identification with and involvement in a religion or system of religious beliefs) is a potential positive influence on adolescent pro-social behavior. However, relatively little research has examined relations between religiosity and pro-social behavior, and it has been almost solely conducted using college-age or adult samples hence, little is known about links between religiosity and pro-social behavior, particularly among adolescents (Batson, 1983).

In Ethiopian context, nowadays hate speech, inter-ethnic conflict, youth violence, domestic migration of people, and lack of empathy or concern for others are commonly observable, which could be manifestation of decrement in the behavior of pro-social behavior and altruism. Therefore, these factors motivated the researchers to assess the condition of pro-social behavior in relation to relation to different psychosocial factors.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Is religiosity related to pro-social behavior?
2. Is there a relationship between dimensions of parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian and permissive) and pro-social behavior?
3. Is there a relationship between empathy and pro-social behavior?
4. What are the most predicting variables (religiosity, parenting styles and empathy) of pro-social behavior?

**DEFINITIONS OF BASIC TERMS AND OPERATIONAL DEFINITION:**

1. Pro-social Behaviors: Voluntary behavior intended to benefit another, consists of actions such as helping, sharing, donating, co-operating, and volunteering for the intention of altruistic, compliant, emotional, public, dire and anonymous forms/types of helping.
  - 1.1. Altruism: Is voluntary helping motivated primarily by concern for the needs and welfare of another, often induced by sympathy responding and internalized norms/principles consistent with helping others (Eisenberg & Miller, 1987).
  - 1.2. Compliant: Defined as helping others in response to a verbal or nonverbal request (Davis, 1994).
  - 1.3. Emotional: Were conceptualized as an orientation toward helping others under emotionally evocative circumstances (Carlo & Randal, 2002).
  - 1.4. Public: Described as pro-social behavior which is conducted in front of an audience and more likely to be motivated, at least in part, by a desire to gain the approval and respect of others (Schroeder, 1995).
  - 1.5. Dire pro-social behaviors were defined as helping in crisis or emergency situations (Carlo & Randal, 2002).
  - 1.6. Anonymous: It is helping of individuals without the knowledge of the person being helped and other people. (Carlo & Randal, 2002).
2. Empathy: to share in another's feelings and understand another's feelings among ArsiNegelle Preparatory Students.
3. Parenting style: Parenting styles are standards and demands set by parents for their children and the responses to and communication with their children.
4. Psychological Factor: Empathy was considered as psychological factor in this study in facilitating pro-social behavior Among ArsiNegelle Preparatory students
5. Religiosity: A commitment to, identification with and involvement in a religion or system of religious beliefs among ArsiNegelle Preparatory Students.
6. Social Factors: Demographic variables of religiosity and parenting styles as predictor of pro-social behavior Among ArsiNegelle Preparatory students.

**METHODS AND MATERIALS****DESIGN:**

The research design for this study was correlational (non-experimental) research design. Considering the nature of the research questions, quantitative research method was used to describe psychosocial factors as predictor of pro-social behaviors by comparisons of means and investigating the relationship among variables.

**STUDY AREA:**

The study was conducted in Oromia Region, West Arsi Zone, ArsiNegelle Woreda, ArsiNegelle town, which is located 225 km South of Addis Ababa on the way to Hawassa city. The Preparatory school is the only governmental school that encompasses students from different, religion, ethnic group, language, culture and locality. These students are from three kebeles of ArsiNegelle town and many neighboring rural kebeles. This diversification of students in different aspect was an opportunity to investigate psychosocial factors that facilitate pro-social behavior among ArsiNegelle Preparatory students.

