



NIGERIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Volume 3, Issue 1

Online ISSN: 2682-6151

Print ISSN: 2682-6143

2020

Editor-in-Chief

Prof. S.O. Adebayo

Managing Editor

B.E. Nwankwo Ph.D

Self-Monitoring, Peer-bullying and Parenting Style in Prosocial Behaviours of Boarding School Students

Iboro F. A. Ottu¹
Anietie M. Umoren²
Gabriel Robert Umoh¹
James Robson Sunday¹

¹Department of Psychology, University of Uyo, Nigeria

²Department of Psychology, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Email: iboro.fa.ottu@uniuyo.edu.ng or iboro2061@yahoo.com

Abstract

Prosocial behaviours can be groomed or inhibited through many direct or indirect attributes. Among teenagers who live in school dormitories, prosocial behaviour tends to decline due to the culture of bullying, which has suffused the Nigerian School System and heightened in boarding school facilities. This study examined the role of bullying, self-monitoring and parenting style on pro-social behaviour among students in a Federal Government College in Nigeria. The study adopted a cross-sectional survey, and sampled 200 participants using a structured questionnaire that measured self-monitoring, parenting style, peer bullying and prosocial behaviour. Findings revealed a significant relationship between prosocial behaviour and mother parenting style. The negative relationship between bullying and prosocial behaviour was, as expected, not surprising. Similar relationships between other independent variables (self-monitoring, and father parenting style) and prosocial behaviour, did not show significant results. The multiple regression results indicate that these independent variables did not predict prosocial behaviour among the study sample. Although past studies have reported levels of correlation between these variables and prosocial behaviour, the overly negative and low beta value of bullying in this study shows that victimized students may be deeply depressed and needed more social support from parents and teachers to strengthen their self-confidence which they seem to bolster through individual self-monitoring. It is recommended that future studies should examine the role of school social support as a way of reducing the impact of bullying on students' psyche towards the manifestation of new levels of prosocial behaviours.

Keywords: *Boarding school system, parenting style, prosocial behavior, self-monitoring, students' bullying.*

Introduction

Prosocial behaviour denotes a constellation of voluntary acts intended to benefit or improve the welfare of others. These behaviours are some of our intuitive, reflexive and even automatic acts (Zaki & Mitchell, 2013) that do not seem to provide a direct reward to the person performing it (Batson, et al., 2011). Sometimes it can assume a social exchange dimension in the form of reciprocal altruism when we help others in expectation of future reciprocation by those we have helped. Generally, people have continued to show concern over the expression of prosocial behaviour partly as a way of verifying the nexus between personal and social needs and partly because, it is central to human social functioning (Knafo, et al., 2009).

Literature Review

Prosocial behaviours, are defined as any voluntary behaviour primarily aimed at benefiting another (Eisenberg, et al., 2006) or a broad category of acts that are defined by society as generally beneficial to other people and the ongoing political system (Piliarin, & Schroeder, 2005). They are shaped by both cognitive (assessment of costs and rewards) and affective (arousal and emotion) processes. They are broad and multidimensional constructs that include cooperation, donation and volunteering (Padilla-Walker & Carlo, 2014). They can be enacted among adolescents and is related to the resolution of social and academic problems including truancy, suspension, school dropout and teenage pregnancy (Allen, et al., 1997; Moore & Allen, 1996).

In a recent study, Ding, et al (2018) linked prosocial behaviour to three sources of moral motivation with clear directions, a development that has departed from prior research. One investigation on the sources and perspectives of prosocial behaviour found that prosocial behaviours of anonymous peers exert a profound influence on whether college students reciprocated or not (Park & Shin, 2017). Moreover, prosocial behaviour in the form of sharing, helping and cooperating is a hallmark of social competence throughout childhood (Wentzel, 2015), while antisocial behaviours such as discrimination readily lead adolescents to engage in health-risky behaviours such as drug use (Ottu & Oladejo, 2014).

In the school setting, prosocial behaviour should incorporate any action intended to help fellow students and others, especially in the course of learning. One motivation for prosocial behaviour is altruism, or the desire to help others with no expectation of reward. Generally, it is characterized by a concern for the right, feeling and welfare of other people (Cherry, 2018). Behaviours that can also be described as prosocial include feeling of empathy and concern for others and behaving in diverse ways that help or benefit other people. According to Batson, et al. (1981), prosocial behaviours refer to “a broad range of actions intended to benefit one or more people other than one self, and such behaviours can include helping, comforting, sharing and cooperation”.

