

# INFLUENCE OF SELF EFFICACY, SELF ESTEEM AND RISK-TAKING BEHAVIOUR ON PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AMONG COMMERCIAL BUS DRIVERS

**OlukayodeAyooluwa Afolabi & Opeyemi Mary Owoola**

*Department of Pure & Applied Psychology,*

*AdekunleAjasin University,*

*Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria*

*E-mail: [afolabi95@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:afolabi95@yahoo.co.uk)*

*Tel. 08034676352*

## **Abstract**

*This study examined the influence of self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour on prosocial behaviour among commercial drivers in Ibadan, Oyo state. Using a cross-sectional survey design, two hundred and thirty (230) drivers (all males) with their ages ranging between 19 to 59 years ( $M = 37.20$ ,  $SD = 9.55$ ) were randomly selected from different motor parks in Ibadan. One hypothesis was stated and tested using multiple correlations and 2x2x2 ANOVA (Analysis of Variance). Results revealed that self-efficacy [ $F(1,222) = 10.72$ ;  $p < .01$ ]; self-esteem [ $F(1,222) = 9.84$ ;  $p < .01$ ] and risk taking behaviour [ $F(1,222) = 15.78$ ;  $p < .01$ ] had significant main effects on prosocial behaviour of commercial bus Drivers. Also, self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour had a significant interaction effects on prosocial behaviour [ $F(1,222) = 5.22$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ]. It is recommended that commercial drivers should be oriented on how to increase their level of self-esteem and self-efficacy in order to reduce their level of risk-taking behaviour while driving in order to enhance their willingness to help others. Finally, government, non-governmental organisations and individuals should help in sensitizing commercial drivers on the importance of helping others.*

**Keywords:** Self-efficacy, self-esteem, risk-taking behavior, prosocial behavior, commercial drivers.

## **Introduction**

Prosocial behaviour encompasses voluntary helping acts that the society values, with the intention of promoting harmonious relations and benefiting another as opposed oneself (Vaughan & Hogg, 2005). This definition makes a reference to the consequences of a doer's actions rather than the motivations behind the

actions. While these actions benefit the recipient; they can also be costly to the doer. (Benabou&Tirole, 2005). These prosocialbehaviours comprise a wide range of activities like sharing, comforting, rescuing and helping (Knickerbocker, 2003). One is thus faced with the decision to help others to the expense of oneself (Simpson, Brett &Willer. 2008).

According to Hastings, Rubin and De Rose (2005), prosocial behaviour is sympathetic, helpful and considerate behaviour towards other people with the intention of actively establishing and maintaining positive relationship among members of a social group. People tend to exhibit prosocial behaviour from time to time. Giving a helping hand to someone or helping a lost child finds his or her parents are examples to illustrate to what extend people try to help others (Schaller & Cialdini, 1990). When considering prosocial behaviour, the external, explicit actions are emphasised; as opposed to the internal, implicit motivations for those prosocial actions. The term prosocial behaviour arose in the 1970s, leading to psychological analysis of the giving, helping and sharing processes. Prosocial behaviour came to be seen as key in harmonious interpersonal and group interactions. Prosocial moral reasoning has been theoretically and empirically linked to prosocial behaviour (Carlo, Gustavo, Mareta, Dasilva, Eisenberg, Claudia & Silvia, 1996).

Evidence has suggested that prosociality is central to the well-being of social groups across a range of scales. Empathy is a strong motive in eliciting prosocial behaviour, and has deep evolutionary roots. Prosocial behaviour occurs when someone acts to help another person particularly when they have no goal other than to help a fellow human. Prosocial behaviour varies with content as much as between people. Men will tend to show sympathy for short periods, while women will show it for longer periods (Jas, 1999). People who are in good mood are more likely to do well, as are people who are feeling guilty (North, Tarrant, & Hargreaves, 2004). People in small towns are more likely to help than those squashed together in cities (North et, al, 2004). Religious practice has also been associated with prosocial and helping behaviour, as helping is often considered a religious obligation. Prosocial behaviour fosters positive traits that are beneficial for children and society. It may be motivated both by altruism and by self-interest, for reasons of immediate benefit for future reciprocity.