**POPULATION OF THE STUDY:**

In this study, ArsiNegelle Preparatory School students were target population. The target population across sex and grade level is shown below:

**TABLE 1: STUDY POPULATION ACROSS SEX AND GRADE LEVEL**

Grade 11			Grade 12			Grand total			
M	F	Total	M	F	Total				
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
495	42.31	222	18.97	717	61.28	300	25.64	153	13.08
						453	38.72	1170	100

**SAMPLE SIZE AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUES:**

The sample size of this study was determined using a simplified Slovin’s formula that is,

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where,

n = the sample size

N = the population size and

e = the level of precision/margin of error expressed as 5%

Accordingly, by applying the above formula, the sample size of the present study was calculated as follows:

$$n = \frac{1170}{1+1170(0.05)^2} = 298.08 \approx 299$$

Therefore, the final total participants for this study were 299 (male= 203 and female=96) students. Then, this calculated sample size was distributed to each of the selected study areas of gender and grade level proportional to the size of students. Students from both gender and grade level were selected using stratified systematic random sampling technique using list of students taken from school records.

After deciding the sample size of the respondents, the participants of the study were stratified across sex and grade level. Based on the strata, proportional sample size was taken using the following formula.

$$ni = \frac{n \times Ni}{N}$$

Where ni = sample of strata

n = Total sample size of all strata

Ni = Population of each strata

N = Total population

For instance, ni(sample size of male from grade 11) =  $299 \times \frac{495}{1170} \approx 126$

**TABLE 2: PROPORTIONAL SAMPLE SIZE ACROSS SEX AND GRADE LEVEL**

Grade 11			Grade 12			Grand total							
M		F		T		M		F		T			
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
126	42.14	57	19.06	183	61.20	77	25.75	39	13.05	11	38.80	299	100

**INSTRUMENTS FOR DATA COLLECTION:  
 MEASURES FOR PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR**

The instrument employed to measure pro-social behavior is known as Pro-social Tendency measure (PTM). It consists of 21-item questionnaire which includes six different types of pro-social behavior measures: altruistic, emotional, compliant, public, dire, and anonymous. Participants rated how much each statement describes them on a 5-point Likert scale type (1= Does not describe me at all to 5 = Describes me greatly) developed by Carlo and Randall (2002).

The altruism scale consists of 3 items and measures voluntary helping behavior, driven solely by concern for another individual. The emotional subscale (4 items) measures helping behavior driven by an emotionally evocative situation. The dire subscale (3 items) measures helping behavior in emergency situations. The compliant subscale (2 items) measures helping when asked. The public scale (4 items) measures helping behavior in front of an audience are likely to be motivated, at least in part, by a desire to gain the approval and respect of others. The anonymous subscale (5 items) measures helping in situations where no one would know you helped. Carlo and Randall (2002) demonstrated that the PTM has adequate internal consistency, reliability, and construct validity. Therefore, this scale was employed to measure pro-social behavior of students among ArsiNegelle elementary school students.

**MEASURE FOR RELIGIOSITY**

Measure of religiosity was measured using Religious Orientation Scale (ROS) (Allport, 1967). The ROS is a popular and psychometrically sound self-report measuring two dynamics of religious commitment intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity. This 15-item scale provides two subscale scores: the intrinsic score reflects religiosity marked by inner conviction, spiritual experience and resistance to social pressures contrary to one's beliefs; the extrinsic score reflects a dependency upon religion for emotional support and for social approval and social influence. For the instrument, participants answered the items on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

**MEASURE FOR PARENTING STYLE**

The measure of parenting style was used Parenting Style Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ) developed by Robinson, Mendelco, Olsen & Hart (1996). In this study, dimensionality of a modified version of the 28- item Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ); Determined what parenting styles were being measured in the modified 28-item Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ) Robinson et al.

**MEASURE FOR EMPATHY**

Questionnaire of Cognitive and Affective Empathy (QCAE; developed by Reniers, Corcoran & Drake, 2011) was used to collect data on empathic behavior of students. An 11-item scale that measures of cognitive and affective empathy on a 4-point Likert scale type (1= “strongly disagree” to 4= “strongly agree”). Therefore, this scale was employed to assess empathic behavior of ArsiNegelle preparatory school students in this study.