The dimensions of prosocial behaviour are diverse, and have been associated with a wide range of positive individual characteristics and outcomes (Flynn, et al., 2015). Some studies have associated prosocial behaviour with empathy (Batson, 1987; Penner, et al., 2005); agreeableness (Caprara, et al., 2010) and peer acceptance (Crick, 1996; Layous, et al., 2012).

Self-Monitoring and Prosocial Behaviour

Ordinary, self-monitoring looks good as predictor of social behavior. To verify whether self-monitoring can cultivate or inhibit prosocial behaviour, a number of studies show some

directions. We first look at the social comparison theory that proposes that our sense of self is influenced by comparison with others. Self-comparison occurs when we learn about our abilities and skills, the appropriateness and validity of our opinions, and our relative social status by comparing our attitudes, beliefs and behaviours with those of others (Jhangiani & Tarry, 2014). Self-monitoring inherently means the evaluation of our attitudes, beliefs and behaviours to see how they can make us socially competent or socially incompetent in any situation, especially in comparison with others. Self-monitoring also involves some level of self-regulation. Flook, Goldberg, et al. (2015) for instance, investigated self-regulatory skills in preschool children through a mindfulness-based kindness curriculum. Self-regulation, which can be a process or an outcome of self-monitoring, involves modulating feelings, thoughts, and behaviour and can be very much associated with academic achievement and social competence, whether concurrently or prospectively (Eisenberg, et al., 2014; Spinrand, et al., 2006). In the study, they found that a mindfulness kindness curriculum was capable of promoting self-regulation and prosocial behaviour in young children.

The concept of self-monitoring can be propelled through strategic self-presentation and self-verification. People who engage in strategic self-presentation may be high self-monitors while those who engage in self-verification may be low self-monitors.

According to Swam (2012), self-verifiers rely on a social psychological theory that asserts that people want to be known and understood by others according to their firmly held beliefs and feelings about themselves or their self-views. In other words, the theory proposes that people want others to see them as they see themselves even if their self-views are negative or even not true. Additionally, Swam mentions that people may seek self-verification because self-verifying evaluations make the world seem coherent and predictable.

Self-monitoring is the process of a person's evaluation of him/herself. The feeling of self-worth derived from some levels of self-monitoring is related to the quantity of prosocial behaviour, so also are positive self-concepts (Cauley & Tyler, 1989 as cited in Gupta, 2015). Self-monitoring may therefore help someone to be in tune with social expectation and may increase in people the tendency to be self-conscious towards acceptable standards of behaviour. Therefore, self-monitoring will increase the motivation to engage in different forms of social behaviour.

Bullying and Prosocial Behaviour

Student involvement in bullying, whether as bullies, victims or bystanders, has serious implication for social, emotional and academic development (Raskaukas, et al., 2010). From

these dimensions, bullying undermines prosocial behaviour, empathy and academic advancement. Raskaukas et al., (2010) has reported that bullying in New Zealand was related to empathy and classroom climate, with bullies and bully victims having a lowest connection to school and poorest relationship with teachers. Bullying on its own manifests as an outcome of insecure connection to a peer group. The findings of this study have implications for interventions designed to enhance children's emotional experiences. For instance, Donnellan (Education World, 2014), believes that the more divided a school's social network is, the greater the chance that bully tactics will be used by individuals and groups within the school community. Bullying can take the form of open direct acts such as verbal abuse, public humiliation or physical aggression, but it can also be more direct, for example, excluding or isolating a target (Desrumaux, et al., 2015). Even though bullying is likely to decrease prosocial behaviour, Desrumaux et al., (2015) who based their investigation on the Weiner's model of help giving, driven by social and individual causes, affective reactions and responsibility; found that when perpetrator's acts were serious, the situation was judged less equitable, the victim less responsible and the perpetrator more responsible. The study's findings were mixed in the sense that the bullied person displayed both prosocial and antisocial behaviour depending on the context and the victim's interpretation of the behaviour. However, it was reported that where prosocial behaviour still endues, the victim is likely to feel increasing level of inequity, increasing level of victim's responsibility and intention to assist the victim with decreased perception of the victim's responsibility.

Bullies are generally considered to lack empathy. A common theme among much of the researches is that the presence of empathy in a person has a direct effect on prosocial behaviour, especially among children (Berman, 1998; Chapman, et al., 1987; Cotton, 2001). With these revelations, it is important to investigate the extent which bullying in our secondary schools would create and/or hinder the necessary atmosphere for the emergence, pursuit and enjoyment of prosocial behaviour. It appears that bullying may affect prosocial behaviour in diverse ways-with detrimental effects on the bully (the perpetrator), the bullied (the victim) and the observer (bystander). Bystanders are individuals who observe a bullying event, but are not directly involved as a bully or victim (Evans & Smokowski, 2015). In our (Nigerian) boarding schools today such people could be teachers, friends, hostel officers and significant others who may or may not play the intervention role of helpers when students are brutalized either physically or emotionally by their school mates through various acts of humiliation, aggression and provocation.

