

## **Pro-Social Behaviour Of High School Teachers**

**Mr.N.Ramesh,**

Part-Time Ph.D Scholar,

Alagappa University College of Education,

Alagappa University,

Karaikudi,

e-mail: sachien7106@gmail.com

**Dr.C.Anbuchelvan,**

Research Guide & Assistant Professor,

Alagappa University College of Education,

AlagappaUniversity ,

Karaikudi,

e-mail: anbueducation123@gmail.com

### **ABSTRACT**

Prosocial behavior is a voluntary one with utmost intention to do for the benefit of others with set of actions in terms of helping others, sharing what ones have, donating to the needy one, co-operating and volunteering in all activities without personal gain. It is well known that teacher is not only pivotal center for the transformer of knowledge, character, value, but its play a vital role and model for the educand for developing all necessary qualities. The prosociality concept teaches us the nature of being kindness with others and the nature of existence of pros-sociality among the school teachers is need for shaping the educand in the present and fastest scenario. This concept and it values would be promoted among the students without compramisation at any cost. As a teacher, the investigator is very much anxious to know about how the present level of pro-social behaviour and its influencing factor which is enough to handle the students with techno atmosphere at the high school level. So a study is designed to conduct on pro-social behaviour to a sample of 250 participants as high school teachers who are randomly selected from Government high schools in Namakkal and Salem Districts of Tamilnadu, India through simple survey method. *RameshChelvans' Pro-Social Behaviour Scale (2018)* was five point scale, developed and validated by the investigator was employed to measure the pro-social behaviour with respect to educational qualification as demographic variable. The descriptive analysis revealed that the majority of the school teachers (55.20 %) have average pro-social behaviour. The differential analysis has shown that different levels of pro-social behaviour were found as determinant factor and educational qualification has no significant influence on the pro-social behaviour in total and it dimensions including behaviour towards students, colleagues, and family whereas *significant influence on the behaviour towards work, parents, and towards society of high school teachers*. It is very high time to promote and nourish this more valuable pro-social behaviour among the teachers through pre-service, inservice and internship programmes without delay.

*Keywords: Pro-Social Behaviour, and High School Teachers.*

\*\*\*\*\*

## **PRO SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR**

Pro-sociality is a set of social actions or behaviours which are fundamental basis for the social based roles that develop a new behaviour called as prosocial behaviour or people based behaviour. The term prosocial behavior means aggregate of positive actions that benefit others, prompted by empathy, moral values, and a sense of personal responsibility irrespective of personal gain. Teaching is a system of actions that varied in form and related with taught and educand behaviour under the prevailing physical and social conditions.

It is very necessary that teaching and teacher behaviour can be analyzed and assessed frequently. This analysis and assessment provides a valid feedback for the improvement of the students' accomplishment. According to *Morrison (1998)*, teaching is a well designed and disciplined social process in which teacher influence the behaviour of the less experienced pupil and helps to develop according to the needs and goals of the society through curriculum and content. Prosocial behavior in the classroom can have a significant impact on a student's motivation for learning and contributions to the classroom and larger community. For example, empathy is a strong motive in eliciting prosocial behavior, and has deep evolutionary roots.

According to *Yayuk Hidayah et.al (2020)*, “ Student organization as a place to develop the talents of the students in the form of aspirations, ideas, and creativity to provide opportunities for students to be able to nurture their sense of organization”. In student organizations, students are met with certain conditions that bring on pro-social attitudes.

## **PROSOCIAL BEHAVIORAL MODELS**

As teachers are uniquely positioned to model prosocial behaviour for students (**Frey & Kaiser, 2015**) such as kindness, it is important to understand both how teachers conceptualize kindness within their professional context and how they enact kindness as part of their professional duties. The extent to which teachers demonstrate prosocial behavior in schools impacts the quality of teacher-student relationships (**Raider-Roth, & Holtzer, 2009**). **Hamre & Pianta (2006)** argue that there exist key teacher behaviours that contribute to building close student-teacher bonds. These include explicitly teaching students about social and emotional development, participating in frequent social conversations with students, increasing teacher accessibility, valuing students' perspectives and ideas, and the use of behavior management strategies that convey clear expectations for behaviour and support of students. Nurturing pro-social behaviours might improve academic outcomes, test scores and classroom grades (**Cathleen Beach Board, 2019**). In short, in the bulk of their interactions with students, teachers have opportunities to act as model for prosocial behaviour, especially kindness.

## **DIMENSIONS OF PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR**

**Behaviour towards Work:** It refers the individual caring, helping and sharing responsibility when teaching work is given at any time without harming others. **Behaviour towards Students:** It refers the individual caring, helping, comforting, donating, and sharing responsibility towards students with ultimate aim of uplifting students' community without individual biasness and differences. **Behaviour towards Colleagues:** It refers the individual caring, comforting, donating, helping and sharing responsibility among the same peer groups work and working colleagues with voluntarily involvement.

