

---

## PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR AND SELF-ESTEEM OF DAYSCHOLARS AND HOSTEL STUDENTS

---

*S.K. Priyadharshini, A. Velayudhan*

### Abstract

*The present study focuses on Prosocial Behavior and Self-esteem of hostel students and day scholars (N=120, Hostellers 60 and Day Scholars 60). These students were studying in the various departments of Bharathiar University, Coimbatore. The Mean, Standard Deviation, and ANOVA were used to determine the significant difference among university students in their Prosocial Behavior and Self-esteem. Altruism, Courtesy and Sportsmanship were found to be more among the hostellers, whereas there was no significant difference found among the students in their Self-esteem.*

### Introduction

Prosocial behavior refers to "voluntary action that is intended to help or benefit another individual or group of individuals" (Eisenberg and Mussen, 1989). This definition refers to consequences of a doer's actions rather than motivations behind those actions. These behaviors include a broad range of activities: sharing, comforting, rescuing and helping. A familiar example of

prosocial behavior is when an individual makes an anonymous donation to a person, group or institution without any resulting recognition, political or economic gain: here, the donation is a prosocial action.

Prosocial behavior refers to helping, which, in turn, means understanding the needs of recipient, and making a sincere effort to fulfill them. Thus, prosocial behavior should only

---

□ *S.K. Priyadharshini* is a Postgraduate Student, Department of Psychology, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore.

□ *Dr. A. Velayudhan* is a Lecturer with the same institution.

© Journal of Community Guidance & Research

refer to activities that honor the recipient's interests. Prosocial behaviors occur when someone acts to help another person, particularly when they have no goals other than to help a fellow human. Since the early 1970's a number of scholars have studied prosocial behaviors.

Ostrove, Crick and Keating (2005) conducted a study on Gender-Biased Perceptions of Preschoolers Behaviors: How much is aggression and prosocial behavior in the eye of beholder? The study investigated the perceptions of male and female college students who evaluated preschoolers' actual aggressive and prosocial behavior. Findings revealed that men were not as accurate as women were in identifying relational aggression and prosocial behavior.

Barry and Wentzel (2006) conducted a study on Friends Influence on Prosocial Behavior, the role of motivational factors and friendship characteristics. This revealed that a friend's behavior is related to an individual's prosocial goal perceived, which in turn, is related to an individual's prosocial behavior.

Rogers in his self-theory emphasized the whole of

experience, the phenomenal field. Out of the phenomenal field, a self or self-concept gradually develops. Rogers did not start out to make the self a central idea in his theory, but he found that clients spontaneously thought in such term "it seemed clear...that the self was an important element in the experience of the client and that in some odd sense his goal was to become his "real self" (Rogers, 1959).

Self-esteem is one of the important aspects of self-concept. "Self-esteem is a perception that you are of value that who you are and what you can contribute to the world are valuable". "It is the self-evaluation made by each individual; one's attitude towards oneself along a positive negative dimension". These attitudes often serve as a self-esteem function, helping one to maintain or enhance feelings of self-worth.

Rosenberg (1965) defined Self-esteem as the "evaluation, which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself, expressed as an attitude of approval". Self-esteem is affected by a variety of influences, ranging from formation of childhood experiences in relation to our

parents to our own standards or ideal self. People differ in the degree to which they like or dislike themselves. For instance, self-esteem is directly related to expectations for success. People with high self-esteem believe that they possess the ability they need in order to succeed at work, whereas people with low self-esteem depend on the receipt of positive evaluations from others.

Prelow, Weaver and Swenson (2006) conducted a study on Competence, Self-esteem and Coping Efficacy as mediators of ecological risk and depressive symptoms in urban African American and European American youth. The results indicate self-esteem as a presumed mediator of the impact of ecological risk on depressive symptoms for both African American and European American youth. Connors and Casey (2006) in their study on sex, body-esteem and self-esteem, indicated that perceived attractiveness and the salience of weight and shape were significant predictors of self-esteem.