Evans and Smokowski (2015) identify prosocial bystanders as those who actively intervene in bullying dynamics to support the victim and end the bullying. In their study, they

found that a decreased rate of self-esteem was significantly associated with an increased likelihood to engage in prosocial bystander behaviour. Concerning the victim, Perren and Alsaker (2006) has enumerated the effects of school bullying to include the development of poor leadership skills, tendency towards unnecessary submission, and high levels of withdrawal and isolation from others. Other effects could manifest through the victim being less cooperative and sociable and also having few playmates. In their study which assessed the impact of social capital such as social support in bullying dynamics, the authors found that bullies and bully-victims were generally more aggressive than their peers while bully-victims were less sociable, with few or no playmates. In all, bullies were less prosocial and had, surprisingly, more leadership skills than non-involved school mates. A recent study has found that susceptibility to social influence is associated with a host of negative outcomes with emerging evidence pointing to the role of peers and parents in adolescent's positive and adaptive behaviour (Telzer, et al., 2017). In studying students' social development from a school setting, Pfeiffer, et al., (2016) compared students from day and boarding schools with regard to achievement of specific social goals, perceived social support and reported prosocial behaviour – using a sample of 701 students. They found that students from day schools reported higher levels of peer-group integration than students from boarding schools. However, the study found no difference in prosocial behaviour between the two groups.

Parenting Style and Prosocial Behaviour

A number of studies have investigated the extent to which parenting style may influence the development of prosocial behaviour among adolescents. For example, Mallick and Cour (2015) surveyed prosocial behaviour among secondary school students in relation to their home environment. They sampled 200 senior secondary school students through a simple random sampling procedure and found that there was no significant difference in control, protectiveness and permissiveness in relation to prosocial behaviour. Also, the study found no difference in prosocial behaviour among male and female students.

In another study which analyzed parenting style effects such as acceptance, negative control and negligence and prosocial and aggressive behaviour in adolescents through empathy and emotional instability as mediating variables (Llorca, et al., 2017), it was found that empathy and emotional instability act as direct mediators in general on aggressive behaviour in a negative way and in a positive way on prosocial behaviour. These studies have affirmed the place of parents in the moderation of children's behaviour. For instance, among the many agents of social control, parents have been described as children's primary socialisation agents, particularly for moral development, prosocial behaviour and academic outcomes (Emagnaw &

Hong, 2018). In the primary context of parenting, the first conceptualization of parenting styles was done by Baumrind (1966, 1967, 1973) when she visualized parenting as a cross association of two principal concepts of ‘firm’ and ‘warm’ to derive the three early categories of parenting styles, namely: authoritarian (firm but not warm) permissive (warm but not firm) and authoritative (warm and firm). These dimensions, are basically intertwined with four important features of family functioning, namely, nurturance or warmth, firmness and clarity of control, level of maturity demands and degree of communication between parent and the child (Emagnaw & Hong, 2018)

| BEHAVIOURAL DIMENSION | <i>Parents are warm</i> | <i>Parents not warm</i> |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| <i>Parents are firm</i> | Authoritative Parenting | Authoritarian Parenting |
| <i>Parents not firm</i> | Permissive (indulgent) Parenting | ?? |

Fig 1. Contingency illustration of Parenting as a Cross association of “firmness” and “warmness”. Show by Parents To this children (Baumzind, 1966, 1967 & 1973)

These conceptualizations left a yawning gap unfilled (as indicated in the contingency table) which was why Maccoby and Martin (1983), using a two-dimensional framework advanced a variation to Baumrind’s categorisation based on the degree of demand and control parents have over their children as well as the degree of acceptance and rejection. When these dimensions were crossed, they derived another category of parenting style which was not part of the first schedule by splitting permissive parenting into permissive (indulgent) and neglectful (uninvolved) variants.

| BEHAVIOURAL DIMENSION | <i>Parents are demanding</i> | <i>Parents are controlling</i> |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| <i>Parents indicate Acceptance</i> | Authoritative Parenting | Authoritarian Parenting |
| <i>Parents indicate Rejection</i> | Permissive (indulgent) Parenting | Neglecting Parenting (uninvolved) |

