



PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOUR OF ADOLESCENT STUDENTS INVOLVED IN DIFFERENT COMMUNITIES IN WEST BENGAL

Amit Das ¹ & Dr. Arjun Chandra Das ²

RESEARCH ARTICLE



Author Details:

¹ Research Scholar, Department of Education, University of Kalyani, West Bengal, India;

² Professor, Department of Education, University of Kalyani, West Bengal, India

Corresponding Author:

Amit Das

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.70096/tssr.250307001>

Abstract

Prosocial behaviour is a voluntary social act that helps others or benefits society. Some examples of Prosocial Behaviour such as- helping others, sharing others, comforting others, volunteering, cooperating etc. The focus of this research is to develop an instrument that measures attitudes of Prosocial Behaviour of adolescent students. Mainly the Prosocial Behaviour Scale was developed for later adolescent students who are in study class 11 and have an average age of 16 to 17 years. The work was initiated with a total of five research objectives. Based on these objectives, a total of five research hypotheses have been designed and tested through different statistical techniques. Three of these hypotheses were tested using the t-test and two were tested using the ANOVA. In this present study, the descriptive survey method and quantitative approach have been used. A total of 144 samples were composed, representing the entire population. A sample of Higher Secondary school students was taken from Uttar Dinajpur and Birbhum Districts of the targeted population. This study's results indicated that there are differences in the various perspectives of prosocial behaviour, and there are also no differences in the various perspectives of prosocial behaviour among adolescent students.

Keywords: *Adolescents, Attitude Scale, Items Analysis, Prosocial Behaviour, West Bengal*

Introduction

Positive attitudes encourage various social activities and behaviours. Prosocial behaviour refers to a range of positive behaviours including positive interactions (e.g., friendly play or peaceful conflict resolutions), altruism (e.g., sharing, offering help), and behaviours that reduce stereotypes (Mares and Woodard, 2007). This behaviour can be motivated by various factors such as social norms, personal values, ideology, positive attitudes etc. Prosocial intention is defined as the willingness to be prosocial, that is, to perform actions that benefit other individuals or groups (Baumsteiger & Siegel, 2019). During the various social crisis, these prosocial behavioural attitudes become important. As was seen during the COVID-19 pandemic. At that time, cooperation with each other became inevitable. Studies during the pandemic either focus on prosocial activities preventing COVID-19 or every day volunteering activities like donating food, money, or clothes or providing emotional comfort (Aresi et al., 2022). Many people maintained physical distance but were responsible for each other. They extended a helping hand to each other while maintaining their distance. In a trying time when people are advised to maintain physical distancing, researchers suggest that prosocial behaviour may help improve bonding and the quality of life. It may also help reduce the impact of stress on emotional functioning (Shukla et al., 2022). Overall, it can be said that Prosocial Behaviour means voluntary activities that benefit others, such as donating, sharing and helping. It promotes positive relationships with others, rapport building with each other, cooperation with each other, and social health in communities and well-being. Prosocial behaviour extends a broad area of activities intended to benefit others. This includes but is not limited to, cooperation, sharing, helping, charitable giving, and volunteering (Manesi et al., 2017).

The focus of this research is to develop an instrument that measures attitudes of Prosocial Behaviour of adolescent students. This study has provided various information regarding the prosocial behaviour of present students in West Bengal. With the help of this can be aware of the present level of students' attitudes towards prosocial behaviour. In this way, it is possible to identify the study of their present behaviour with respect to society with the help of social work and the reason for their various anti-social behaviour. Based on this research information, it is also possible to remedy their anti-social behaviour.

Concept of Prosocial Behaviour

Prosocial behaviour refers to positive social behaviours. This behaviour involves costs for the self and results in benefits for other people in society. Prosocial Behaviour is influenced by cultural values, empathy and humanities. Two definitions are

mentioned here – Shroder (2005) note that the term Prosocial represents a broad category of acts that are defined by some significant segment of society or one's social group as generally beneficial to other people.

