

Role of Socio demographic Factors on Prosocial Behavior among Fresh Undergraduates in Nigeria

Damilare. A. Fagbenro¹Foluke H. Olagundoye²&Akeem A. Kenku (Ph.D)³

¹Department of Psychology, ObafemiAwolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria

²Department of Psychology, Federal University Oye-Ekiti Ekiti, Nigeria

³Department of Psychology, Nassarawa State University, Nassarawa, Nigeria

***Corresponding Author:** Damilare. A. Fagbenro, Department of Psychology, ObafemiAwolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State, NigeriaDareinui2008@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Prosocial behaviour among fresh undergraduates in Nigeria is on a decline. This prompts this study to investigate the role of socio demographic factors (age, gender and level of study) on prosocial behaviour among fresh undergraduates in Osun state, Nigeria. The study adopted the descriptive survey research design. A total number of two hundred and twenty four (N= 224, Male = 93, Female = 131, Mean age = 19.29, S.D = 1.81) constitute the respondents. Participants were selected using convenient sampling technique. Three hypotheses were tested using One way Anova and t-test for independent measure. Result showed that there was a significant effect of age on prosocial behaviour of fresh undergraduates ($F = (2, 223) = 7.78, p < .05$). There was significant difference in the prosocial behaviour of fresh undergraduates based on level of study ($t = 1.96; df = 222, p < .05$). Finally, gender had significant influence on prosocial behaviour ($t = -3.51; df = 222, p < .05$). The study concluded that socio demographic factors (age, gender and level of study) has influence on prosocial behaviour among fresh undergraduates in Osun Nigeria.

Keywords: Prosocial behaviour, socio demographic factors (age gender, and level of study), Undergraduate

INTRODUCTION

University is an avenue where adolescent learn and engage in many activities. One very important thing that should be learnt in this environment is how to help people voluntarily without attaching any reward to it. This type of behaviour in the literature is often called prosocial behaviour. Many scholars have defined prosocial behaviour in various forms, in the view of Afolabi(2013) he defined prosocial behaviour as any voluntary actions that are willing to help another individual or set of people. It refers to the activities that are conducted or planned to help individuals without expecting anything in return. Penner and Finkelstein (2000) define prosocial behaviour as the ability to remember the wellbeing and right of people such that one feel concern and empathy about them and to behave in a way that will benefit them without necessarily thinking of any positive return. Similarly, Eisenberg, Yoon and Suh (2003) defined prosocial behaviour as voluntary behaviour that is intended to benefit another and

is not motivated by the expectation of external reward.

Myers (1996) assert that pro-social activities involve attention and assistance towards other people, displaying of love, loyalty, and service to individual or group of people without any expectation to get any reward in return. Prosocial behaviours are also displayed for many reasons which include practical concern, egoistic and other-oriented (Boxer, Tisak, & Goldstein, 2004). The purest forms of pro-social behaviour could be motivated by altruism, which is an unselfish interest in helping another individuals or group of people. In the word of Sanstock (2007) altruism can be sparked by the empathy one have for a person who need help or someone who have a close relationship between the benefactor and the recipient. Humans have long been considered a pro-social species. Fehr and Fischbacher (2003) assert that prosocial behaviour is a major component of human nature. The opportunities for, and diversity of altruism behaviours speed up as children enter adolescence, partly due to new and emerging interpersonal relationships,

cognitive and emotive development, as well as changes in social context (Fabes Carlo, Kupanoff&Laible, 2000). For example, new and modified relationships with peers and adult can influence adolescents' prosocial behaviours such that it provides new targets of helping and exposure to new values, belief systems, or behaviours. Furthermore, many teachers and lecturers expect students to actively engage in learning activities and quite a lot of adolescent particularly older students willing join service clubs with the assistance of parent encouragement.

Adolescents and students also have greater additional opportunities for engaging in behaviours that benefit others. Prosocialbehaviour is an important psychological issue among undergraduates. In a time where the rate of deviant behaviours such as aggressiveness, bullying and substance use is on a high increase, positive behaviour such as prosocial behavior especially among fresh undergraduates appears declining (Obosi,Adejimi&Badejo2017).