Self-efficacy could be one of the major contributors to an individual's prosocial behavior. Self-efficacy is the judgment of capabilities to organize and affect courses of actions to attain a goal. It is the people's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute course of action required to attain designated type of performance (Bandura, 1997).According to Bandura (1997), efficacy beliefs are

best understood as domain-specific. Bandura also views confidence as essentially task-dependent in contrast to others (e.g. Pertides, 2010) who espouse the view that certain personality traits predispose those who possess them to be generally confident. Also Bandura et al. 2003 found that high emotional self-efficacy makes it easier to engage oneself with empathy in others' emotional experiences and resist social pressure to engage in antisocial activities (Bandura, Caprara, Barbaranelli, Gerbino and Pastorelli, 2003).

Alessandri, Caprara, Eisenberg and Steca (2009) stated that certain people are more inclined than others to enact behaviours that benefit others. For example, people are likely to devote energy toward prosocial behaviour which may involve both sacrifices and cost, unless they believe they are able to both master the emotions associated with the recognition of others' need and establish a suitable relationship and action favourable to meet those needs (Caprara, Alessandro, Giunta, Panera & Eisenberg, 2010).

Self esteem is another relevant variable in prosocial behaviour. Self-esteem is used to describe a person's overall sense of self-worth or personal value. It is often seen as a personality trait, which means that it tends to be stable and enduring over time. Self-esteem can involve a variety of beliefs about the self, such as the appraisal of one's own appearance, beliefs, emotion and behaviour. It can be categorized into low self-esteem and high self-esteem. According to one definition (Branden, 1969); there are three key components of self-esteem which are, self-esteem being an essential human need that is vital for survival and normal healthy development; Self-esteem arises automatically from within and it is based upon a person's beliefs and consciousness; Self-esteem occurs in conjunction with a person's thoughts, behaviours, feelings and actions.

There is a relationship between self-esteem and prosocial behaviour. Leary, Tambor, Terder and Downs (1995) proposed that, if there is a drop on human self-esteem, it will result to a drop in prosocial behavior too. Individuals will become less likely to exhibit prosocial behaviour if their self-esteem is low. However, in the research of Blackhart, Knowles, Nelson, and Baumeister (2009), there is no significant relationship between the levels of prosocial behaviour and self esteem. Another study done by Rigby and Slee in 1993 measures three dimensions of interpersonal relations among Australian school children. School children from two secondary schools answered 20 questions assessing styles of interpersonal relations which revealed that low level of self-esteem were found among children who reported being more victimized than others, and high self-esteem among children practicing more prosocial behaviour (Rigby & Slee, 1993).

Risk taking behaviour refers to the tendency to engage in behavior that have the

potential to be harmful or dangerous, yet at the same time provide opportunity for some kind of outcome that can be perceived as positive. According to Muuss and Porton (1998), to take risk means to consciously choose behaviour that is potentially dangerous to one's physical or mental health (p.422). Driving fast or engaging in substance use are examples of risk taking behaviour by Drivers. Risk taking behaviour is also defined as volitional behaviour whose outcome is uncertain and which entails negative consequences. More than any other age group, adolescents and young adults are prone to engaging in risk taking behaviours, such as dangerous driving, drug and alcohol use, unprotected sex, delinquency and eating disorders and in coping with anxiety and frustration. Zuckerman (1998), identified sensation seeking as a predictor of risk-taking behaviour. He identified four factors of sensation seeking; thrill and adventure seeking, experience seeking, disinhibiting and boredom susceptibility.

Prosocial behaviour is any helpful action that benefits other people without necessarily providing any direct benefit to the person who performs the act. It may even involve some degree of risk. People that engage in prosocial behaviour possess some factors and one of them is heroism. Heroism is any action that involves courageous risk taking to obtain a socially valued goal. A good example is saving the life of a drowning person or donating an organ to someone in need of a transplant.

One study by Bayraktar, Kumru & Melike (2004) examined the predictors of prosocial behaviour among male and female college students in Turkey. The aim of the study was to investigate the demographic and interpersonal predictors of prosocial behaviour and its correlation with risk-taking behaviours. The result showed that risk-taking behaviour predicted prosocial behaviour negatively in all the models. Also, Julie & Anthony (2000), conducted a study on adolescents' and their friends' health-risk behaviour. The aim of the study was to examine models of risk for adolescent health-risk behaviour, including family dysfunction, social acceptance, and depression as factors that may compound or mitigate the associations between adolescents' and peers risk-behaviour. Result showed that friends' prosocial behaviour was negatively associated with adolescent violence and substance use. Based on these literatures, the focus of this study is to examine the influence of self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk taking behaviour on prosocial behaviour among commercial drivers in Ibadan, Oyo State.