**PILOT STUDY**

The other important task was checking for reliability of the instruments through conducting a pilot test before administering to the participants of the study. It was so essential to check for reliability of the instruments to take some modifications on the instruments to administer for target participants. Accordingly, before using of the instruments for data gathering, pilot study was carried out on 50(male=34, female= 16) grade twelve and eleven students who could not involve in the main study. Based on the data collected, Cronbatch alpha reliability test of the instrument of each scale was measured as it is shown in the table 3.

**TABLE 3: CRONBACH’S ALPHAS RELIABILITY FOR THE SCALES**

Scale	Number of items	Reliability coefficient for original scale	Reliability coefficient of pilot study
Altruism	3	.77	.79
Emotional	4	.78	.72
Dire	3	.58	.56
Complaint	2	.82	.78
Anonymous	5	.82	.74
Public	4	.78	.71
Religious	15	.69	.72
Orientation			
Authoritative	11	.70	.76
Authoritarian	13	.61	.86
Permissive	4	.59	.74
Empathy	11	.69	.71

As it can be seen in table 3, the reliability of instruments of pilot study had sufficient cronbach’s alpha value to measure using the scales.

**STUDY VARIABLES**

**Dependent Variable**

Pro-social behavior score was dependent variable of this study. The six types of pro-social behaviors were assessed.

**Independent Variables**

In this study, psychosocial factors like religiosity, parenting style and empathy were independent variables.

**METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS**

The data gathered through self-report questionnaire were ordered, coded and entered into the computer and analyzed using SPSS version 20.0 statistical software. The selections of appropriate analysis methods were based on the objectives of the study; the type of data and study variables as well as different assumptions associated with the use of each analytical method.

Different analysis methods were employed for different purposes. One of these was descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages that was computed to summarize demographic characteristics of participants. Pearson correlation was computed to explore whether there was or not significant relationship existed between religiosity and pro-social behaviors, whether there was or not significant relationship between different dimensions of parenting style (authoritarian, authoritative and permissive) and pro-social behavior and whether there was or not significant relationship between empathy and pro-social behaviors. Finally, multiple regression was used to identify the most predicting variable of pro-social behaviors.

## RESULTS

### Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Table 4: Socio-Demographic characteristics of respondents grade level, age and religion by sex

Grade Level	Sex				Total	
	Male		Female			
	N	%	N	%	N	%
11	126	42.14	57	19.06	183	61.20
12	77	25.75	39	13.04	116	38.80
Total	183	61.20	116	38.80	299	100

  

Age Group	Sex				Total	
	Male		Female			
	N	%	N	%	N	%
16-18	128	42.80	76	25.41	204	68.23
19-22	75	25.09	20	6.69	95	31.77
Total	203	67.89	96	32.10	299	100

  

Religion	Sex				Total	
	Male		Female			
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Orthodox	21	7.03	34	11.38	55	18.40
Catholic	3	1	3	1	6	2
Muslim	72	24.05	18	6.02	90	30.10
Protestant	107	35.80	40	13.38	147	49.16
Other	0	0	1	0.34	1	0.34
Total	203	67.88	96	32.12	299	100

As it can be observed from table 4, 126(42.14%) and 57(19.06%) were male and female respondents from grade eleven respectively. Whereas 77(25.75%) and 39(13.04%) were male and female respondents from grade 12 respectively.

Regarding age group of respondents, 128(42.80%) and 76(25.41%) were male and female respectively in age group of 16-18. Whereas the rest respondents 75(25.09%) and 20(6.69%) were male and female respectively in age group of 19-22.

In similar Table 4, concerning religion of the respondents 107(35.80%) and 40(13.38%) were male and female protestant respectively. Followed by 72 (24.05%) and 18(6.02%) Muslim, 21(7.03%) and 34(21.38%) Orthodox and 3(1%) and 3(1%) were Catholic males and females respectively. The rest 1(0.34) was other religions.