Twenge et al. (2007) defined "Prosocial Behaviour as actions that benefit other people or society as a whole. It facilitates group work and in turn provides individuals with immense benefits for the long run".

Significance of the Study

Prosocial behaviour raises a better sense of a healthy community. Healthy communities are built on prosocial behaviour that helps protect the mental health, well-being, and pleasure of their social lifestyle. When increasing prosocial behaviour in the community, can must reduce antisocial behaviour and aggressive behaviour. When students behave pro-socially toward peer groups and society, they feel a positive environment. As a result, prosocial students are feeling attitude to be happy, more cooperative, help others and become more positive. Positive emotions motivate students to learn, open themselves to new information, and participate in activities. When students experience positive emotions in the classroom, they become more creative, work harder, and persist through challenges. Various behavioural problems are seen in adolescence period. It is necessary to study how to solve all these problems, this is the importance of this study.

Review Related Studies

Carlo and Randall (2002) studied on "The development of a measure of prosocial behaviours for late Adolescents." In this study have proposed that there are six main types of Prosocial Behaviour which are dependent on personal and situational factors, such as Altruistic Prosocial Behaviour, Compliant Prosocial Behaviour, Emotional Prosocial Behaviour, Anonymous Prosocial Behaviour, Dire Prosocial Behaviour and Public Prosocial Behaviour. Jackson (2010) studied on "Is prosocial behaviour a good thing? Developmental changes in children's evaluations of helping, sharing, cooperating, and comforting." This study investigated the development of prosocial thinking in children. Specifically, the goals were to examine whether children evaluate prosocial behaviours similarly and whether there are developmental differences in evaluations of prosocial behaviours. Kayser et al. (2010) studied on "Why mood affects help giving, but not moral courage: comparing two types of prosocial behaviour." In this study, they Compare two types of prosocial behaviour, Help Giving and Moral Courage. Help giving is mostly a low-cost prosocial behaviour; however, it might also include coming to the aid of a stranger with an acute problem. Moral courage, which always involves high costs (i.e., helping the victim of discrimination while risking personal harm), occurs to be based on trait characteristics. Baker (2013) studied on "Social Support and Success in Higher Education: The Influence of On-Campus Support on African American and Latino College Students". The major objective was to know how personal support from the college environment influences the academic performance of African American and Latino college students who were attending selective colleges. The findings of the results indicate that it was important to differentiate between different forms of personal support and the race and gender of students getting support. Bhochhibhoya et al. (2017) studied on "Sources of Social Support Among International College Students in the United States". The main objective of the study was to operationalize different sources of social support and evaluate determinants of mental health among international students. Padilla-Walker (2018) studied on "Associations between Prosocial and Problem Behavior from Early to Late Adolescence." This present study has highlighted prosocial behaviour as negatively associated with problem behaviour during adolescence, we know little about how these variables might be associated longitudinally, whether there are bidirectional effects, and whether there might be different patterns of co-occurrence of behaviours for different individuals. Chakraborty (2019) studied on "A Study of Social Support in Improving Adolescents' Health in Birbhum". The major aim of the study is to enhance well-being of the adolescents by strengthening available social support to become a socially healthy and productive citizen. In this study, the researcher framed the sample of a total of 400 adolescent students of 15-18 years from Birbhum districts in West Bengal. This study concludes that a strong social support system could play a crucial role in maintaining positive social health.

The Problem

After studying the above review of related studies on Prosocial Behaviour, the researcher found a research gap and recognized the title as "Prosocial Behaviour of Adolescent Students Involved in Different Communities in West Bengal."

Objectives of the Study

1. To determine the difference in Prosocial Behaviour among Adolescent students in terms of their Gender.
2. To determine the difference in Prosocial Behaviour among Adolescent students in terms of their study lifestyle.
3. To study the difference in Prosocial Behaviour among Adolescent students in terms of their participation in co-curricular activities.
4. To study the difference in Prosocial Behaviour among Adolescent students in terms of their community.
5. To study the difference in Prosocial Behaviour among Adolescent students in terms of their monthly family incomes.