### **Hypothesis**

Self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour will have main and interaction effects on prosocial behaviour among commercial drivers in Ibadan.

## **Method**

### ***Design and Participants***

This study was a cross-sectional survey. Participants were 230 (all males) commercial drivers, sampled from different Motor Parks in Ibadan, Oyo State. The age ranged between 19 and 59 years (Mean=37.20, SD= 9.5). Based on demographic variables, 189 (82.2%) were married while 41 (17.8%) were singles. Another 99 (43.0%) of the participants were Christians while 131 (57.0%) were Muslims. Among the participants, 2 (0.9%) of them had below Primary School Certificate, 65 (28.3%) had Primary School Certificate, 147 (63.9%) had WASCE/GCE/SSCE, 13 (5.7%) had OND/NCE/NRN and lastly, 3 (1.3%) of the participants claimed they had first degree.

### **Measures**

Self-efficacy was measured with General Self-Efficacy Scale by Jerusalem and Schwarzer (1995). It is a 10-item scale which is scored on a 4-point Likert format with response options ranging from not at all (1) to exactly true (4). The author reported that the Cronbach's alpha ranged from .76 to .90. The reliability coefficient of this scale for this study is .76. High scores indicated that the individual had high level of self-efficacy. Sample items in the scale include 'I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough' 'I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort'.

Self-esteem was measured using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale by Rosenberg (1965). It is a 10-item scale which is scored on a 4-point Likert format with response options ranging from strongly agree (3) to strongly disagree (0). The scale has a reliability coefficient of .82 using test re-test method. With the present sample, the scale had obtained a reliability coefficient of .70. Here, the higher the score, the higher the self-esteem. Samples from the scale include: "I certainly feel useless at times", "At times, I think I am no good at all" etc.

Risk-taking behaviour was measured using the Manchester Driver Behaviour Questionnaire. It is a 27- item scale developed by Lajunen, Parker & Summala (2004). Responses were on a six-point scale ranging from never (1) to nearly all the time (6). The scale has four sub-groups namely aggressive violations which consist of three items; ordinary violations, which consist of eight items; error, which consist of eight items and lapses, which also consist of eight items. The scale has a reliability coefficient of 0.60. In this study, the scale showed a reliability coefficient of .75. High scores indicated high level of risk-taking. However, in this study, only the items in aggressive violations and ordinary violations were used (eleven items in all) to measure risk-taking behaviour among commercial Drivers.

Prosocial behaviour was measured using Prosocial Behaviour Scale. It is a 12-item scale developed by Afolabi (2013) and is scored on a 5-point Likert format with response format ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The scale has a reported reliability coefficient of 0.81, test-retest of 0.77 and split half of 0.72. The reliability coefficient of .80 was established for this study. Sample items in the scale include: "I enjoy helping others", "I stopped helping people because there is no gain in it" etc.

### **Procedure**

Permission was sought from the Head (Chairman) of each Motor Park where the study was carried out. In order to gather adequate information from the participants, the items in the questionnaire were translated into Yoruba Language. This is because most of the drivers do not understand English and this may affect their willingness to participate in the study. This translated version of the questionnaire was previewed by individuals who had knowledge in interpreting English to Yoruba language and the content validity for the translated questionnaire was established. The translated version of the questionnaire was read to the drivers in order to enhance their response. Some of the questionnaires were also given to those who understand English. The questionnaire was administered to only commercial Drivers in Ibadan, Oyo State. Some of the Motor Parks visited were those located in Ojoo, Sango and Bodija, The University of Ibadan Motor Park and Iwo Road (all in Ibadan). Out of the 250 questionnaires taken to the field, 231 questionnaires were administered and 230 were useful for this research. The data collection took about two months.

### **Data Analysis**

In this research, Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to determine the relationship among the variables studied. Also, the hypothesis stated in the previous chapter was analyzed using 2x2x2 Analysis of Variance.