**Table 5: Respondents’ Mother and Father Level of Education**

Level of education	Mother’s		Father’s	
	N	%	N	%
Illiterate	75	25.08	17	5.7
Primary Level (1-8)	105	35.1	134	44.8
Secondary Level (9-12)	64	21.4	76	25.4
Diploma	50	16.7	11	3.7
Degree and above	5	1.7	61	20.4
Total	299	100	299	100

As it is clearly shown in the table 5 above, of the total respondent’s, 105(35.1%) of respondents’ mother’s level of education was primary level, 75(25.08%) were illiterates, 64(21.4%) were secondary level, 50(16.7%) were diploma graduate and the remaining 5(1.7%) were degree and above graduates.

Regarding respondents’ father level of education, 134(44.8%) were at primary level, 76(25.4%) at secondary level, 61(20.4%) degree graduates, 17(5.7%) illiterates and 11(3.7%) diploma graduates. Therefore, we can say that most of mother’s and father’s level of education lies on primary school.

**Table 6: Family’s/Guardian’s Level of Income / Month**

Family’s/guardian’s level of income in Birr	N	Percent
Greater than 2000	117	39.13
1000-2000	10	3.34
Less than 1000	53	17.73
Not quantified	119	39.80
Total	299	100

Table 6 shows that 117(39.13%) of the respondent’s family/guardian had an income greater than 2000 Birr and followed by 53(17.73%) with an income of less than 1000 Birr, 10(3.34%) had income 1000-2000 and 119(39.80%) did not know their family’s income. Therefore, it possible to conclude that larger number of respondents did not know their family’s/guardianslevel of income.

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGIOSITY AND PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR**

To explore the strength and direction of relationship between religiosity and overall pro-social behaviors and types of pro-social behavior, Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was employed.

**Table 7: Pearson Product Moment Correlation between Religiosity and Pro-social Behavior**

Variable	Overall pro-social behavior(r)	Complain t(r)	Anonymou s(r)	Public (r)	Emotiona l(r)	Dire (r)	Altruism (r)
Religiosity Pearson Correlation	.614**	.242**	.102	.300**	.508**	.439	.464**
Sign.(2-tailed)	.000	.000	.078	.000	.000	**	.000
N	299	299	299	299	299	.000	299
						299	

- \*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
- \* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The result of the correlation indicated in table 7 shows that religiosity score was positively and significantly correlated with overall pro-social( $r = .614, p = .000$ ), emotional ( $r = .508, p = .000$ ), altruism( $r = .464, p = .000$ ), dire( $r = .439, p = .000$ ), public ( $r = .300, p = .000$ ) and complaint( $r = .242, p = .000$ ). Whereas anonymous( $r = .102, p = .078$ ) total score was positively but not significantly correlated with religiosity total score. The result imply that as religiosity score increases, there is increase in overall pro-social behaviors and all types of pro-social behaviors except for anonymous pro-social behavior positively and insignificantly correlated with religiosity total score. Therefore, it is possible to say that religiosity facilitates overall pro-social behaviors and all types of pro-social behaviors except for anonymous pro-social behavior.

Relationship between Parenting Styles and Pro-social Behavior

To investigate the strength and direction of relationship between parenting styles and overall pro-social behaviors and types of pro-social behavior, Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used.

**TABLE 8: PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT FOR THE CORRELATION BETWEEN PARENTING STYLES AND PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR**

Variable		Overall pro-social behavior (r)	Complain t(r)	Anonymou s(r)	Public (r)	Emotiona l(r)	Dire (r)	Altruism (r)
Authoritative	Pearson	.399	.462**	.255**	-.031	.175**	.462	.089
Correlation		.000	.000	.000	.593	.002	**	.126
Sign.(2-tailed)		299	299	299	299	299	.000	299
N		.406**	.363	-.102	.035	.017	299	.561**
Authoritarian	Pearson	.000	.000	.080	.552	.769	.575	.000
Correlation		299	299	299	299	299	**	299
Sign.(2-tailed)		-.006	-.138*	-.041	.288	-.052	.000	-.025
N		.994	.017	.481	.000	.372	299	.662
Permissive	Pearson	299	299	299	299	299	-.094	299
Correlation							.104	
Sign.(2-tailed)	N						299	