Fig 2. Contingency Illustration of Parenting As a degree of “Demand” and “Control” Parents Exercise on their Children (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Beyond these classifications, the importance of parenting styles in the development of prosocial behaviour was also found in a recent study (Ottu, 2019) where parental involvement with adolescents and social identity as dimensions of evolutionary psychology was investigated among two hundred and seventy-three adolescents in Ibadan, Nigeria. Results of the study indicated that parental involvement and social identity predicted prosocial behaviour among students. These results further indicated that their reports of parental involvement and social identity were influential to the evolution of prosocial behaviour. Therefore, based on this background, the study seeks to test the following hypotheses:

1. There will be significant relationship between self-monitoring, bullying, parenting styles and prosocial behaviour among students of Federal Government College in Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.
2. Self-monitoring, bullying, and parenting styles will significantly predict prosocial behaviour among students of Federal Government College in Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

Method

Design: A cross-sectional survey was adopted to study a purposively selected boarding institution, the Federal Government College, Ikot Ekpene where prosocial behaviours among students were suspected to have drastically ebbed due to a number of antisocial behaviours, principally bullying.

Setting/Participants:

The Federal Government College, Ikot Ekpene (FGCIK) is a national secondary school located in Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. The school was established by the Nigerian government in 1973 as one of the federally funded “Unity Schools” for the purpose of bringing together students from diverse regions across Nigeria to forge unity as a way of healing the wounds of the Nigerian civil war. The school has facilities for both boarding (95%) and day (5%) students. Students (boys and girls) are graded from Junior Secondary One (JSS1) through Senior Secondary Three (SSS3) for a 6-year programme. For the purpose of this study, participants were drawn from JSS3 – SSS3 to allow for maturity of responses. Among the participants, 109 were males while 99 were females.

Instruments:

A questionnaire consisting of five sections was used to collect relevant data in the study. Demographic variables (sex, age, name of school, position in class, parent’s socioeconomic status) were measured in the first section of the questionnaire through individual items. To

ensure content and construct validity as well as reliability of data collection, the following scales were revalidated and used for the study:

Self-Monitoring Scale:

The Self-Monitoring (SM) Scale measures the extent to which people consciously employ impression management strategies in social interactions. Basically, the scale assesses the degree to which people manipulate the nonverbal signals that they send to others and the degree to which people adjust their behaviours to situational demands. Research shows that some people work harder at managing their public images than do others. In his maiden study, Snyder (1974) reported a reasonable test-retest reliability (.83 for one month) and, for an initial study, provided ample evidence regarding the scale's validity. The interpretation of the scale's scores is as follows: High score: 15-22; Intermediate core: 9-14 and low score 0-8.

Prosocial Personality Battery:

This is a 56-item inventory comprising of 7 subscales: Social Responsibility (SR), Empathic Concern (EC), Perspective Taking (PT), Personal Distress (PD), Other-Oriented Moral Reasoning (O), Mutual Concerns moral reasoning (M) and Self-reported altruism (SRA). Factor 1, Other-oriented empathy, = sum of scores on SR, EC, PT, O, M. Factor 2, Helpfulness, = sum of PD (reversed) and SRA.

Child Adolescent Bullying Scale:

This is a 20 – item questionnaire developed by Strout, Vessey, DiFazio and Ludlow (2018). It is rated on a 5-point Likert format ranging from 1= “strongly disagree” to 5= “strongly agree”. Using a sample of 352 youths from diverse racial, ethnic, and geographic backgrounds (188 female and 159 male, 5 transgender and sample mean of 13.5 years) the scale established evidence of internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's α = 0.97) as well as construct and divergent validity. Sensitivity and specificity rating were 84% and 65% respectively.

Perceived Parenting style Scale:

This is a 38-item scale developed by Gafoor and Kurukkan (2014) which measures parenting in four domains of authoritative, authoritarian, permissive and negligent. The scale is divided into responsive and control subscales. It is rated on a 5-point Likert format: “Very right” = (5), “Mostly right” = (4), “Sometimes right”, “Sometimes wrong” = (3), “Mostly wrong” = (2), and “Very wrong” = (1). It has good criterion related validity and test-retest reliability.

Procedure:

Copies of the questionnaire were administered to students as respondents after the approval from the Principal of the school. The researchers met and discussed modalities for the study with the school principal from the backdrop of peer-bullying presented variously at the school's Parent Teachers' Association meeting. As a way of addressing this problem, the principal had no hesitation in approving the conduct of the study. It was also agreed that the outcome of the study will be discussed by the researchers with staff and students of the school in a special interactive session to be organized by the principal as a way of sensitizing and discouraging students from antisocial behaviours. Consent to participate in the study by students was implied by the voluntary completion of the questionnaire through the principal's approval-a form of parental consent for teenager. Students were selected using random technique on class stream's basis. Participation was restricted to JSS3 to SS3 students to allow for maturity of responses.