Nowadays, Adolescent especially undergraduate students engage in behaviour that tends to increase their rewards and reduce their costs. From this perspective, adolescent are relatively rational and are concerned about their self-interest. This assertion has neglected the popular saying in the biblical world that says "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself". However it is no longer news that immoral behaviours are on a high increase among today's undergraduate students. Such behaviours include aggressiveness, violent act, lack of respect for others, selfish acts as well as lack of empathy for student to help their colleagues or course mate in courses, assignment, school registration as well as other important school activities. This becomes a great problem for concerned stakeholders in Nigeria education system. It is imperative this problem be looked into as soon as possible if truly these set of people are adjudged the leader of tomorrow who are expected to engage in moral behaviours such as prosocial tendency in the society. Thus the need to improve and enhance prosocial behaviour among undergraduate students especially the new students who are just new on campus is a major concern. Studies on antecedents responsible for prosocial actions have a relatively long history in social psychology. However, in developing country such as Nigeria little or nothing has been done to investigate the development of prosocial behaviour particularly

among fresh undergraduate in Osun state Nigeria. Hence, there is dearth in our understanding of how certain socio demographic factors such as age, gender and level of study could influence prosocial development among fresh undergraduate students.

Nwobodo(2013) define gender, as the social attributes and opportunities related with being male and female and the relationships between women and men; girls and boys as well as the relations between women and women and those between men and men. These attributes are socially constructed and are learned through socialization process. This attributes are often context/time specific and changeable. Nwobodo(2013) further states that gender influence what is expected and valued in a woman or a man in a given social context. The construct of gender also includes the expected role held about the characteristics, attitudes and likely behaviours of both women and men. These roles and expectations are often learned, changeable over time and varies within and between different cultures. Research is still of a conflicting view on which of the gender engage in more prosocial behaviour.

Another socio demographic considered important in this study is Age. Age can be defined as the length of time that a person has lived or a thing has existed. Every human being has both the chronological age which is the numerical in nature while the mental age refers to a person's mental ability that is expressed as the age at which an average person reaches the same ability. Naturally, human age varies among each other, the age range makes some people to be called children, while some are called adolescent and some are also refer to as adult. The age at which undergraduates are could influence their orientation regarding helping others.Level of study refers to stage within a programme of study and in most cases relates to the years of study in which that level might be pursued. This level of study often refers to the year that a student will spend on a specific course of study. it often ranges between 4 to 8 year depending on the course of choice a student wish to study. Activities involved in 100 or 200 level of study could make or mar undergraduates to engage in prosocial behaviour.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Many research have been investigated on prosocial behaviour, studies such as (ObosiAdejimi&Badejo, 2017; Krebs 2007;

Chou 2008) found that there is no gender differences on prosocial behaviour while studies such as (Eisenberg 2006; Pursell, Rubin, Booth-LaForce and Rose-Krasnor 2008) found gender differences on prosocialbehaviour. Onyencho and Afolabi (2018) found that age and gender has no significant effect on prosocialbehaviour among police officers. Ogunboyede and Agokei (2016) examined level of study and altruism behaviour among 145 university student. In the study done by Afolabi (2014)found that age and gender have significant relationship with prosocialbehaviour among 294 undergraduates students. Orji (2013) in his study found that gender hasno statistical significant predictor of altruism among secondary school student.

Vaculik, Mark, Prochazka, and Kveton(2007) found that gender have no influence on prosocialbehaviour among 340 respondents. Redzo and Paul (2011) found that men engage in altruistic behaviour than women.Afolabi(2014) investigate prosocialbehaviour among 440 students from two Nigerian Universities. The result revealed thatrespondents residing in a village are more prosocial than those in a cityAlso;cultural/ethnic differences significantly influence prosocialbehaviour. Quain, Yidana and Ambotumah (2016) examined some socio demographic factors of Prosocialbehaviour among 520 university students. The study found that age positively influence prosocialbehaviour amongst the students. The result revealed that level of study influence altruism behaviour among the sampled respondents in another study done by Fischer, Wallace and Fenton (2000) who found that year of study significantly influence prosocialbehaviour among in-school adolescent.Based on the reviewed literature, there is still dearth of literature that has co-jointly investigated the socio demographic factors (age, gender and level of study) on prosocialbehaviour among fresh undergraduates in Osun state Nigeria. This prompts the study to fill this gap in the literature. This present study also raised some hypotheses which will guide this study

- There will be a significant effect of age on prosocial behaviour of fresh undergraduates
- There will be a significant difference in the prosocial behaviour of fresh undergraduates based on level of study

- There will be a significant difference in the prosocial behaviour of fresh undergraduates based on gender.