- \*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
- \* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 8 revealed that authoritative parenting style is positively and significantly correlated to overall pro-social behavior( $r = .399, p = 0.000$ ), complaint( $r = .462, p = 0.000$ ), anonymous ( $r = .255, p = 0.000$ ), emotional( $r = .175, p = 0.002$ ) and dire ( $r = .462, p = 0.000$ ). Whereas public( $r = -.031, p = 0.593$ ) and altruism( $r = 0.089, p = 0.126$ ) were negatively and positively but insignificantly correlated with authoritative parenting style respectively. Above table 15, also result revealed that authoritarian parenting style is positively and significantly correlated to overall pro-social behavior( $r = .406, p = 0.000$ ), complaint( $r = .363, p = 0.000$ ), dire( $r = .575, p = 0.000$ ) and altruism( $r = .561, p = 0.000$ ). Whereas public( $r = .035, p = 0.552$ ) and emotional( $r = .017, p = 0.769$ ) were positively but insignificantly correlated with authoritarian and anonymous( $r = -.102, p = 0.080$ ) was negatively and insignificantly correlated with

authoritarian parenting styles. In the same table 15 above, the result indicated that permissive parenting style was negatively and insignificantly correlated with overall pro-social behavior ( $r = -.006$ ,  $p = 0.924$ ), anonymous ( $r = -.041$ ,  $p = 0.481$ ), emotional ( $r = -.052$ ,  $p = 0.372$ ), dire ( $r = -.094$ ,  $p = 0.104$ ), and altruism ( $r = -.025$ ,  $p = 0.662$ ). Whereas positively and negatively but significantly correlated with public ( $r = .288$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) and complaint ( $r = -.138$ ,  $p = 0.017$ ) respectively.

Generally, from this correlation analysis, one can see that there was positive and significant correlation result of authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles with overall pro-social behavior. The magnitude of the difference of correlation result between two parenting style was found insignificant. Therefore, we can generalize that there was no significant difference between authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles in facilitating overall pro-social behavior. Whereas, permissive parenting style adversely contributed to overall pro-social behaviors.

### RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMPATHY AND PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

To explore the strength and direction of relationship between empathy and overall pro-social behaviors and types of pro-social behavior, Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was employed.

Table 9: Pearson Product Moment for the Correlation between Empathy and Pro-social Behavior

Variable	Over-all pro-social behavior (r)	Complaint (r)	Anonymous (r)	Public (r)	Emotional (r)	Dire(r)	Altruism (r)
Empathy	.405	.214**	-.111	.071	.228**	.494**	.533**
Pearson	.000	.000	.055	.233	.000	.000	.000
Correlation	299	299	299	299	299	299	299
Sign.(2-tailed)							
N							

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

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

As one can see from table 9, the result of the correlation indicated that empathy score was positively and significantly correlated with score of altruism ( $r = .533$ ,  $p = .000$ ), dire ( $r = .494$ ,  $p = .000$ ), over-all pro-social behavior ( $r = .405$ ,  $p = .000$ ), emotional ( $r = .228$ ,  $p = .000$ ) and complaint ( $r = .214$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Whereas empathy score was negatively and insignificantly correlated with score of anonymous ( $r = -.111$ ,  $p = .055$ ), positively and insignificantly correlated with public ( $r = .071$ ,  $p = .233$ ). This implies that as the score for empathy increases, there was increase for score of altruism, dire, over-all pro-social behavior, emotional and complaint pro-social behavior types too. Therefore, from this finding it is possible to conclude that empathy facilitates for altruism, dire, over-all pro-social behavior, emotional and complaint pro-social types while it reversely minimizes anonymous pro-social type and facilitates public pro-social type to some extent.

### Regression Analysis of the Most Predicting Variables of Pro-social Behavior

In order to identify the most predicting variables of pro-social behavior, multiple regression was employed. Accordingly, standardized coefficient Beta was computed to decide the most predicting variables of pro-social behavior.