### **Results**

The results of descriptive and inter-variable correlations are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: Showing the mean, standard deviation and inter-variable correlations among the research variables**

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Age	37.20	9.955	1							
2. Marital Status	-	-	-.558**	1						
3. Religion	-	-	.090	-.077	1					
4. Education Qualification	-	-	-.336**	.275**	-.150*	1				
5. Self-Efficacy	35.85	3.257	.081	-.132*	.227**	-.149*	1			
6. Self-Esteem	21.87	2.898	.179**	-.204**	.169*	-.152*	.351**	1		
7. Risk Taking Behaviour	18.90	5.122	-.123	.291**	-.186**	.162*	-.505**	-.328**	1	
8. Pro-Social Behaviour	53.48	4.576	.005	-.138*	.155*	-.206**	.391**	.352**	-.423**	1

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)  
 \*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).  
 \*\* p< 0.01, \*p<0.05, N = 230 df = N-2

**Research Variables**

The result in Table 1 shows that self-efficacy has a significant relationship with prosocial behaviour { $r(228) = .391; p < 0.01$ }. This means that the higher the level of self-efficacy of the commercial drivers, the higher the chances of their engagement in helping others. Also, the result in Table 1 shows that self-esteem has a significant relationship with prosocial behaviour { $r(228) = .352; p < 0.01$ }. This also implies that the higher the self-esteem, the higher the level of prosocial behaviour among commercial drivers. Finally, the result in Table 4.1 shows that risk-taking behaviour has a significant relationship with prosocial behaviour. This implies that risk-taking behaviour has significant effect on prosocial behaviour { $r(228) = -.423; p > 0.01$ }. This implied that high risk takers are less prosocial. In other words, the higher the risk taking behaviour of drivers, the lower their level of prosocial behaviour.

**Table 2: Summary 2 X 2 X 2 ANOVA showing the main and interaction effects of self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour on Prosocial Behaviour**

Source	Ss	Df	MS	F	P
Self-Efficacy	165.430	1	165.430	10.722	< .01
Self-Esteem	151.958	1	151.958	9.849	< .01
Risk Taking Behaviour	243.574	1	243.574	15.787	< .01
Self-Efficacy * Self-Esteem	3.719	1	3.719	.241	> .05
Self-Efficacy * Risk Taking Behaviour	3.975	1	3.975	.258	> .05
Self-Esteem * Risk Taking Behaviour	31.957	1	31.957	2.071	> .05
Self-Efficacy * Self -Esteem * Risk Taking Behaviour	85.282	1	85.282	5.527	< .05
Error	3425.197	222	15.429		
Total	4795.391	229			

From the result in Table 2, self-efficacy has a main effect on prosocial behaviour among commercial drivers [F (1,222) = 10.72; p<0.01]. This implies that the higher the self-efficacy, the higher the level of prosocial behaviour among commercial drivers.

The results also showed that self-esteem has a main effect on prosocial behaviour among commercial drivers [F (1,222) = 9.85; p< 0.01]. This implies that the higher the self-esteem, the higher the level of prosocial behaviour among commercial drivers.

In addition, from Table 2, risk-taking behaviour has a main effect on prosocial behaviour among commercial drivers [F (1,222) = 15.78; p< 0.01]. This implies that the lower the risk-taking behaviour, the higher the level of prosocial behaviour among commercial drivers.

From the result in Table 2, self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour have an interaction effect on prosocial behaviour [F (1,222) =5.22; p< 0.05]. This implies that self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour have interaction effect on prosocial behaviour. Therefore hypothesis one which stated that self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour will have main and interaction effects on prosocial behaviour among commercial drivers was partially



confirmed.

### **Discussion**

The main purpose of this study is to examine how self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour influence prosocial behaviour among commercial Drivers in Ibadan. One hypothesis was formulated and tested in the study. The hypothesis states that self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour will have a main and interaction effect on prosocial behaviour among commercial Drivers. This hypothesis incorporates both the main and the interaction effect of self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour on prosocial behaviour.

The result in Table 2 confirmed the prediction that self-efficacy will have a main effect on prosocial behaviour. The result indicated that self-efficacy had a significant main effect on prosocial behaviour among commercial Drivers. This is in support of Eklund, Loeb, Hansen and Andersson-Wallen (2012)'s findings that stated that self-efficacy had a positive significant correlation with prosocial behaviour. Self-efficacy beliefs (i.e., social self-efficacy beliefs and empathic self-efficacy beliefs) have also been found to account for significant portions of the variability in psychological functions, including prosociality (Caprara et. al. 2010; Caprara, &Steca, 2007; Caprara, Alessandro& Eisenberg,2011).Children who believed in their self-efficacy to regulate their own learning and academic attainments (high academic self-efficacy), behaved more prosocially and were more popular than children with low academic self-efficacy (Bandura, 1996). This implies that peoples' self-efficacy will determine whether an individual will engage in prosocial behaviour.