Hypotheses of the Study

- H1: There is a significant mean difference in Prosocial Behaviour between male and female students.
H2: There is a significant mean difference in Prosocial Behaviour between Hostellers and Non Hostellers students.
H3: There is a significant mean difference in Prosocial Behaviour between participating and non-participating students in co-curricular activities.

- H4: There is a significant mean difference in Prosocial Behaviour between General, OBC, SC and ST students.
 H5: There is a significant mean difference in Prosocial Behaviour between students from low, medium and high family incomes.

Methodology

Research Method

Research design is plans and the procedures for research to detailed methods of data collection and analysis (Cresswell, 2009). In this study have been used a Descriptive Survey method and quantitative approach. Descriptive research is a research method that tries to describe and interpret objects appropriate to the situation (Best, 1982).

Population

The population of the study was composed of all Higher Secondary School (11th grade) students in West Bengal, India, during the academic session 2024- 2025.

Sample

A sample of 144 Higher Secondary school students was taken from Uttar Dinajpur and Birbhum Districts of the targeted population. The investigator has selected two schools from every district in West Bengal. The researcher used a simple random sampling technique for the study to draw the samples.

Table 1: Sample Distribution

Independent Variables		N		Percentage
Gender	Male	62	144	43.05555556
	Female	82		56.94444444
Study Lifestyle	Hostelers	42	144	29.16666667
	Non-Hostelers	102		70.83333333
Co-curricular	Participating	82	144	56.94444444
	Not Participating	64		44.44444444
Community	General	46	144	31.94444444
	OBC	34		23.61111111
	SC	47		32.63888889
	ST	17		11.80555556
Monthly Family Income	Low	88	144	61.11111111
	Medium	49		34.02777778
	High	7		4.86111111
		Total = 144		

Delimitation of the Problem

- The study is limited to middle adolescent students who were studying in higher secondary (11th grade only) schools.
- The current study is limited to Uttar Dinajpur and Birbhum Districts in West Bengal.
- Only 141 higher secondary middle adolescent students were chosen.
- Used a Self-constructed close-ended questionnaire Scale.

Tools and Techniques

The researcher prepared a Self-constructed Prosocial Behaviour scale for the study. The questionnaire was a 5-point response scale, which consisted of 50 items. The questionnaire was standardized and finally, 37 items were accepted based on the significance level of p-value ($P \leq 0.05$). The researcher used Mean & SD, t-tests and F-tests as a statistical technique for hypothesis testing. The scoring procedure is shown in the table below.

Table 2: The Scoring of the items of the Prosocial Behaviour Scale

Nature of Items	SA	A	U	D	SD
Positives Items	5	4	3	2	1
Negative Items	1	2	3	4	5

Testing The Hypothesis

Hypothesis-1

H01: There is no significant mean difference in Prosocial Behaviour between male and female students.

Table 3: Prosocial Behaviour between male and female students

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	SE _D	df	t- value	p-value
Male	62	145.98	15.98	6.46	2.695	142	2.39*	0.0179
Female	82	152.44	16.04					

*Significant at 0.05 level

Analysis

From the 't-table' the researcher found that the critical value of t with 142 (df) at a 5% level is 1.98 and the 1% level is 2.61. Our computed value of 't' i.e., 2.40 is greater than 5% critical value and less than 1% critical value ($2.40 > 1.98$ & $2.40 < 2.61$) and hence is significant at 0.05 level. It means that the null hypothesis (H01) is rejected.

Hypothesis-2

H02: There is no significant mean difference in Prosocial Behaviour between Hostellers and Non Hostellers students.

Table 4: Prosocial Behaviour between hostellers and non-hostellers students

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	SE _D	df	t- value	p-value
Hostellers	42	145.64	15.40	5.67	2.956	142	1.92 ^{NS}	0.057
Non Hostellers	102	152.31	16.41					

NS= Not Significant

Analysis

From the 't-table' the researcher found that the critical value of t with 142 (df) at a 5% level is 1.98 and the 1% level is 2.61. Our computed value of 't' i.e., 1.92 is less than both the critical values ($1.92 < 1.98$ & 2.62) and hence no is significant. It means that the null hypothesis (H02) is accepted.