METHODOLOGY

Design

The studyadopteda descriptive survey research design. This is because the researchers only observe and describe the behaviour of a sample of a population without influencing it in any way.

Setting

This study was carried out at the ObafemiAwolowo University (O.A.U) Ile-Ife, Osun state Nigeria. Obafemi Awolowo University is one of the federal university in Nigeria. It was founded in October 1961. The university is located at Ife central local government area. The rationale for using this setting is because of its accessibility and convenience to the researchers.

Participants

A total of two hundred and twenty four (224) undergraduates were conveniently selected for participation in the study. Their socio demographic factors revealed that 93(41.5%) of the respondents were males while 131(58.5%) were females. 72(32.1%) were aged 16-18 years, 119(53.1%) were aged 19-21 years and 33(14.7%) were aged 22-24 years. 126(56.3%) were Christians, 91(40.6%) were Muslims and 7(3.1%) belonged to other Religious Groups. 75(33.5%) belonged to Polygamous family while 149(66.5%) belonged to Monogamous family. 107(47.8%) were 100 level students while 117(52.2%) were 200 level students.

Instruments

The instrument for the collection of data was a structured validated questionnaire, which consist of two (2) sections: Section A tap the socio demographic factors of the respondents which include sex, age, religion, family type, and level of study. Section B of the questionnaire measure pro-social behaviour which was measured with a 22-item version of Prosocial Tendencies Measure (PTM) developed by Carlo and Randall (2002). Sample of the item reads "I think that helping others without them knowing is the best type of situation" and "I can help others best when people are watching me". Each item was scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 -does not describe me at all to 5 - describes me very well. The author reports a

Role of Socio demographic Factors on Prosocial Behavior among Fresh Undergraduates in Nigeria

reliability of .86. In this study a Cronbach's alpha of .76 was reported in this study.

Procedure

Questionnaires were used to collect data from the participants in the study. After, the required permissions were obtained from the university authority. The researcher seeks participant consent through verbal response and those who agreed to take part in the study were assured of confidentiality and discretion of the study. The researcher also informed the participants the purposes and/or objectives of the study. Direction on how to complete the questionnaires was given and, the participant was also encouraged to be truthful in their response. Questionnaires were administered to participants during lecture free time across two faculties of the institution. The collection of data lasted for a period of one week and two days. A total number of two hundred and fifty

questionnaires were distributed to the participants but only two hundred and twenty four were retrieved as eleven of the questionnaires were badly filled while thirteen was not returned totaling about twenty four questionnaires that were missing. The retrieved questionnaires were subjected to appropriate statistical analysis.

Statistical Analysis

The collected data was coded and then analyzed using the IBM statistical package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22. Both descriptive and inferential statistic was used for data analysis in this study. The descriptive statistics was used to analyze the socio demographic factors while the inferential statistic was used to test the hypotheses. Hypothesis one was tested using one-way Anova while hypothesis two and three was tested using t-test for independent measure all at .05 level of significance.

RESULTS

Table 1. One-way ANOVA showing the effect of age on prosocial behaviour of fresh undergraduates

Source of variation	Sum of square	DF	Mean square	F	Sig.
Age	741.647	2	370.824	7.789	.001
Error	10522.067	221	47.611		
Total	11263.714	223			

The above table showed that there was a significant effect of age on prosocial behaviour of fresh undergraduates ($F = 7.789$, $P(.001) < .05$). Hence, age influenced prosocial behaviour of fresh undergraduates in the study.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of age based on prosocial behaviour of fresh undergraduates

Age	N	\bar{x}	Std. Deviation
16-18 years	72	58.1667	6.9869
19-21 years	119	57.4874	7.2508
22-24 years	33	52.9394	5.3732
Total	224	57.0357	7.1070

The table above showed the descriptive statistics of age based on prosocial behaviour of fresh undergraduates in the study.

Table 3. Post Hoc Test showing multiple pairwise analyses of age based on prosocial behaviour of fresh undergraduate

(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig. p-value
16-18 years	19-21 years	.6793	1.0337	.512
	22-24 years	5.2273*	1.4554	.000
19-21 years	16-18 years	-.6793	1.0337	.512
	22-24 years	4.5480*	1.3621	.001
22-24 years	16-18 years	-5.2273*	1.4554	.000
	19-21 years	-4.5480*	1.3621	.001

* sig. at .05 level

Table 3 above revealed that undergraduates between 16 – 18 year significantly scored higher on prosocial behaviour (Mean = 57.58) than those between 19-21 years (Mean = 57.48) and 22-24 years (Mean = 52.93).