**Table 10: Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis of the Most Predicting Variables of Pro-social Behavior**

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>
	B	Std. error	Beta				
Constant	0.824	0.170		4.837	0.000	0.512	0.504
Religiosity	0.428	0.036	0.556	11.961	0.000		
Authoritative	0.228	0.036	0.346	6.311	0.000		
Authoritarian	0.041	0.040	0.062	1.035	0.302		
Permissive	-0.103	0.035	-0.129	-2.948	0.003		
Empathy	0.020	0.062	0.016	0.317	0.751		

Table 10, result revealed that among the independent variables, religiosity (Beta = 0.556) was the most predicting variable of pro-social behavior. Followed by authoritative, permissive, authoritarian and empathy (i.e. Beta = 0.346, -0.129, 0.062 and 0.016) respectively. The variables religiosity, authoritative, permissive (negatively), and authoritarian and empathy together facilitated (Adj. R<sup>2</sup>) = 50.4% of variations in overall pro-social behavior. The result indicated that one unit increase in religiosity results in 0.428 unit increase in pro-social behavior. One unit increase in authoritative parenting style, results in 0.228 unit value increases in pro-social behavior. And one unit increase in authoritarian parenting style results in 0.041 unit value increase in pro-social behavior. One unit increase in permissive parenting style, results in 0.103 units of value decrease in pro-social behavior. Finally, a one unit increase in empathy results in 0.020 unit value increase in pro-social behavior.

## DISCUSSION

### RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGIOSITY AND PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Pearson product moment correlation was conducted to deal with relationship between religiosity and pro-social Behavior and the result of the correlation indicated that religiosity score was positively and significantly correlated with overall pro-social behavior ( $r = .614$ ,  $p = .000$ ), emotional ( $r = .508$ ,  $p = .000$ ), altruism ( $r = .464$ ,  $p = .000$ ), dire ( $r = .439$ ,  $p = .000$ ), public ( $r = .300$ ,  $p = .000$ ) and complaint ( $r = .242$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Whereas anonymous total score was positively but insignificantly correlated with religiosity total score ( $r = .102$ ,  $p = .078$ ). The result imply that as religiosity score increases, there is increase in overall pro-social behaviors and all types of pro-social except for anonymous positively and insignificantly correlated with religiosity total score. Therefore, it is possible to say that religiosity facilitates overall pro-social behaviors and all types of pro-social behaviors except for anonymous.

The find of this study is similar to what was found in Ahmed (2009) that recent empirical studies indeed show a positive relationship between religiosity and pro-social behaviors. In a three-person public goods game and a dictator game, finds that imams-in-training (religious subjects) are more cooperative and more altruistic in the respective games compared to social science students at a local college in India (nonreligious subjects). Again the finding of this study is similar with what was found in (Argaw, 2008) that religiously, children who scored high on religiosity also scored high on altruism. It is thought that if one believes his or her behavior is being monitored by a supernatural force, then selfishness will be reduced and pro-social behavior will be increased.

### The Relationship between Parenting Styles and Pro-social Behavior

Pearson product moment correlation was conducted to know the relationship between dimensions of parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian and permissive) and pro-social behavior and the result revealed that authoritarian parenting style is positively and significantly correlated to overall pro-social behavior ( $r = .406$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) and results revealed that authoritative parenting style is positively and significantly correlated to overall pro-social behavior ( $r = .399$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). The result indicated that permissive parenting style was negatively and insignificantly correlated with overall pro-social behavior ( $r = -.006$ ,  $p = 0.924$ ). Generally, from this correlation analysis, we can see that there was positive and significant correlation result of authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles with overall pro-social behavior. The magnitude of the difference of correlation result between two parenting style was found to be insignificant. Therefore, we can generalize that there was no significant difference between authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles in facilitating overall pro-social behavior. Whereas, permissive parenting style adversely contributed to overall pro-social behaviors.