## **Method**

### **Objective**

The study was conducted to see the difference among Day

Scholars and Hostel Students in Prosocial Behavior and Self-esteem.

### **Hypothesis**

1. There will be no significant difference between Hostellers and Day Scholars in Prosocial Behaviors.
2. There will be no significant difference between Hostellers and Day Scholars in Self-esteem.

### **Sample**

The sample consists of 60 Hostellers (30 Women and 30 Men) and 60 Day Scholars (30 Women and 30 Men) studying in the various departments of Bharathiar University, Coimbatore.

### **Tools**

Modified version of Prosocial Behavior Questionnaire (Chaitanya and Tripathi, 2001) and Self-esteem Questionnaire (Karunanidhi, 1996).

### **Statistics**

The data was subjected to Mean, Standard Deviation and ANOVA.

### **Discussion**

Results in tables 1 & 2, clearly indicate that there is significant difference among Day Scholars and Hostel Students in

their Prosocial Behavior. This might be due the fact that Hostel Students have more opportunities to mix with other students than the Day Scholars. So naturally they possess qualities such as: Altruism -the behavior that is directly and intentionally aimed at helping a specific individual or group of individuals. For instance, if any one of the students falls ill the hostel students come forward to help them immediately; civic sense - the behavior that is designed to increase one's participation in and support university activities

as a whole; courtesy -taking actions to prevent problems from occurring by respecting others needs; conscientiousness - carrying out the role behaviors well beyond the minimum required level; sportsmanship - behavior that is involved when a person accepts minor frustrations without complaint; perception towards university environment- any discretionary behavior that is not recognized by the formal reward by university.

From the results in tables 3 & 4, it is seen that there is no significant difference in altruism,

**Table-1: Mean and S.D of Day Scholars and Hostel Students in Prosocial Behavior**

S. No.	Dimension	Group	N	Mean	S.D
1	Altruism	Day Scholars	60	9.50	2.095
		Hostellers	60	10.85	2.238
2	Civic sense	Day Scholars	60	6.43	1.406
		Hostellers	60	8.90	2.433
3	Courtesy	Day Scholars	60	6.23	1.577
		Hostellers	60	8.68	2.534
4	Conscientiousness	Day Scholars	60	7.66	1.385
		Hostellers	60	10.55	2.913
5	Sportsmanship	Day Scholars	60	9.18	2.727
		Hostellers	60	10.61	2.662
6	Perception towards university environment	Day Scholars	60	8.15	2.417
		Hostellers	60	10.20	2.723

**Table-2: The differences among Day Scholars and Hostel Students in Prosocial Behavior**

S. No.	Dimensions	Groups	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F
1	Altruism	Between groups	54.675	1	54.675	11.632*
		Within groups	554.650	118	4.700	
2	Civic sense	Between groups	182.533	1	182.533	46.208*
		Within groups	466.133	118	3.950	
3	Courtesy	Between groups	180.076	1	180.076	40.419*
		Within groups	525.717	118	4.455	
4	Conscientiousness	Between groups	249.408	1	249.408	47.918*
		Within groups	614.183	118	5.205	
5	Sportsmanship	Between groups	61.633	1	61.633	8.485*
		Within groups	857.167	118	7.264	
6	Perception towards university environment	Between groups	46.875	1	46.875	7.069*
		Within groups	782.450	118	6.631	

\*Significant at 0.01 level

civic sense, courtesy, conscientiousness and sportsmanship between day scholar girls and boys. There is a difference in the dimension of perception towards university environment.

From the results in tables 5 & 6, it is seen that there exists no significant difference in altruism, Civic sense, sportsmanship and perception towards university environment between hostel girls and boys. There exists a significant difference in the dimensions of courtesy and conscientiousness. Boys have a greater degree of courtesy, which

means that they take actions to prevent problems from occurring by respecting others needs. Girls tend to have high conscientiousness indicating that they carry out the role behaviors well beyond the minimum required level.

Tables 7 and 8 results clearly indicate that there is a significant difference between day scholars and hostel students in their self-esteem.