Self-esteem was also found to have a main effect on prosocial behaviour among commercial drivers. This is in support of Rigby and Slee (1993)'s findings that low self-esteem were found among children who reported victimization and high self-esteem among children practicing more prosocial behaviour. However, in study of preschools and elementary schoolchildren, investigators typically have found no evidence of a relation between self-reports of self-esteem and measures of prosocial behaviour (Rehberg& Richman, 1989). In the studies of children in the fourth grade to high school, investigators generally have found that prosocial children have a positive self-concept (Laible, Carlo&Roesch, 2004; Larrieu & Mussen, 1986; Rigby &Slee, 1993). This means that people with high self-esteem were likely to engage in helping behaviour.

Also, it was confirmed that risk-taking behaviour has a main effect on prosocial behaviour among commercial Drivers. The result indicated that risk-taking behaviour had a significant effect on prosocial behaviour among commercial Drivers. This is in support of Julie et al (2000) which revealed that friends'

prosocial behaviour was negatively associated with adolescent violence and substance use. Another study by Bayraktar, Kumru & Melike (2004) showed that risk-taking behaviour predicted prosocial behaviour negatively in all models. This implies that individuals who are low in risk-taking behaviour tend to engage in prosocial behaviour. Finally, self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour also have interaction effects on prosocial behaviour. This implies that self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour can be combined to determine helping behaviour among Nigerian commercial drivers.

### **Conclusion**

This study investigated the influence of self efficacy, self esteem and risk-taking behaviour on prosocial behaviour among commercial Drivers in Ibadan. The result in the study showed that self-efficacy had a main effect on prosocial behaviour. Also, self-esteem had a main effect on prosocial behaviour. Furthermore, risk-taking behaviour was also found to have a main effect on prosocial behaviour. Finally, self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour had an interaction effect on prosocial behaviour. Therefore, high prosocial behaviour among commercial drivers to some extent depends on their self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour. The practical implication of this finding is that commercial drivers with high self-efficacy, high self-esteem and low risk-taking behaviour tend to engage in prosocial behaviour.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that commercial drivers should be sensitized on how to increase their self-esteem (self-worth) and self-efficacy (their ability to perform the desired behaviour). Also, they (commercial drivers) should be counseled on how to reduce their risk-taking while driving such as reducing unnecessary overtaking, smoking while driving etc. The government, non-governmental organisations and individuals should help in sensitizing commercial Drivers on how to help others who are in need of help and also to report any case of emergency that need urgent assistance to the necessary agencies (Federal Road Safety Corps, Police, Hospitals, etc.) involved.

### **Limitations of the Study**

This study examined how self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour influence prosocial behaviour among Ibadan commercial Drivers, but there are also some limitations of the study. In this study, self-efficacy, self-esteem and risk-taking behaviour are only examined to know their effect on prosocial behaviour. The study did not include other variables that can contribute to helping behaviour among commercial Drivers. The study was only conducted on commercial drivers in Ibadan, Oyo state. Other studies can also include other commercial Drivers in other states. Another weakness of this study can be linked to the limited number of

participants involved in the research study.

## **References**

- Afolabi, O.A. (2013). Roles of personality types, emotional intelligence and gender differences on prosocialbehaviour.*Psychological Thought*, 6 (1), 124-139.
- Ajzen, I. (2002). Residual effects of past on the later behaviour: habituation and reasoned action perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6(2), 107-122.
- Alessandri, G., Caprara, G. V., Eisenberg, N.&Steca, P. (2009).Reciprocal relations among self-efficacy beliefs and prosociality across time.”*Journal of Personality*, 77 (4), 1229– 1259.
- Bayraktar, F., Kumru, A.S.&Melike, V.R. (2004).The Predictors of ProsocialBehaviour among Male and Female College Students in Turkey.1-25.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (1996). Regulation of cognitive processes through perceived self-efficacy. In G. H. Jennings & D. Belanger (Eds.), *Passages beyond the gate: A Jungian approach to understanding the nature of American psychology at the dawn of the new millennium* (pp. 96-107). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.
- Bandura, Albert, Barbaranelli, Claudio, Caprara, Gian Vittorio, &Pastorelli, Concetta. 1996.”Multifaceted impact of self-efficacy beliefs on academic functioning.*Child Development*, 67, 1206 - 1222.
- Bandura, A., Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Gerbino, M. &Pastorelli, C. (2003).Role of affective self-regulatory efficacy in diverse spheres of psychosocial functioning.*Child Development*, 74 (3), 769 - 782.
- Benabou, R. &Tirole, J. (2005).Incentives and ProsocialBehaviour. National Bureau of Economic Research, 1-7 Retrieved April 9, 2008 from NBER Working Paper.
- Blackhart, G. C., Knowles, M. L., Nelson, B. C.&Baumeister, R. F. (2009). Rejection elicitseemotional reactions but neither causes immediate distress nor lowers self-esteem: Ameta-analytic review of 192 studies on social exclusion.*Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 13, 269-309.
- Branden, N. (1969). *The psychology of self-esteem*. New York: Bantam.
- Caprara, G. V., Alessandri, G. & Eisenberg, N. (2011).Prosociality: The Contribution of traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs.*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0025626
- Caprara, G. V., Alessandro, G.D., Giunta, L., Panera, L. & Eisenberg, N. (2010).The contributions of agreeableness and self-efficacy beliefs to