Results

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants

| Variables | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Gender | | |
| Male | 109 | 54.5 |
| Female | 91 | 45.5 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |
| Class | | |
| JSS3 | 49 | 24.5 |
| SSS1 | 55 | 27.5 |
| SSS2 | 38 | 19.0 |
| SSS3 | 55 | 27.5 |
| Missing | 3 | 1.5 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |
| Religion | | |
| Christianity | 197 | 98.5 |
| Islam | 1 | 0.5 |
| Others | 2 | 1.0 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |
| State of Origin | | |
| Abia | 24 | 12.0 |
| Akwa Ibom | 138 | 69.0 |
| Anambra | 14 | 7.0 |
| Bayelsa | 2 | 1.0 |
| Cross River | 3 | 1.5 |
| Ekiti | 1 | 0.5 |

| | | |
|-------|-----|-------|
| Enugu | 2 | 1.0 |
| Imo | 16 | 8.0 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |

Parent SES

| | | |
|-----------------|-----|-------|
| Completely poor | 34 | 17.0 |
| Not rich | 34 | 17.0 |
| Rich | 104 | 52.0 |
| Somewhat rich | 12 | 6.0 |
| Very rich | 2 | 1.0 |
| Missing | 14 | 7.0 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |

Position in Class

| | | |
|--------------|------------|--------------|
| 1-5 | 91 | 45.5 |
| 6-10 | 57 | 28.5 |
| 11-15 | 27 | 13.5 |
| 16-20 | 12 | 6.0 |
| Missing | 13 | 6.5 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |

Table 1 shows that 54.5% of participants were males while 45.5% were females. As the state is largely of Christian population, 98.5% of participants were Christians. The state of origin reveals that participants were mostly drawn across the South-south and South-Eastern parts of the country with the majority (69%) coming from Akwa Ibom State. The result further shows that majority of the participants who were students come from family backgrounds perceived by participants to be rich. The next table presents inter-correlation among variables.

Hypothesis 1 was tested with correlation analyses and the result is presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Correlation Analysis showing Relationship among the Study Variables

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---|
| 1 Pro-social Behaviour | | | | | |
| 2 Self Monitoring | .061 | | | | |
| 3 Bullying | -.005 | -.017 | | | |
| 4 Mother Parenting | .162* | .093 | .005 | | |
| 5 Father Parenting | .120 | .027 | -.045 | .562** | |

*, $P = 0.05$ level

**, $P = 0.01$ level

From the table, prosocial behaviour has a significant positive relationship with mother's parenting style ($r = 0.162$, $p < .05$). The correlation between prosocial behaviour and self-monitoring ($r = 0.061$, $p > .05$), bullying behaviour ($r = -0.005$, $p > .05$) and father parenting style ($r = 0.120$, $p > .05$) were not significant in the study sample. There was however an impressively high relationship between mother and father levels of involvement ($r = 0.562$, $p < .001$).

Hypothesis 2 was tested with multiple regression analysis and the result is presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Multiple Regression showing the Prediction of Prosocial Behaviour by the Independent Variables

| Independent Variables | Beta | T | <i>p</i> | R | R ² | F | <i>p</i> |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|----------|-------|----------------|-------|----------|
| Self Monitoring | 0.047 | 0.664 | >.05 | | | | |
| Bullying | -0.003 | -0.036 | >.05 | 0.172 | 0.030 | 1.486 | > .05 |
| Mother Parenting | 0.132 | 1.540 | >.05 | | | | |
| Father Parenting | 0.045 | 0.525 | >.05 | | | | |

Dependent Variable: Prosocial Behaviour

Table 3 shows that the joint prediction of prosocial behaviour by independent variables in the study was not significant. [$F(4, 199) = 1.486$; $p > .05$]. The independent variables jointly accounted for less than 5% variance in prosocial behaviour among study participants ($R^2 = 0.030$, $p > .05$).