The finding of this is different with what was found in Cornell and Frick (2007) that harsh or power-assertive discipline, for example, has consistently been found to be negatively related to pro-social behaviors and Denham (1994) that indeed, parenting dimensions such as warmth, secure attachment, and responsiveness to distress have been positively related to pro-social outcomes. Moreover, the present study rejected what was found in Eisenberg and Fabes (1998) they said that most of the environmental research on individual differences in pro-social behavior has focused on parental influences. Children's pro-social behavior is longitudinally predicted by parenting style and Pro-social behavior increases when parents are warm, supportive, responsive, and sensitive to their children's needs. In contrast, less pro-social behavior is found among children whose parents are authoritarian, strict, or punitive. Discrepancy between present study finding and review of literatures happened as a result of existence of many other family factors are known to be important to adolescent's pro-social development. Parents' own behavior plays a crucial role in defining what is normal for their children. Therefore, there can be several factors that affect pro-social development adolescents.

### RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMPATHY AND PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Pearson product moment correlation was conducted to see the relationship between empathy and pro-social behavior and the result of the correlation indicated that empathy score was positively and significantly correlated with score of over-all pro-social behavior ( $r = .405$ ,  $p = .000$ ).

This finding of the relationship between empathy and pro-social behaviors was congruent with Eisenberg & Lennon (1983) that she reviewed a somewhat larger body of literature on the relation between empathy and pro-social behavior. She concluded that there was a significant positive relation between empathy and pro-social behavior for adolescents and perhaps for children when empathy toward the potential recipient of assistance had been correlated with assisting that needy individual. The finding of present study confirmed that there is positive relation between empathy and pro-social behavior for adolescents. This might be due to the reason that our capacity to respond to others in need mainly determined our ability to recognize and interpret the emotions of others. Therefore, empathy plays great role in pro-social behavior development and response to needy others.

### THE MOST PREDICTING VARIABLES OF PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Multiple regression analysis was employed to determine the most predicting variables of pro-social behavior and the result revealed that among the independent variables, religiosity (Beta = 0.556) was the most predicting variables of pro-social behavior. This finding is congruent with Colby & Damon (1992) of several studies has found that religion is the most important feature in the lives of many highly pro-social people. Studies of highly pro-social "moral exemplars" found that the majority cited

religion or spirituality as a reason for helping other. This might be the reason that religion serves as multiple purposes in daily life of human beings in their physical and mental health, tolerance, positive interpersonal relationships and pro-social behavior development.

## CONCLUSION

1. The result of the correlation indicated that religiosity score was positively and significantly correlated with overall pro-social, emotional, altruism, dire, public, complaint. Whereas anonymous total score was positively but not significantly correlated with religiosity total score. The result implied that as religiosity score increases, there is increase in overall pro-social behaviors and all types of pro-social except for anonymous insignificantly correlated with religiosity total score. Therefore, it is possible to say that religiosity facilitates overall pro-social behaviors and all types of pro-social except for anonymous.
2. Result revealed that authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles were positively and significantly correlated with overall pro-social behavior. The result indicated that permissive parenting style was negatively and insignificantly correlated with overall pro-social behavior. Generally, from this correlation analysis, we can see that there was positive and significant correlation result of authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles with overall pro-social behavior. The magnitude of the difference of correlation result between two parenting style was found insignificant. Therefore, we can generalize that there was no significant difference between authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles in facilitating overall pro-social behavior. Whereas, permissive parenting style adversely contributed to overall pro-social behaviors.
3. The result of the correlation indicated that empathy score was positively and significantly correlated with score of altruism, dire, over-all pro-social behavior, emotional and complaint. While empathy score was negatively and not significantly correlated with score of anonymous, positively and insignificantly correlated with public. This implies that as the score of empathy increases score for over-all pro-social behavior, altruism, dire, emotional and complaint pro-social type increases. Therefore from this finding, it is possible to say that empathy facilitates for over-all pro-social behavior, altruism, dire, emotional and complaint pro-social types whereas it reversely minimizes anonymous pro-social type and facilitates public pro-social type to some extent.
4. Result revealed that among the independent variables, religiosity was the most predicting variable of pro-social behavior. Followed by authoritative, permissive (negatively), authoritarian and empathy. Therefore, religiosity plays an important role in facilitating pro-social behavior.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations were forwarded:-