From tables 9 and 10 it is seen that there exists no significant difference in competency -the ability to evaluate and understand one's

**Table-3: Mean and S.D of Day Scholar Girls and Boys in their Prosocial behavior**

S. No.	Dimension	Group	N	Mean	S.D
1	Altruism	Day scholar girls	30	9.86	2.315
		Day scholar boys	30	9.13	1.814
2	Civic sense	Day scholar girls	30	6.66	1.321
		Day scholar boys	30	6.20	1.471
3	Courtesy	Day scholar girls	30	5.93	1.595
		Day scholar boys	30	6.53	1.525
4	Conscientiousness	Day scholar girls	30	7.50	1.137
		Day scholar boys	30	7.83	1.599
5	Sportsmanship	Day scholar girls	30	9.53	2.330
		Day scholar boys	30	8.83	3.074
6	Perception towards university environment	Day scholar girls	30	8.83	1.304
		Day scholar boys	30	9.66	3.021

**Table-4: The Differences among Day Scholar Girls and Boys in their Prosocial Behavior**

S. No.	Dimensions	Groups	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F
1	Altruism	Between groups	8.067	1	8.067	1.865 NS
		Within groups	250.933	58	4.326	
2	Civic sense	Between groups	3.267	1	3.267	1.670 NS
		Within groups	113.467	58	1.956	
3	Courtesy	Between groups	5.400	1	5.400	2.216 NS
		Within groups	141.333	58	2.437	
4	Conscientiousness	Between groups	1.667	1	1.667	0.866 NS
		Within groups	111.667	58	1.925	
5	Sportsmanship	Between groups	7.350	1	7.350	0.988 NS
		Within groups	431.633	58	7.442	
6	Perception towards university environment	Between groups	30.817	1	30.817	5.692 **
		Within groups	314.033	58	5.414	

NS=Not Significant

\*\*Significant at 0.05 level

**Table-5: Mean and S.D of Hostel Girls and Boys in their Prosocial Behavior**

S. No.	Dimension	Group	N	Mean	S.D
1	Altruism	Hostel girls	30	10.83	2.408
		Hostel boys	30	10.86	2.096
2	Civic sense	Hostel girls	30	9.00	2.378
		Hostel boys	30	8.80	2.524
3	Courtesy	Hostel girls	30	8.00	1.875
		Hostel boys	30	9.36	2.930
4	Conscientiousness	Hostel girls	30	11.23	3.036
		Hostel boys	30	9.86	2.661
5	Sportsmanship	Hostel girls	30	10.73	2.981
		Hostel boys	30	10.50	2.345
6	Perception towards university environment	Hostel girls	30	10.43	2.648
		Hostel boys	30	9.96	2.822

**Table-6: The Differences among Hostel Girls and Boys in their Prosocial Behavior**

S. No.	Dimensions	Groups	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F
1	Altruism	Between groups	.017	1	.017	.003 NS
		Within groups	295.633	58	5.097	
2	Civic sense	Between groups	.600	1	.600	.100 NS
		Within groups	348.800	58	6.014	
3	Courtesy	Between groups	28.017	1	28.017	4.630 **
		Within groups	350.967	58	6.051	
4	Conscientiousness	Between groups	28.017	1	28.017	3.437 **
		Within groups	472.833	58	8.152	
5	Sportsmanship	Between groups	0.817	1	0.817	.113 NS
		Within groups	417.367	58	7.196	
6	Perception towards university environment	Between groups	3.262	1	3.267	.436 NS
		Within groups	434.333	58	7.489	

NS=Not Significant

\*\*Significant at 0.05 level

**Table-7: Mean and S.D of Day Scholars and Hostel Students in Self-esteem**

S. No.	Dimension	Group	N	Mean	S.D
1	Competency	Day Scholars	60	43.11	7.573
		Hostellers	60	44.80	8.090
2	Global self-esteem	Day Scholars	60	48.26	7.075
		Hostellers	60	47.30	9.187
3	Moral and self-control	Day Scholars	60	36.31	6.931
		Hostellers	60	37.25	4.692
4	Social Esteem	Day Scholars	60	38.25	26.085
		Hostellers	60	34.43	5.526
5	Family	Day Scholars	60	35.06	6.622
		Hostellers	60	34.91	7.062
6	Body and Physical Appearance	Day Scholars	60	24.48	4.304
		Hostellers	60	25.66	4.201

