



ISSN: 2249-894X

IMPACT FACTOR : 5.7631 (UIF)

UGC APPROVED JOURNAL NO. 48514

VOLUME - 8 | ISSUE - 8 | MAY - 2019



## PRO-SOCIAL AND ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AMONG HIGHER SECONDARY CLASS STUDENTS IN RELATION TO PARENTAL BEHAVIOUR

Latha K.<sup>1</sup> and Dr. V. Vasudevan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M.Ed. Student, Department of Educational Psychology, TNTEU, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, TNTEU, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

### ABSTRACT:

The normal development of empathy has been proposed to be imperative to the healthy emotional and social functioning of youths. In contrast, compromised levels of Parental behaviour have been linked to an increased propensity to engage in antisocial behaviours, including animal cruelty. Previous findings have revealed parent attachment to be intrinsically linked to the development of empathy. This association has been shown to play a role in

predicting the expression of various outcome behaviours, including both those which are pro-social in nature, and those which are antisocial, and potentially aggressive. This study examines these associations in a sample of 300 students. The aim included the investigator of the direct predictive roles played by attachment and parental behaviour for pro-social and antisocial behaviours directed at both humans and animals. We also investigated the mediating role played by parental behaviour in these relationships. Attachment and Parental behaviour significantly predicted pro-social and antisocial behaviours, both individually, and in combination. Furthermore, empathy was found to serve a mediating role in the associations between attachment and human directed pro-social behaviour, the humane treatment of animals, and animal cruelty. These findings expand upon existing literature by demonstrating that it is, at least partially, through parental behaviour that attachment to parents predicts pro-social and antisocial behaviour during higher secondary class students.

**KEYWORDS:** Pro-Social Behaviour, Antisocial Behaviour, Parental Behaviour, Higher Secondary Class Students.

### INTRODUCTION

Pro-social behaviour can be defined as voluntary behaviours made with the intent of benefiting others (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998).

Pro-social behaviour can be defined as behaviour that benefits society. The pro-social or altruistic personality is said to include moral

reasoning, empathetic concern, the ability to take the perspective of others, and agreeableness (Sprecher and Fehr, 2005).

The term antisocial behaviour has grown in its use and meaning over time and has been constructed as a significant social problem since the early 1990's. The use of the term antisocial behaviour has expanded throughout the 1990's and into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The term antisocial, as well as having the

meaning opposed to sociality which has not changed over time also has another meaning. Antisocial opposed to the principles on which society is constituted (Oxford English Dictionary, 1885).

Antisocial behaviour can be defined as acts that inflict physical or mental harm or property loss or damage on others. It is behaviour that is intended to lower the well-being of other persons, which

may or may not constitute the breaking of criminal laws (Coie and Dodge, 1998; Loeber and Schmalin, 1985; Rutter, Giller, and Hagell, 1998).

Many parents create their own style from a combination of factors, and these may evolve over time as the children develop their own personalities and move through life's stages. Parental rearing style is affected by both the parents' and children's temperaments, and is largely based on the influence of one's own parents and culture. Most parents learn parenting practices from their own parents some they accept, some they discard. According to Darling and Steinberg (1993), parenting practices are defined as specific behaviours that parents use to socialize their children.

### **BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY**

The basic psychological need theory, the investigator examined the direct effects of the satisfaction of three basic psychological needs at school on pro-social and antisocial behaviour as well as mediation of school satisfaction on the relations between the satisfaction of three basic psychological needs at school and pro-social behaviour as well as antisocial behavior. The Pro-social and Antisocial behaviour are like the two sides of the same coin. As students transition from childhood to adolescence, they become increasingly dependent on social relationship with peers. In this period they are affected by their family. The parental behaviour also play a major role in adolescents either developing a pro-social and antisocial behaviour with the views expressed above the investigator felt that there is a need of hour to investigate pro-social and antisocial behaviour among higher secondary class students in relation to such variables namely parental behaviour.

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

- To find out whether there is any significant difference between male and female higher secondary class students in their pro-social behaviour and anti-social behaviour.
- To find out the level of pro-social behaviour and anti-social behaviour among higher secondary class students is moderate.
- To find out whether there is any significant difference between government, private and govt. aided higher secondary class students in their parental behaviour.
- To find out the level of parental behaviour among higher secondary class students is moderate.

### **HYPOTHESES**

1. There is no significant difference between male and female higher secondary class students in their pro-social behaviour and anti-social behaviour.
2. The level of pro-social behaviour and anti-social behaviour among higher secondary class students is moderate.
3. There is no significant difference between government, private and govt. aided higher secondary class students in their parental behaviour.
4. The level of parental behaviour among higher secondary class students is moderate.