1. Since religiosity has a role in facilitating pro-social behaviors, religious leaders are recommended to further teach about importance of pro-social behavior to their congregations as these pro-social behaviors are the base for social well being in a given community where there are many needy people live.
2. Even though, there was no significant difference between authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles in facilitating pro-social behaviors, parents are encouraged to incorporate teaching their children about the importance of pro-social behaviors in their child rearing practices.
3. It was found that empathy had a significant role in pro-social behaviors development. Therefore, students are recommended to exercise sense of empathy to the community with whom they are living.

## REFERENCES

1. Ahmed, A. (2009). "Are Religious People More Pro-social? A Quasi-Experimental Study with Madrasa Pupils in a Rural Community," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 48:2, 368-371.
2. Allport, G. & Ross, M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 432-434.
3. Argaw B. (2008). The altruistic behaviour of home-reared, institutionalized and street children.(MA Thesis).Addis Ababa University.
4. Atkinson, Q. D., & Bourrat, P. (2011). Beliefs about God, the afterlife and morality support the role of supernatural policing in human cooperation. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 32, 41–49.
5. Batson, C. D. (1983). Sociobiology and the Role of Religion in Promoting Pro-social Behavior: An Alternative View. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(6), 138-5.
6. Batson, C.D., (1993). *Religion and the Individual: A Social Psychological Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
7. Bierhoff (2002). *Pro-social Behaviour*. Psychology Press. 21
8. Bonner, K., Koven, L. & Patrick, J (2003). Effects of Religiosity and Spirituality on Depressive Symptoms and Pro-social Behaviors. *Journal of Religious Gerontology*, 14, 189-191.
9. Carlo, G., & Randall, B. A. (2002). The development of a measure of pro-social behaviors for late adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31(1), 31–32.
10. Colby, M & Damon. (1992). *Some Do Care: Contemporary Lives of Moral Commitment*. New York: Free Press.
11. Cornell, A. H., & Frick, P. J. (2007). The moderating effects of parenting styles in the association between behavioral inhibition and parent-reported guilt and empathy in preschool children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 36, 305-309.
12. Davis MH. (1994). *Empathy: A Social Psychological Approach*. Madison, WI: Brown Benchmark
13. Denham, S. A. (1994). Mother-child emotional communication and preschoolers' security of attachment and dependency. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 155, 119-121.
14. Eisenberg, N. (2005). Pro-social moral reasoning. *Psychology Review*.
15. Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. (1998). Pro-social development. In W. Damon (Editor-in-Chief) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed., pp. 701–703). New York: Wiley.
16. Eisenberg, N., & Lennon, R. (1983). Sex differences in empathy and related capacities. *Psychological Bulletin*, 94, 100-101
17. Eisenberg, & Miller, P. (1987). The relation of empathy to pro-social and related behaviors. *Psychological Bulletin*.
18. Macalalay, J.R & Berkowitz, L. (1970). Altruism and helping behavior. *Social Psychological Studies of some Antecedents and Consequences*. New York: Academic Press.
19. Reniers, R.L., Corcoran, R., & Drake, R. (2011). The QCAE: A questionnaire of cognitive and affective empathy. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 93(1), 84–88. doi:10.1080/00223891.2010.528484
20. Robinson, C., Mandlco, B., Olsen, S. F., & Hart, C. H. (1996). Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive Parenting practices: Development of a New Measure. *Psychological Reports*, 77, 819-830
21. Smith, E. R. & Mickie, D. M. (2000). *Social Psychology*. 2nd Ed. New York: Psychology Press
22. Schroeder, D. A., (1995). *The Psychology of helping and altruism: Problems and puzzles*. McGraw-Hill, New York.