**Table-8: Differences among Day Scholars and Hostel Students in their Self-esteem**

S. No.	Dimensions	Groups	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F
1	Competency	Between groups	85.008	1	85.008	1.384 NS
		Within groups	7245.783	118	61.405	
2	Global self Esteem	Between groups	28.033	1	28.033	.417 NS
		Within groups	7934.333	118	67.240	
3	Moral and self control	Between groups	26.133	1	26.133	.746 NS
		Within groups	4134.233	118	35.036	
4	Social Esteem	Between groups	437.008	1	437.008	1.229 NS
		Within groups	41953.983	118	355.542	
5	Family	Between groups	0.675	1	.675	.014 NS
		Within groups	5530.317	118	46.867	
6	Body and Physical Appearance	Between groups	42.008	1	42.008	2.323 NS
		Within groups	2134.317	118	18.087	

NS=Not Significant



**Table-9: Mean and S.D of Day Scholar Girls and Boys in their Self-esteem**

S. No.	Dimension	Group	N	Mean	S.D
1	Competency	Day scholar girls	30	44.60	6.430
		Day scholar boys	30	41.63	8.413
2	Global self-esteem	Day scholar girls	30	49.06	7.803
		Day scholar boys	30	47.46	6.295
3	Moral and self-control	Day scholar girls	30	37.46	5.709
		Day scholar boys	30	35.16	7.900
4	Social esteem	Day scholar girls	30	35.90	4.943
		Day scholar boys	30	40.60	36.721
5	Family	Day scholar girls	30	35.20	7.415
		Day scholar boys	30	34.93	5.848
6	Body and Physical Appearance	Day scholar girls	30	24.70	4.018
		Day scholar boys	30	24.26	4.630

**Table-10: Differences among Day Scholar Girls and Boys in their Self-esteem**

S. No.	Dimensions	Groups	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F
1	Competency	Between groups	132.017	1	132.017	2.354 NS
		Within groups	3252.167	58	56.072	
2	Global self Esteem	Between groups	38.400	1	38.400	.764 NS
		Within groups	2915.333	58	50.264	
3	Moral and self control	Between groups	79.350	1	79.350	1.670 NS
		Within groups	2755.633	58	47.511	
4	Social Esteem	Between groups	331.350	1	331.350	.483 NS
		Within groups	39813.900	58	686.447	
5	Family	Between groups	1.067	1	1.067	.024 NS
		Within groups	2586.667	58	44.598	
6	Body and Physical Appearance	Between groups	2.817	1	2.817	.150 NS
		Within groups	1090.167	58	18.796	

NS=Not Significant

**Table-11: Mean and S.D of Hostel Girls and Boys in their Self-esteem**

S. No.	Dimension	Group	N	Mean	S.D
1	Competency	Hostel girls	30	46.33	7.028
		Hostel boys	30	43.26	8.882
2	Global self Esteem	Hostel girls	30	48.30	9.210
		Hostel boys	30	46.30	9.210
3	Moral and self control	Hostel girls	30	34.60	6.262
		Hostel boys	30	34.26	4.806
4	Social esteem	Hostel girls	30	38.46	4.980
		Hostel boys	30	36.03	4.114
5	Family	Hostel girls	30	35.43	7.555
		Hostel boys	30	34.40	6.620
6	Body and Physical Appearance	Hostel girls	30	25.56	3.626
		Hostel boys	30	25.76	4.768