Discussion

The study investigated the role of self-monitoring, peer-bullying and parenting style on prosocial behaviour of boarding school Students. The results of the study shows that among all independent variables - self-monitoring, bullying and parenting style, only the mother's aspect of parenting style had a significantly positive relationship with prosocial behaviour of students. The relationships of other variables with prosocial behaviour were not significant. The finding of a positive relationship between mother's parenting style and prosocial behaviour is instructive considering the role mothers play in the upbringing of children. The positive relationship tends to suggest that there is strong likelihood for mothers' parenting style to present a great boost to, and enhance children's prosocial behaviour by making them to behave in a socially-acceptable manner in school and other facets of the social environment. Needless to say, the bond between mothers and children presents a sufficient reason for mother's

sustained influence on their children positively. This result is inconsistent with the finding that monitoring one's self-worth could be related to the quantity of prosocial behaviour (Caunley & Tyler, 1989 cited in Ciupta, 2015). The finding depicts Ottu (2019) suggestion that parenting styles that allow for deeper involvement in children's upbringing are fundamental to the evolution of prosocial behaviour. Also, the finding supports the position of Llorca, et al., (2017) which reported that support from parents relates positively with prosocial behaviour.

Further, the direction of the non-significant relationships of other variables - self-monitoring, bullying and father parenting style with prosocial behaviour however followed some expected direction. For instance, the direction of the relationship between bullying and prosocial behaviour shows negative relationship. This is an expected theoretical and empirical relationship direction (Raskaukas et al, 2009; Desrumaux et al, 2015; Raskauskas, et al., 2010) even though in this study, the correlation coefficient of that relationship was not significant. Notably, Raskauskas, et al. (2010) found a negative association between bullying and empathy, which is an aspect of prosocial behaviour leading, to low connection between bullies and victims as well as their school authorities, resulting in poor relationship with their teachers as well. This finding may be attributed to several hidden factors which would be discussed in the limitation of the study.

It can also be observed that the result of the hypothesized joint prediction of prosocial behaviour by self-monitoring, bullying, as well as mother and father parenting styles was not significant. Independently, these explanatory variables did not show significant prediction of prosocial behaviour in the study sample. We expected, from the result of the correlation analysis that mother's parenting style which returned a significant relationship with prosocial behaviour would correspondingly predict prosocial behaviour. This, however, was not the case. The outcome is contrary to previous studies in this area (Eisenberg, et al., 2014; Spinrand, Elsenberg, et al., 2006; Raskauskas, et al. 2010; Ranney, 2015). For instance, Ranney (2015) suggested that self-monitoring and bullying (aggression) were positively and negatively associated with prosocial behaviour respectively and could likely predict same, especially in the cyberspace, but the present study indicates that mother's parenting style is capable of predicting prosocial behaviour just as prosocial behaviour could also predict parenting style in what has been explained as the directionality problem (Goodwin, 1995). Goodwin has also identified the third variable problem, which suggests that every correlation could be as a result of one or a combination of uncontrolled variables that naturally covary with the variables of interest.

Finally, our finding that father- parenting style does not predict and/or affect prosocial behavior partially supports the finding of Carlo et.al (2010) which suggested that parental

control generally does not have any relationship with prosocial behaviour. However, this finding is contrary to Llorca, et al., (2017) and Emagnaw & Hong's, (2018) researches which indicated that parenting styles have sustained effect on prosocial behaviour of their children by fostering and promoting prosocial behaviour among them. The implication of our present findings is that prosocial behaviour may necessarily not be influenced by internal dispositions of the students (self-monitoring) and external dispositions (bullying and parenting support) even though mother's support may likely play a great deal of role in supporting prosocial behaviour. In summary, the tested variables except bullying have the potential to increase prosocial behaviour among adolescents. Bullying has therefore manifested as a central factor capable of inhibiting the potency of other variables. People working with adolescents should therefore be guided by the complexities of implicit personality theory in directing their (adolescents') conduct and social dynamics. This result shows clearly that the maxim that "one bad apple spoils the whole basket" is true in all ramifications of life.

From cumulative evidence which includes this result, it could be asserted that the mixed results from studies on prosocial behaviour could be mirrored on cultural context, individual peculiarities and differences as well as population characteristics and setting. While studies of adolescents on prosocial behaviour often showed encouraging results, those with children are more likely to present contrary results. This could also be attributed to age of reasoning and the varied use of measurement instruments for the constructs and/or variables of the studies as well as developmental dynamics among children.