### **METHODOLOGY**

The Survey Method is followed in the present research, for generating quantitative data suitable for differential and correlative analysis. The population of the present study consists of the higher secondary class students studying in Kanchipuram District. The sample consists of 300 higher secondary class students.

### **RESEARCH TOOLS**

- Pro-social and Antisocial Behaviour Scale by A. Paul Albert (2014).
- Parental Behaviour Scale by T. Thilagavathi (2013).

**STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED**

- Mean
- Standard Deviation
- t-test
- ANOVA

**ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant difference between male and female higher secondary class students in their pro-social behaviour and anti-social behaviour.

**Table 1: Prosocial and Antisocial Behaviour of Higher Secondary Class Students based on Gender**

Gender	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	Level of Significance	Result
Pro-Social Behaviour	Male	150	120.68	13.500	1.102	0.49
	Female	150	121.83	15.193		
Anti Social Behaviour	Male	150	106.13	23.694	1.935	0.001
	Female	150	113.98	16.729		
Pro and Anti Social Behaviour	Male	150	226.81	27.971	2.284	0.002
	Female	150	235.81	22.786		

From Table-1, the calculated t-value is 0.002 which is less than 0.05 level of significance. Thus there is significant difference between male and female students in their pro-social and antisocial behaviour.

**Hypothesis 2:** The level of pro-social behaviour and anti-social behaviour among higher secondary class students is moderate.

**Table 2: Level of Pro-social and Antisocial Behaviour among Higher Secondary Class Students**

Level	Frequency	Percentage
Low	64	21
Moderate	225	75
High	11	4

Table-2 shows that 21% have low level of pro-social and antisocial behaviour, 75% of students have moderate level of pro-social and antisocial behaviour and 4% have high level of pro-social and antisocial behaviour. From this we can understand that majority of moderate level of pro-social and antisocial behaviour.

**Hypothesis 3:** There is no significant difference between government, private and govt. aided higher secondary class students in their parental behaviour.

**Table 3: Parental Behaviour of Higher Secondary Class Students based on Management of School**

Management of School	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Government	100	163.71	23.339	2.334	159.08	168.34
Private	100	168.59	23.759	2.376	163.88	173.30
Aided	100	187.48	17.438	1.744	184.02	190.94
Total	300	173.26	23.945	1.382	170.54	175.98

**Table 3.1: ANOVA**

Management of School	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. Value	Result
Between Groups	31521.980	2	15760.990	33.457	.000	S
Within Groups	139911.740	297	471.083			
Total	171433.720	299				

Table-3.1 depicts that the calculated 'sig' value is 0.000 which is less than 0.05 level of significance. Thus there is significant difference between government, private and govt. aided higher secondary class students in their parental behaviour.

**Hypothesis 4:** The level of parental behaviour among higher secondary class students is moderate.

**Table 4: Level of Parental Behaviour among Higher Secondary Class Students**

Level	Frequency	Percentage
Low	39	13
Moderate	171	57
High	90	30

Table-4 reveals that 13% have low level of parental behaviour, 57% of students have moderate level of parental behaviour and 30% have high level of parental behaviour. This shows that majority of moderate level of parental behaviour.

**FINDINGS**

- Female higher secondary students have obtained a greater mean value (235.81) and Male higher secondary students (226.81) in pro-social and antisocial behaviour.
- It was found that the calculated 't' value is 0.002 which is less than 0.05 level of significance. Hence, there is significant difference between male and female students in their Pro-social and Antisocial Behaviour. Hence the hypothesis is rejected.
- The pro-social behaviour and antisocial behaviour of higher secondary students is moderate.
- It was found that 21% have low level of Pro-social and Antisocial Behaviour, 75% of students have moderate level of Pro-social and Antisocial Behaviour and 4% have high level of Pro-social and Antisocial Behaviour. From this we can understand that majority of moderate level of Pro-Social and Antisocial behaviour.
- Govt. Aided school students have obtained a greater mean value (187.48) than private (168.59) and Govt school students (163.71) in Parental behaviour.
- It was found that the calculated 'sig' value is 0.000 which is less than 0.05 level of significance. Hence, there is significant difference between Government, Private and Aided higher secondary class students in their Parental Behaviour. Hence the hypothesis is rejected.
- The Parental behaviour of higher secondary students is moderate.

- It was found that 13% have low level of Parental Behaviour, 57% of students have moderate level of Parental Behaviour and 30% have high level of Parental Behaviour. We can understand that majority of moderate level of Parental Behaviour.

### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Based on the important findings stated earlier the following recommendations are suggested.

1. Saying a kind word to a classmate, acknowledge other students' feelings, sharing books and advice, defending a victim of bullying these are the just a few of the pro-social behaviours that can enhance students' social and academic lives at school.
2. The institutions should train teachers to integrate values instruction into classroom management. The classroom provides an excellent setting in which to practice social skills. For example, allowing students to participate in class decision making can promote understanding of democratic values, respect for others' opinions and social responsibility. Encouraging cooperative behaviour by assigning academic tasks in the classroom to pairs or small groups of students may promote the students' ability to work together toward common goals.
3. The authorities should train parents in family management skills such as creating healthy eating habits, budgeting, working with each family member, cleaning habits and laundry skills to improve the parental care.
4. The parents must develop their parenting practices such as parental monitoring, autonomy of child, life skills and safety to minimize their children's unwanted behaviour.

### REFERENCES

1. Abraham, M., Susan, T. & Jaise, J. (2010). Preparation and standardization of a comprehensive socio-economic status scale. *Indian Psychological Review (Special Issue)*, pp.271-277.
2. Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, 4(1&2), 1-103.
3. Conger, R.D., Patterson, G.R., & Ge, X. (1986). It takes two to replicate: A medicinal model for the impact of parent's stress on adolescent adjustment. *Child Development*, 66, 80-97.
4. Cudre-Mauroux, Annick. (2011). Self-Efficacy and Stress of Staff Managing Challenging Behaviours of People with Learning Disabilities. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 39(3),181-189.
5. Dabrowska, A. & Pisula, E. (2010). Parenting Stress and Coping Styles in Mothers and Fathers of Pre-School Children with Autism and Down Syndrome. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 54(3), 266-280.
6. Fauzia Islam, Azimur Rahman , Naseema Khatoon & Mohammad Ali Imam. (2014). Education and socio-economic status of Muslim women in Azamgarh district of eastern Uttar Pradesh. *Golden research thoughts*, 3(9), 1-5.
7. Feehan, M., McGee, R., and Williams, S.M. (1993). Mental health disorders from age 15 to age 18 years. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 32, 1118-1126.
8. Geetha, K. (2009). A study of relationship between altruism and emotional competence of student teachers. M.Phil thesis, Department of Education, Annamalai University, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu.
9. Ruchi Thakur, Shubhangana Sharma & Raj Pathania. (2013). A study of Himachal Pradesh: parenting style and social intelligence of adolescents. *Indian journal of applied research*, 3(9), 556-557.
10. Saha, L.J. (2004.) Prosocial Behaviour and Political Culture among Australian Secondary School Students. *International Education Journal*, 5(1), 9-25.
11. Stephanie Chana & Philip Quinnb. (2012). Secondary school students' views of inhibiting factors in seeking counseling. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 40(5), 527-543.
12. Tobias Greitemeyer & Silvia Osswald. (2011).Playing Prosocial Video Games Increases the Accessibility of Prosocial Thoughts. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 151(2), 121-128.
13. Uniyal, M.P. & Bisht, A.R. (1980). Development of socio-economic status scale, 31(1), 29-34.

14. Vasanthi, A. (2013). Relationship between personality and aggression among XII standard students. *New Horizons in Educational Research*, 5(1), 1-5.
15. Vasudevan, A. (2009). A study on attitude towards parents among the higher secondary students in relation to their family environment and achievement in biology, M.Phil. Thesis, Department of education. Annamalai University, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu.
16. Vasuki, N. (2013). Television Viewing Habits and Behaviour Problem among Secondary Level Pupils. *Global Research Analysis*, 2(4), 45-46.
17. Velisiwe Goldencia Gasa. (2005). Learners' aggressive behaviour in secondary school: A psycho-social perspective. Ph.D thesis, Socio-Education, university of South Africa.
18. William S. Aquilino., (2005). Impact of Family Structure on Parental Attitudes toward the Economic Support of Adult Children over the Transition to Adulthood. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(2), 143-167.
19. Yessenia Castro, Joyce L. Carbonell & Joye C. Anestis (2012). The influence of gender role on the prediction of antisocial behaviour and somatisation. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 58(4), 409-416.
20. Zsolnai, Aniko; Lesznyak, Marta; Kasik, Laszlo. (2012). Pre-School Children's Aggressive and Pro-Social Behaviours in Stressful Situations. *Journal of Early Child Development and Care*, 182(11), 1503-1522.