**Table-12: Differences among Hostel Girls and Boys in their Self-esteem**

S. No.	Dimensions	Groups	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F
1	Competency	Between groups	141.067	1	141.067	2.199 NS
		Within groups	3720.533	58	64.147	
2	Global self Esteem	Between groups	60.000	1	60.000	.707 NS
		Within groups	4920.600	58	84.838	
3	Social Esteem	Between groups	1.667	1	1.667	.053 NS
		Within groups	1807.067	58	31.156	
4	Moral and self control	Between groups	88.817	1	88.817	4.256 **
		Within groups	1210.433	58	20.870	
5	Family	Between groups	16.017	1	16.017	.317 NS
		Within groups	2926.567	58	50.458	
6	Body and Physical Appearance	Between groups	.600	1	.600	.033 NS
		Within groups	1040.733	58	17.944	

NS=Not Significant

\*Significant at 0.05 level

personal resources. This feeling reflects esteem based on one's skill, talents and unique achievements. Global self-esteem -the general appraisal of the self and it is based on an adolescent's evolution of all parts of the individual. A positive global self-esteem would be reflected in feelings such as "I am a good person" or "I respect myself". Moral and self control -the reflection of feeling good as being honest, sincere, adhering to social values etc. Individuals who value these are supposed to feel good about themselves. Social esteem -encompasses the individual's feeling about himself as a friend to others. Family-Self-esteem reflects one's feeling about oneself as a member of their family. Body and physical appearance is the body image as a contribution of physical appearance and capabilities. This is based upon one's satisfaction with the way one's body looks and performs among day scholar boys and girls. This may be due to the fact that their attitudes are general and are not taken with respect to their gender and they are considered as equal.

Tables 11 and 12 results clearly indicate that there is no

significant difference between hostel boys and girls in competency, global self-esteem, family and body and physical appearance. This may be due to the fact that they live in a similar environment. There exists a significant difference in moral and self-control. Girls have higher degree of moral and self-control when compared to boys.

### Conclusion

From the results of the study we can conclude that Hostellers seem to be higher in prosocial behavior than the Day Scholars. The Hostellers and Day Scholars are equal in their Self Esteem.

### References

1. **Baron, R.A.** (2003). *Social Psychology. Tenth Edition* .New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India .
2. **Barry, C.M and Wentzel, K.R.** (2006). *Developmental Psychology. Washington D.C: Amer Psychological Association/Educational Publishing Foundation.*
3. **Connors, and Casey.** (2006). *Psychological Reports. Missoula: Psychological Reports.*
4. **Chaitanya, S.K. and Tripathi, N.** (2001). *Dimensions of organizational Citizenship Behavior. Indian Journal Of Industrial Relations. Vol. 37. No.2,(218-230)*
5. **Darley, John, and Bibb Latane.** (1970). *The Unresponsive Bystander: Why doesn't he help?. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.*
6. **Eisenberg, Nancy, and Mussen, P.H.** (1989). *The Roots of Prosocial*

*Prosocial Behavior and Self-esteem of Dayscholars and Hostel Students*

- Behavior In Children.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. **Gawronsk, B and Bodenhouse, G.V.** (2006). *Psychological Bulletin.* Washington D.C: Amer Psychological Association/Educational Publishing Foundation.
  8. **Herrbach,O.** (2006). *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* England: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
  9. **Hilgard, E.R.** et.al. (1975). *Introduction to Psychology.* Sixth Edition .New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing Co Pvt Ltd.
  10. **Karunanidhi, S.** (1996). *Self-Esteem Inventory.* Chennai: University of Madras.
  11. **Margon, G.T.** et al. (1993). *Introduction to Psychology.* Seventh Edition. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Ltd .
  12. **Ostrove, J.M, Crick, N.R and Keating, C.F.** (2005). *Sex Roles.* NewYork: Springer/Plenum publishers.
  13. **Posdakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Paine,B. and Bachrach, D.** (2000). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior:A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research.* *Journal Of Management,* 26(3),513-516.
  14. **Prelow, H.M, Weaver, S.R and Swenson, R.R.** (2006). *Journal of Youth and Adolescent.* New York: Springer /Plenum publishers.
  15. **Robbins, S.P.** (2003). *Organizational Behavior.* Tenth Edition. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India private limited.