Hypothesis-3

H03: There is no significant mean difference in Prosocial Behaviour between participating and non-participating students in co-curricular activities.

Table 5: Prosocial Behaviour between participating and non-participating students

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	SE _D	df	t- value	p-value
Participating	82	152.49	16.20	5.37	2.604	142	2.06*	0.04
Non-participating	62	147.11	14.45					

*Significant at 0.05 level

Analysis

From the 't-table' the researcher found that the critical value of t with 142 (df) at a 5% level is 1.98 and the 1% level is 2.61. Our computed value of 't' i.e., 2.06 is greater than 5% critical value and less than 1% critical value ($2.06 > 1.98$ & $2.06 < 2.61$) and hence by conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be statistically significant at 0.05 level. It means that the null hypothesis (H03) is rejected.

Hypothesis-4

H04: There is no significant mean difference in Prosocial Behaviour between General, OBC, SC and ST students.

Table 6: ANOVA between general, OBC, SC and ST students of Prosocial Behaviour

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
General	46	6918	150.39	287.62
OBC	34	5143	151.26	289.29
SC	47	6989	148.70	233.127
ST	17	2501	147.12	274.86

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	265.16	3	88.39	0.33 _{NS}	0.80	2.67
Within Groups	37611.17	140	268.65			
Total	37876.33	143				

NS= Not Significant

Analysis

From the analysis in the table, it is seen that the calculated F value is 0.33 and the p-value is 0.80 ($p > 0.05$). Hence F is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H04) is accepted.

Hypothesis-5

H05: There is no significant mean difference in Prosocial Behaviour between students from low, medium and high monthly family incomes.

Table 7: ANOVA between low, medium and high monthly family income students of Prosocial Behaviour

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Low	88	13079	148.63	295.85
Medium	49	7408	151.18	229.15
High	7	1064	152	148.67

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	246.35	2	123.18	0.46 _{NS}	0.63	3.06
Within Groups	37629.97	141	266.88			
Total	37876.33	143				

NS= Not Significant

Analysis

From the analysis in the table, it is seen that the calculated F value is 0.46 and the p-value is 0.63 ($p > 0.05$). Hence F is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H05) is accepted.

Findings of the Study

1. From the null hypothesis H01, the result indicated that there is a significant difference in Prosocial Behaviour between male and female students in Higher Secondary (11th grade) schools in WB, during the session 2024-2025 academic year. The findings concluded that female students have a greater Prosocial Behaviour than male students.
2. From the null hypothesis H02, the result indicated that there is no significant difference in Prosocial Behaviour between Hostellers and Non Hostellers school students in WB.
1. From the null hypothesis H03, the result indicated that there is a significant difference in Prosocial Behaviour between participating and non-participating students in co-curricular activities. The findings concluded that students involved in co-curricular activities have a greater Prosocial Behaviour than students who are not involved in co-curricular activities.
2. From the null hypothesis H04, the result indicated that the F is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected. So, we can say that there is no significant difference in Prosocial Behaviour between General, OBC, SC and ST students.
3. 5. From the null hypothesis H05, the result indicated that the F is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected. So, we can say that there is no significant mean difference in Prosocial Behaviour between students from low, medium and high monthly family incomes.

Conclusion

Based on all the above discussion and all the hypotheses tested, we can say that there is a significant difference in Prosocial Behaviour between males and females as well as female students have greater Prosocial Behaviour than male students. On the other hand, there is no significant difference in Prosocial Behaviour between Hostellers and Non Hostellers school students. It is also seen that there is a significant difference in Prosocial Behaviour between participating and non-participating students in co-curricular activities, and it is also proven that students involved in co-curricular activities have a greater Prosocial Behaviour than students who are not involved in co-curricular activities. In this study, it is clear from ANOVA that there is no significant difference in Prosocial Behaviour between General, OBC, SC and ST students, and there is no significant mean difference in Prosocial Behaviour between students from low, medium and high monthly family incomes. Overall, it can be said that there are

differences in the various perspectives of prosocial behaviour, and there are also no differences in the various perspectives of prosocial behaviour among adolescent students. Therefore, it is clear that this behaviour has crucial effects on them, so more research work is needed on this.