Limitations and Future Research

Cross-sectional studies such as this are not without limitations. The study, like similar studies of this nature, has limitations which may make generalization of its findings difficult and therefore the need to limit it to its scope and study population. One of such limitations is the study setting which was a single boarding secondary school. This may not have given room for the collection of diverse data that may have boosted the results of the study in a diversity ways. Further and extensive studies could therefore consider the inclusion of more secondary schools with cultural diversity. Also, we suspect that the study's participants could have had some distractions in responding to some of the research instruments as the instruments were administered during their end of term examinations and this could have caused some forms of fatigue on the participants in the course of responding to them. It is therefore suggested that future studies may consider the use of instruments that show more flexibility to the participants, especially with studies involving secondary school students. Finally, this study did not concretely control any extraneous variables to ensure that the variation in the outcome variable is due convincingly to the manipulation of the independent variables and not due to other

confounding variables. Therefore, further studies could consider experimental and/or statistical control of confounding variables such as demographic factors that may play significant roles in prosocial behaviour among school children. It is of great importance for parents to watch and nurture their children with sustained vigilance in order to help them cultivate prosocial behaviours while in interaction with them and significant others. It must in conclusion, be acknowledged that in matters of parental example, “the apple has never been known to fall farther from the tree”.

References

- Abdul-Gafoor, K. A. & Abidha K. (2014). Construction and Validation of Scale of Parenting Style. *Guru Journal of Behavioral and Social Sciences*, 2, (4) 315-323.
- Aquino, K., Freeman, D., Reed, I. I., Lim, V.K.G & Felps, W. (2009). Testing a social-cognitive model of moral behaviour: the interactive influence of situations and moral identity centrality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(1) 123-141.
- Batson, C. (1987). Prosocial Motivation: Is it ever truly altruistic? In Berkowitz L (Ed). *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol 20. San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press (pp 65-122).
- Brittian, A. S. & Humphries, M. L. (2015). *Prosocial Behaviour during Adolescence*. International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioural Science (Second Edition). University of Illinois, Chicago, IL, USA, pg 221-227.
- Carlo, G., Mestre, M.V., Samper, P., Tur-Porcar, A. (2010). The longitudinal relations among dimensions of parenting styles, sympathy, prosocial moral reasoning, and prosocial behaviors. *International Journal of Behavioral development*, 35(2) 116-124.
- Cherry, K. (2018). *The basics of prosocial Behaviour*. An unpublished manuscript.
- Chin, J. M. (2010) *Moral Uncertainty Promotes Prosocial Behaviour: Exploring the self-signaling motivating for prosocial behaviour*. PhD Dissertation, The University of British Columbia.
- Desrumaux, N., Machado, T., Przygodzki-Lionet, N. & Lourel, M. (2015). Workplace Bullying and Victim's Prosocial or Antisocial Behaviours: What Effects on Equity, Responsibility, Judgment and Help Giving? *Journal of Human Behaviour in the Social Environment*, 25 (6) 201-215.
- Ding, W., Shao, Y., Sun, B., Xie, R., Li, W. & Wang, X. (2018). How can Prosocial Behaviour be Motivated? The Different Roles of Moral judgment, Moral Elevation, and Moral Identity among Young Chinese. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9:814.doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00814.
- Do, K. T., McCormick, E. M. & Telzer, E. H. (2009). The Neural Development of Prosocial behaviour from childhood to adolescence. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 129-139.

- Donnellan, E. (2014). Bullying Prevention. In Education World (2014) – *Columbia International College's Newsletter*, Canada.
- Eagly, A. (2009). The His and Hers of Prosocial Behaviour: An Examination of the Social Psychology of Gender. *American Psychologist*, 64(8), 644-658.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A. & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial Behaviour. In Eisenberg, N., Damon, W. & Lerner, R. M. (Eds). *Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol 3. Social, Emotional and Personality Development*. New York: Wiley. P. 646-718.
- Goodwin, C. J. (1995). *Research in Psychology: Methods and Design*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T. & Smith, C. (2004). *The regulation of Emotion*. Mahwah, N. J. US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publisher.
- Emagnaw, A. B. & Hong, J. (2018). Relationship among parenting styles, prosocial behaviour and school performance of students who are attending grade seven and eight state schools. *Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, 2(2), 44-50
- Evans, C. B. & Smokowski, P. R. (2015). Prosocial Bystander Behaviour in Bullying Dynamics: Assessing the Impact of Social Capital. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 44(12) 2289-2307.
- Flook, L., Goldberg, S.B., Pinger, L. & Davidson, R. J. (2015). Promoting Prosocial Behaviour and Self-regulatory Skills in Prosocial Children through a mindfulness-based kindness curriculum. *Developmental Psychology*, 51(1), 44-51
- Flook, L., Zahn-Waxler, G. & Davidson, R. J. (2019). Developmental Differences in prosocial behaviour between preschool and late elementary School. *Frontiers in Psychology*, <http://doi.org/10.3359/fpsyg.2019.00876>.
- Flynn, E., Ehrenreich, S. E., Beron, K. J. & Underwood, M. K. (2015). Prosocial Behaviour: Long term Trajectories and Psychosocial Outcomes. *Social Development*, 24(3) 462-482.
- Garlo, G. (2014). The development and correlates of prosocial moral behaviour. In Kitten, M & Smetana J. G. (Eds) *Handbook of Moral Development*. (2nded.) New York: Psychology Press (208-234).
- Hay, D. F. & Cook, K. V. (2007). The transformation of prosocial behaviour from infancy to childhood In: Brownell, C.A. & Kopp, C.B. (Eds). *Socio-emotional development in the toddler years: Transitions and Transformations*. New York Guilford Press.
- Jhangiani, R. & Tarry, H. (2014). *Principles of Social Psychology*. 1st International Edition.
- Kidron, Y. & Fleischman, S. (2006). Research Matters Promoting Prosocial Behaviour, *Educational Leadership*, 63(7), 90-91.
- Knafo-Noam, A. & Israel, S. (2009). Genetic and Environmental Influences on Prosocial Behaviour. *Prosocial motives, emotions and behaviour: The Better Angels of our nature*, 149-167.