- prosociality. *European Journal of Personality*, 24, 36 - 55.
- Caprara, G. V. & Steca, P. (2007). Prosocial agency: The contribution of values and self-efficacy beliefs to prosocial behavior across ages. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 26, 218–239.
- Carlo, G., Koller, S. H., Eisenberg, N., Da Silva, M. S., & Frohlich, C. B. (1996). A cross-national study on the relations among prosocial moral reasoning, gender role orientations, and prosocial behaviors. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 231-240.
- Chou, K. (1998). Effect of age, gender and participation in volunteer activities on the altruism behaviour of Chinese adolescents. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 159, 195-201.
- Ekmond, J., Loeb, C., Hanson, E.M. & Andersson-Wallen, A. (2012). Who cares about others? Empathic self-efficacy as an antecedent of prosocial behaviour. *Current Research in Social Psychology*. Retrieved online on March 4, 2014 from <http://www.uiowa.edu/~grpproc/crisp/crisp.html>
- Hastings, P. D., Rubin, K. H., & DeRose, L. (2005). Links among gender, inhibition, and parental socialization in the development of prosocial behavior. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 51, 467 - 493.
- Jas. P. (1999). Charitable giving: Stability or stagnation? *Research Quarterly*, 6,
- Knickerbocker, R.L. (2003). Prosocial Behaviour. Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University. 1-3.
- Laible, D. J., Carlo, G. and Roesch, S. C. (2004). Pathways to self-esteem in late adolescence: The role of parent and peer attachment, empathy, and social behaviors. *Journal of Adolescence*, 27 (6), 703-716
- Lajunen, T., Parker, D., & Summala, H. (2004). The Manchester Driver Behaviour Questionnaire Study. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 36, 231-238.
- Larrieu, J., and Mussen, P., 1986. Some personality and motivational correlates of children's prosocial behavior. *Journal of Genetic Psychology* 147, pp. 529–542.
- Leary, M.R., Tambor, E.S., Terdar, S.K. & Downs, D.L. (1995). Self-esteem as interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 683, 518-530.
- Muuss, R. E. & Porton, H. D. (1998). Increasing risk behavior among adolescents. In R. E. Muuss & H. D. Porton (Eds.), *Adolescent behavior and society* (pp. 422-431). New York: McGraw Hill.
- North, A. C., Tarrant, M., & Hargreaves, D. J. (2004). The effects of music on helping behavior: A field study. *Environment and Behavior*, 36, 266-275
- Pertides, K. V. (2010). An application of belief-importance theory with references to the big five and trait emotional intelligence. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 38, 697-710.
- Rehberg, H. R., & Richman, C. L. (1989). Prosocial behavior in preschool

- children: A look at the interaction of race, gender, and family composition. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 12, 385–401
- Rigby, K. & Slee, P.T. (1993). Children's attitude towards victims. In D.P. Tattum (Ed). *Understanding and Managing Bullying*, pp 119-135. New York: Heinemann Books.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Schaller, M. & Cialdini, R.B. (1990). Happiness, sadness: A motivational integration. In E.T. Higgins, & R.M. Surrentino (Eds.), *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition* (vol.2. pp.265-295). New York: Guilford Press
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON.
- Simpson, Brett, & Willer, R. (2008). Altruism and Indirect Reciprocity: The Interaction of Persona and Situation in Prosocial Behaviour. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 77, 37-50.
- Vaughan, G. & Hogg, M. (2005). *Social Psychology* (4<sup>th</sup> edn). London: Prentice-Hall [www.learningtogive.org/papers/paper52.html](http://www.learningtogive.org/papers/paper52.html).