Table4.Independent t-test showing the difference in the prosocialbehaviour of fresh undergraduates based on level of study

Level	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	P
100 Level	107	58.46	6.89	222	1.96	<.05
200 Level	117	55.72	7.07			

Table 4above showed that there was significant difference in the prosocialbehaviour of fresh undergraduates based on level (t= 1.96; df= 222; p<.05). Hence, 100 level students (M=58.46) had a better prosocial behaviour than those in 200 level (M=55.72). The hypothesis is accepted.

Table5.Independent t-test showing the difference in the prosocialbehaviour of fresh undergraduates based on gender

Gender	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	P
Male	93	52.95	13.91	222	-3.51	<.05
Female	131	59.52	12.54			

Table 5shows that gender had significant influence on prosocialbehaviouramong fresh undergraduates(t= -3.51; df= 222; p<.05).This means that femaleundergraduates (M=59.52, S.D=12.54) reported higher prosocialbehaviour than male (M=52.95, S.D= 13.91). Hence, the result confirmed the stated hypothesis and it is accepted in this study.

DISCUSSION

The present study has been able to contribute to knowledge on the role of socio demographic factors (age, gender and level of study) on prosocialbehaviour among fresh undergraduate students. From the hypotheses postulated to guide this study, the first hypothesis which revealed that there was a significant effect of age on prosocialbehaviour of fresh undergraduates. The study findings was in line withAfolabi (2014) who found that age have significant relationship with prosocialbehaviour among 294 undergraduates students. The study finding is also in line with Quain, Yidana and Ambotumah (2016) who examined socio demographic factors of prosocial behavior amongst 520 university students. The study found that age positively influence prosocialbehaviour amongst the students. The study was not in line with Onyencho and Afolabi (2018) who found that age and gender has no significant effect on prosocialbehaviour among police officers. The justification for this finding could be that young undergraduates between the ages of 16 -18yrs still inculcate the value of their parent which invariably could make them engage inprosocialbehaviour on campus.

The second hypothesis revealed that there was significant difference in the prosocialbehaviour of fresh undergraduates based on level of study. The study finding was in accordance with Ogunboyede and Agokei, (2016) who examined

level of study and altruism behaviour among 145 university student. The result revealed that level of study influence altruism behaviour among the sampled respondents. The study was also in line with Fischer, Wallace and Fenton (2000) who found that year of study significantly influence prosocialbehaviour among in-school adolescent. The reason for this finding could be that undergraduates who are in100level are relatively new in the university environment and faces little academic pressure which invariably could make them engage in prosocialbehaviour as a way of life.

The third hypothesis revealed that gender had significant influence on prosocialbehaviouramong fresh undergraduates meaning that more female have engage in prosocialbehaviour than male undergraduate. The study was similar withstudies such as (Eisenberg 2006; Pursell, Rubin, Booth-LaForce and Rose-Krasnor 2008) who found that female engage in prosocialbehaviour than their male. The justification for this finding may be unconnected with the fact that women are naturally emotionally and have empathy toward people which often makes them willing to assist or help other without necessary looking for incentives.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this present study, it was concluded that there was significant influence of age on prosocialbehaviour meaning

that undergraduates who ranges from 16 – 18 year engage more in prosocialbehaviour. It was also concluded that gender have significant influence on prosocialbehaviour which implies that female undergraduate engage more in prosocialbehaviour than their male counterpart. Finally, level of study have significant influence on prosocialbehaviour meaning that undergraduate who are in 100level engage in prosocialbehaviour than undergraduate in 200 level.

IMPLICATION OF THE STUDY

The study has been able to contribute significantly to the body of knowledge on prosocialbehaviour. The findings from this study highlight practical implications. The influence of socio demographic factors such as age gender and level of study are very important predictor variables which can influence prosocialbehaviour among fresh undergraduates. This result implies that the influence of sociodemographic factors cannot be overemphasized in the engagement of prosocialbehaviour among fresh undergraduates. Hence, the findings therefore have implications for professional psychologist, and university management. For professional psychologist, they should develop a psychological intervention programtailoured toward male undergraduates whose age ranges from 19-25yrs and who are in 200levels. University management should organize seminars for undergraduates on the important of engaging in prosocialbehaviour in the university and outside the university system.