- Knafo-Noam, A., Uzefovsky, F., Israel, S., Davidor, M., & Za-Waxler, C. (2015). The Prosocial Personality and its Facets: Genetic and environmental architecture of mother-reported behaviour of 7-year old twins. *Frontiers of Psychology*, 6, 112-220
- Llorca, A., Richaud, M. C. & Malonda, E. (2017). Parenting Styles, Prosocial and Aggressive Behaviour: The role of emotions in offender and Non-offender Adolescents. *Frontiers in Psychology* 8, <http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.9017.01246>.
- Mallick, M. K. & Cour, S. (2015). Prosocial behaviour among senior secondary school students in relation to their Home environment. *Educational Quest: An International Journal of Education and Applied Social Sciences*, 6(2) 81-89.
- Moore, C. W., & Allen, J. P. (1996). The effects of volunteering on the Young Volunteer. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 17(2) 231-258.
- Moradi, S. Van Quaquebeke, N. & Hunter, J. A. (2018). Flourishing and Prosocial Behaviours: A Multilevel Investigation of National Corruption Level as a Moderator. *PLOS ONE* 13(7): 1-25.
- Ottu, I. F. A. & Oladejo, A. A. O. (2014). Perceived discrimination and Social Identity as adolescents pathways to early substance abuse. *African Journal of drugs and alcohol studies*, 13(1) 3-42.
- Ottu, I. F. A. (2019). Adolescents' Parental Involvement and Social Identity: Evolutionary Psychology and Social Exchange Evidences on Prosocial Behaviour. *Journal of Behavioural and Social Sciences*, 6 (1), 29-41.
- Park, S. & Shin, J. (2017). The Influence of Anonymous Peers on Prosocial Behaviour. *PLOS ONE* 12(10): 1 – 2.
- Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. A. Piliavin, D. & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial Behaviour: Multilevel Perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56(1) 365-392.
- Penner, L. A., Fritzsche, B. A., Craiger, J. P. & Freifeld, T. S. (1995). Measuring the prosocial personality. In J. N. Butcher, & C. D. Spielberger (Eds.) *Advances in personality assessment*, (12). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pfeiffer, J. P., Piquart, M., & Krick, K. (2016). Social Relationships, prosocial Behaviour, and perceived social support in students from Boarding Schools. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 31(4) 279-289.
- Ranney, J. D. (2015). *Popular in the Digital Age: Self-Monitoring, Aggression, and Prosocial Behaviors in Digital Contexts and their Associations with Popularity* Doctoral dissertation, North Dakota State University.
- Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30, 526–37.
- Spinrad, T. L., Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., Fabes, R. A., Valiente, C., Shepard, SA, Reiser, M., Losoya, S. H. & Guthrie, I. K. (2006). Relation of Emotion Related Regulation to Children's Social Competence: A Longitudinal Study. *Emotion* 6(3) 498-510.

- Strout, T. D., Vessey, J. A., Difazio, R. L., & Ludlow, L. H. (2018). The Child Adolescent Bullying Scale (CABS): Psychometric evaluation of a new measure, *Resource in Nursing Health*, 41, 1–13.
- Sui, A. M. H., Shek, D. T. L., & Lai, F. H. Y. (2012). Predictors of Prosocial Behaviour among Chinese High School Students in Hong Kong. *The Scientific World Journal*, 2012, 1-7.
- Swaan, W. B. Jr (2012). Self-verification theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds). *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology* (pp 23-42). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Wentzel, K. (2015). Prosocial Behaviour and Schooling. In Tremblay R.E, Boivin, M. & Peters R.D (Eds). *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood*.57-61.