**Behaviour towards School Parents:** It refers the individual comforting, donating, caring, helping and sharing responsibility towards the school parents for maintaining good rapport thereby giving counseling, creating awareness and understanding with regard to their wards performance. **Behaviour towards Society:** It refers the individual donating, caring, helping, comforting, donating, and sharing responsibility towards nearby society, and community without hesitation. **Behaviour towards Family:** It refers the individual donating, caring, comforting, donating, helping and sharing tendency towards family members with ever parental care.

### **RATIONALE OF THE STUDY**

School is the miniature of the society where all type of emotional and social behaviours including prosocial behaviour those settings promotes frequent interpersonal interactions take place among individuals from diversified socioeconomic, social, and differential ethnic set-up. Teachers have opportunities to act as a role model for prosociality behaviour. Student-teacher relationships have potentially significant and far-reaching implications for students' school adjustment (*Bouffard, & Weissbourd, 2013*) as they can influence students' through a sense of belonging and community, motivation and school engagement which, in turn, impact students' intellectual development and achievement (*Jones et al., 2013*) and development of students' prosocial skills and behaviours. Major policies in the school should support and fostering students' prosocial behavior. A policy should includes social and emotional integrated learning aspects that can be implemented into classrooms at all grade levels. It should mandates that teachers are to foster socially responsible behaviour among the students, including developing skills and dispositions that enhance and enrich the classroom and school community for promoting national and global integration. Through prosocial education in which teachers develop effective classroom learning environments and teach the whole child, principals encourage positive school climates, superintendents assess the health and productivity of their systems and communities and parents contribute to the well-being and thriving of their school children" (*Aruna Devi, & Portia, 2017*). Therefore the researcher intends to study on prosocial behaviour of school teachers in selected geographical area.

### **TITLE OF THE STUDY**

The title of the present study is "*Pro-Social Behaviour of High School Teachers*"

### **OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF THE KEY TERMS**

- **Pro-Social Behaviour:** According to the investigator, prosocial behaviour is a voluntary behaviour performed with the intention of benefiting another person or group of persons. It is nothing but helping, caring and cooperating with others.
- **High School Teachers:** According to the investigator, teachers who are working in high schools that offer education from sixth standard to tenth standard level of school education in Tamilnadu.

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The followings are the important objectives of the present study.

1. To study the levels of pro-social behaviour of high school teachers.
2. To find whether there is any significant difference among the low, average and high levels of teaching aptitude of high school teachers with respect to pro-social behaviour.
3. To measure the significant difference, if any between high school teachers' whose educational qualification as undergraduate and postgraduate in their pro-social behaviour and its dimensions.

### **HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY**

The followings are the important hypotheses of the present study.

1. The level of pro-social behaviour of high school teachers is high in nature.

2. There will be no significant difference, if any among the low, average and high levels of teaching aptitude of high school teachers with respect to their pro-social behaviour.
3. There will be no significant difference, if any between high school teachers' whose educational qualification as undergraduate and postgraduate in their pro-social behaviour and its dimensions.

#### **METHOD AND DESIGN**

The investigator adopted simple survey methodology. There were 36 educational community developmental (CD) blocs in Salem and Namakkal Districts. The investigator adopted random sampling technique for the selection of government high schools from each bloc. The total population for the present was 880 high school teachers and a sample of 250 high school teachers was selected randomly from 36 high schools

#### **TOOL USED**

*RameshChelvans' Pro-Social Behaviour Scale (2018)* was developed and validated by the investigator. The scale consisted six dimensions with each ten statements. All are positive statements with five point degree of opinion with respect to frequency of happening. The minimum and maximum score range limits from 60 to 300. The higher score indicates higher be pro-social behaviour. The reliability of research tool has been established through coefficient of internal consistency. It has been found out by test –retest method and it was found as 0.7261. The intrinsic validity is also called as the index of reliability (**Guilford, 1954**). The square root of reliability values gives the intrinsic validity of the pro-social beahviour scale and it found as 0.8521.The investigator used Mean  $\pm$  1S.D (standard Deviation) norms based on the distribution property of normal curve which constitute 68.36 percentage of sample distribution.

#### **DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS**

##### **Low, Average and High Levels of Pro-Social Behaviour of High School Teachers**

The low, average, and high levels of pro-social behaviour scores of high school teachers were analyzed. The total count, percentage, mean, and standard deviation for the low, average, and high levels of pro-social behaviour scores of high school teachers are shown in Table 1.1.