LIMITATION AND SUGGESTION FOR FUTURE STUDY

All empirical study is faced with its limitation. Firstly, the study is faced with the challenge of generalizability of the results. This is because the respondents of this study were relatively small and only selected from one university. Also, participants were unwillingly to fill the questionnaire as most claim they have other important things to do order than filling a questionnaire. Time constraints were also a major limitation in this study. Future study should employ larger sample. Also incentives can also be inculcated by future researcher to the respondents. Longitudinal study can also be considered by future researcher.

REFERENCES

- [1] Afolabi, O.A. (2014). Psychosocial predictors of Prosocialbehaviour among a sample of Nigerian undergraduates.*European Scientific Journal*, 10(2), 241 -266
- [2] Afolabi, O.A. (2013). Roles of personality types, emotional intelligence and gender differences on prosocialbehaviour. *Psychological Thought*, 6 (1), 124-139.
- [3] Boxer, P., Tisak, M. S., & Goldstein, S. E. (2004). Is it bad to be good? An exploration of aggressive and prosocial behavior subtypes in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 33, 91-100.
- [4] Carlo, I., & Randall, U. (2002).Self-efficacy and Prosocial Tendencies in Italian Adolescents.*Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 92, 239 – 245
- [5] Chou, Y. (2008). Friendships in middle school: Influences on motivation and school adjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96, 195 - 203.
- [6] Eisenberg, N., Yoon, P., &Suh, U. (2006).Prosocialdevelopment. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social emotional, and personality development* (pp.646–718). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- [7] Fabes R., Carlo G.,Kupanoff K., &Laible D. (1999).Early adolescence and prosocial/ moral behavior I: The role of individual processes. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 19, 5-16
- [8] Fehr, E., &Fischbacher U. (2003).The nature of human altruism.*Nature*, 425, 785–791
- [9] Fischer, H., Wallace, P., &Fenton, U.(2000). Pro-social behaviour among in-school adolescent.*Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57, 149-161.
- [10] Krebs, P. (2007). Impact of ProsocialBehaviouramong undergraduates.*International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 4, 2 (86), 1-11.
- [11] Myers, D. G. (1996). *Social Psychology* (5th ed.). USA: McGraw-Hill.
- [12] Nwobodo, I. (2013). Gender issues and leadership effectiveness in Nigeria labour union activities: an appraisal. *Psychology of gender*, 26, 74-88.
- [13] Obosi, C., Adejimi, A., &Badejo, R. (2017).Role of psychological and parental social factors in pro-social behaviour among pre-adolescents and adolescents in Lagos state.*African journal for the psychological study of social issues*, 20(3), 285-300
- [14] Ogunboyede, M., &Agokei, R.(2016). ProsocialBehaviour of In-School Adolescents: The Perceived Influence of Self-Esteem, Peer Influence and Parental Involvement. *British Journal of Education, Society &Behavioural Science*, 13(2),1-9
- [15] Onyencho, V., &Afolabi, O. (2018).Influence of personality and Gender Differences on Pro-Social Behaviour among a Sample of Nigerian Police Personnel. *The International Journal of Humanities & Social Studies*, 6(4),179- 184

Role of Socio demographic Factors on Prosocial Behavior among Fresh Undergraduates in Nigeria

- [16] Orji, C. (2013). Self-efficacy, peer pressure and gender as predictors of altruism among adolescents. A Master's of science degree (M.sc.) in the Department of Psychology, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- [17] Penner LA., & Finkelstein M. (1998). Dispositional and structural determinants of volunteerism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 525-537
- [18] Pursell, K., Rubin, R., Booth-LaForce, T., & Rose-Krasnor, R. (2008). Teenage volunteers and their values. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 24, 337-357.
- [19] Rehberg, H. R., & Richman, C. L. (2013). Prosocial behaviour in preschool children: A look at the interaction of race, gender and family composition. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 12, 385-401
- [20] Sanstock, H. (2007). Prosocial behaviour among adolescent. *Journal of development* 4-56-67
- [21] Vaculik, M., Mark, J., Prochazka, A., & Kveton, P. (2004). The relation between prosocial behaviour, self-efficacy. *Journal of psychological counseling*, 5, 67-78

Citation: Damilare. A. Fagbenro, Foluke H. Olagundoye & Akeem A. Kenku (Ph.D), " Role of Socio demographic Factors on Prosocial Behavior among Fresh Undergraduates in Nigeria ". (2018). *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies*, 5(9), pp.41-47.

Copyright: © 2018 Damilare. A. Fagbenro. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.