Acknowledgment: No

Author's Contribution: Amit Das: Data Collection, Literature Review, Methodology, Analysis, Drafting; Dr. Arjun Chandra Das: Referencing.

Funding: No

Declaration: All the authors have given consent for the publication.

Competing Interest: No

References

1. Carlo, G., & Randall, B. A. (2002). The development of a measure of prosocial behaviors for late adolescents. *The Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31(1), 31-44. DOI:10.1023/A:1014033032440
2. Twenge, J.M., Baumeister, R.F., Dewart, N.C., Ciarocco, N.J., & Bartels, M.J. (2007). Social exclusion decreases prosocial behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(1), 56-66. DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.56
3. Jackson, M., & Tisak, M. S. (2010). Is prosocial behaviour a good thing? Developmental changes in children's evaluations of helping, sharing, cooperating, and comforting. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 19(3), 349-367. <https://doi.org/10.1348/026151001166146>
4. Kayser, D. N., Greitemeyer, T., Fischer, P., & Frey, D. (2010). Why mood affects help giving, but not moral courage: comparing two types of prosocial behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40(7), 1136-1157. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.717>
5. Baker, C. N. (2013). Social support and success in higher education: The influence of on-campus support on African American and Latino college students. *The Urban Review*, 45(5), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-013-0234-9>
6. Bhochhibhoya Amir, Dong Yue & Branscum Paul et al. (2017). Sources of Social Support Among International College Students in the United States. *Journal of International Students*, 7(3), pp. 671- 686. DOI:10.5281/zenodo.570032
7. Manesi, Z., Van Doesum, N. J., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2017). *Prosocial behavior*. In V. Zeigler-Hill & T. K. Shackelford (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*. New York: Springer. DOI:10.1007/978-3-319-28099-8_1894-1
8. Padilla-Walker, L.M., Memmott-Elison, M.K. & Coyne, S.M. (2018). Associations between Prosocial and Problem Behavior from Early to Late Adolescence. *Journal of Youth Adolescence* 47, 961–975 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0736-y>
9. Chakraborty, M. (2019). *A study of social support in improving adolescents' health in Birbhum*. Shodhgangotri@INFLIBNET, Visva Bharti University, Social Work. <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14146/6909>
10. Baumsteiger, R., & Siegel, J. T. (2019). Measuring prosociality: The development of a prosocial behavioral intentions scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 101(3), 305–314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2017.1411918>
11. Aresi, G., Procentese, F., Gattino, S., Tzankova, I., Gatti, F., Compare, C., Marzana, D., Mannarini, T., Fedi, A., Marta, E., & Guarino, A. (2022). Prosocial behaviours under collective quarantine conditions. A latent class analysis study during the 2020 COVID-19 lockdown in Italy. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 32(3), 490–506. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2571>
12. Shillington, K. J., Vanderloo, L. M., Burke, S. M., Ng, V., Tucker, P., & Irwin, J. D. (2022). A cross-sectional examination of Canadian adults' prosocial behavior during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Rural Mental Health*, 46(3), 174- 182 doi: 10.1037/rmh0000201.
13. Shukla, S., Mishra, S. K., & Agustino, R. D. (2022). Reflection of Types of Prosocial Behavior During COVID-19 in Collectivistic Asian Countries-India and Indonesia. *Qualitative health research*, 32(13), 1993–2005. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10497323221129260>
14. Williams, C., McGee, T.R., Walding, S. et al. (2024). The Role of Prosocial Behaviour in the Deceleration of Conduct Problem Behaviour. *J Dev Life Course Criminology* 10, 169–192. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40865-024-00256-3>

Publisher's Note

The Social Science Review A Multidisciplinary Journal remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published data, map and institutional affiliations.

©The Author(s) 2025. Open Access.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>