**Table 1.1**

**N, Percentage, Mean, and Standard Deviation Values for Low, Average, and High levels of Pro-social behaviour of High School Teachers**

Level	N	Percentage	Mean	S.D
High (218 to 300 )	44	17.60	221.18	0.84
Average (205 to 217)	138	55.20	212.01	3.90
Low (60 to 204)	68	27.20	202.97	1.53
Total	250	100.00	211.17	6.75

It is ascertained from the Table 1.1, for the whole sample, the table shows that the mean (211.17) and standard deviation (6.75) scores of high school teachers have average pro-social behaviour. Among the total 250 high school teachers, 44 high school teachers (17.60 percent) have high level pro-social behaviour (Mean=221.18, S.D=0.84), 138 high school teachers(55.20 percent) have average level pro-

social behaviour (Mean=212.01, S.D=3.90), and 68 high school teachers(27.20 percent) have low level pro-social behaviour (Mean=202.97, S.D=1.53).

**DIFFERENTIAL ANALYSIS**

**Different Levels of Pro-Social Behaviour of High School Teachers**

The **pro-social behaviour** scores of high, average and low levels of high school teachers were analyzed and the details are presented in Table.1.2. One way analysis of variance was computed to find out whether there are significant differences among the three sub groups of high school teachers in respect of their **pro-social behaviour**.

**Table.1.2**

**Analysis of Variance for High, Average and Low levels on Pro-Social Behaviour of High School teachers**

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	Obtained F - Value	Tabulated F-Value	Level of Significance
Between Groups	9080.486	2	4540.243	492.193	3.00 at 0.05 Level	Significant at 0.01 Level
Within Groups	2278.458	247	9.225		4.63 at 0.01 Level	
Total	9080.486	2	4540.243			

It is evident from the Table 1.2, that the ‘F’ value **obtained is 492.193** and it is found to be **greater** than the **table value of 4.63 at 0.01 level** of significance. Therefore the null hypothesis is **rejected**. It may be inferred that the **high school teachers belonging to different levels differ significantly among themselves** in respect of their **pro-social behaviour**. A ‘t’ test has been applied to find out whether the difference between the mean values of different groups of sub sample levels with respect to **pro-social behaviour** is significant or not and presented in Table.1.2.1

**Table.1.2.1**

**t-test values for different groups of sub sample levels on Pro-Social Behaviour**

Variable	Sub-groups	t- value	Tabulated t-value	Level of Significance
<b>Teaching Aptitude</b>	High /Average level	15.42	1.96 at 0.05 Level	Significant at 0.01 Level
	Average / Low level	18.38		Significant at 0.01 Level
	Low/ High level	71.90	2.58 at 0.01 Level	Significant at 0.01 Level

From the table 1.2.1, it is clear that the t- values for the difference between **pro-social behaviour** mean scores of high school teachers of high and average, average and low, and low and high levels sub-groups are significant at 0.01 levels.

**Educational Qualification and Pro-Social and it Dimensions of High School Teachers**

The undergraduate and postgraduate high school teachers' mean scores of pro-social behaviour and its dimensions including behaviour towards work, students, colleagues, parents, society, and family were analyzed with critical ratio (t-test) and the details are given in Table.1.3

**Table.1.3**  
**t-test value for the Pro-Social Behaviour and its Dimensions Scores of High School Teachers with respect to Educational Qualification**

Variable and its Dimensions	Educational Qualification	N	Mean	SD	Obtained t-value	Level of Significance
Pro-Social Behaviour	UG	109	211.17	6.842	0.013	NS at 0.05 Level
	PG	141	211.16	6.710		
Behaviour Towards Work	UG	109	31.21	5.591	2.731*	S at 0.05 Level
	PG	141	33.43	6.890		
Behaviour Towards Students	UG	109	28.06	1.720	0.781	NS at 0.05 Level
	PG	141	27.87	1.919		
Behaviour Towards Colleagues	UG	109	28.87	4.418	1.759	NS at 0.05 Level
	PG	141	29.89	4.659		
Behaviour Towards School Parents	UG	109	30.09	6.231	2.658*	S at 0.01 Level
	PG	141	28.52	5.810		
Behaviour Towards Society	UG	109	29.57	4.360	2.762*	S at 0.05 Level
	PG	141	31.18	4.718		
Behaviour Towards Family	UG	109	32.04	3.512	0.333*	NS at 0.05 Level
	PG	141	31.89	3.550		

UG- Under Graduate, PG-Post Graduate \* - Significant at 0.05 Level. NS- Not Significant  
Tabulated t-value 1.96 at 0.05 Level, 2.58 at 0.01 Level,  $df=N_1+N_2-2=248$

It is well cleared from the above Table.1.3, the t-values for undergraduate and postgraduate high school teachers with reference to pro-social behaviour in total and its dimensions behaviour towards students, colleagues, and family are found to be 0.013, 0.781, 1.759 and 0.333. All these t-values are

lesser than t-table value of 1.96 and not significant at 0.05 levels. Hence, the framed null hypotheses are accepted and research hypothesis rejected. To sum up undergraduate and postgraduate high school teachers do not differ significantly in their pro-social behaviour in total and its dimensions including behaviour towards students, colleagues, and family.

In the case of behaviour towards work, parents, and society, the t-values are found to be 2.731, 2.658, and 2.762. All these t-values are greater than table value 1.96 at 0.05 levels. So the framed null hypotheses are rejected and research hypotheses are accepted. To sum up undergraduate and postgraduate high school teachers differ significantly in their behaviour towards work, behaviour towards parents, and behaviour towards society.

### **DISCUSSIONS**

It is highly appreciated that average pro-social behaviour was found among the high school teachers. Teachers are the role models and acted as very good aspirators for the development of ideal character and behaviour among the students. According to *Carter & Pool (2012)*, school teachers' positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) focuses on supporting students pro-social behaviors, and preventing them from their challenging behavior. According to *Helm, & Christoph (2017)*, students' social pro-sociality and competencies, would improve with the teachers cooperativeness as well as teaching process. The pro-social behaviour among the school teachers should be nourished and improved further. The research tool developed by the investigator should be adopted among the school teachers and help the teachers to understand their level of pro-sociality.

Other interesting findings have shown that 27.20 percentages of teachers have low pro-social behaviour. So rapid measures to be taken by the school heads and higher educational officials to improve the pro-sociality among the teachers who lack it and it should be improved through frequent inservice and orientation programmes at any cost. Another interesting finding shown that different levels have significant influence with pro-social behaviour of government high school teachers. So school management should plan and implement strategies to nullify its impact among the teachers and take care to ensure that it should not affect the students' achievement and performance.

A very significant result of the present study has shown that educational qualification has significant influence on the dimensions of pro-social behaviour especially with respect to behaviour towards work, parents, and society. In two dimensions especially behaviour towards work and society, the high school teachers with higher educational qualification had high prosocial behaviour than their counterparts but reversed in the case of behaviour towards society. So education has significant influence on improving pro-sociality with respect to work place, school environment and approaching parents. Further this present study ensure that higher education not only improves education ladder of teachers but improves and nourishes pro-social behavioural too. The teachers through self behavioural analysis, observing senior fellow teacher's kind behaviour with other stockholders, egoless follow-up of higher qualified faculties, and matured pro-social models of seniors inside the would definitely help them to improve their pro-sociality irrespective of training. The investigator also recommends the higher educational institutions like NCTE should focus the concept in curriculum framework with necessary internship practice and pre-service and in-service training programmes through its teacher education programmes.

### **CONCLUSION**

Pro-social behaviour of the teacher is very inevitable and important for healthy and wealthy society in this competitive and techno world. The way that teachers treat the students and the way students treat one another is a part of their learning experience as well as balanced social and emotional

wellbeing. So, this behaviour to be nurtured and improved as it determines the social skill and relationship among the individuals especially students at high school level. So teacher should have the whole moral and individual responsibility of being kind with everyone.

## REFERENCES

1. Aruna Devi, S.T., & Portia, R.(2017). Pro-Social Behaviours of School Teachers in Classroom.
2. *International Journal of Applied and Advanced Scientific Research* , 2(2), 10-12, e-ISSN:2456-3080, <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.830936>
3. Bouffard, Richard Weissbourd, Stephanie M. Jones, & Suzanne M. (2013). Educators' Social and Emotional Skills Vital to Learning, 94(8),62-65, *Journal of PDK International*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172171309400815>
4. Carter, D.R., & Pool, J.L.(2012). Appropriate Social Behavior: Teaching Expectations to Young Children. *Early Childhood Educational Journal*, 40, 315–321 (2012).
5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-012-0516-y>
6. Cathleen Beach Board. (2019). Promoting Pro-social Behaviours in the Classroom,
7. [www.edutopia.org](http://www.edutopia.org)
8. Frey, J.R., & Kaiser, A.P. (2015). Effects of school-based social skills interventions on the social behaviors of preschoolers: A meta-analysis. *Australasian Journal of Special Education*, 39 (1), 37 – 55, <https://doi.org/10.1017/jse.2014.9> ISSN: 2248-9703. UGC Approved Journal – 41042.
9. Guilford, J. P. (1954). *Psychometric Methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
10. Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2006). *Student-Teacher Relationships*. In G. G. Bear & K. M. Minke (Eds.), *Children's needs III: Development, prevention, and intervention*, Pp- 59–71, National Association of School Psychologists.
11. Helm, & Christoph (2017). Effects of social learning networks on student academic Achievement and pro-social behavior in Accounting, *Journal for Educational Research*, 9 (1), 52-76, DOI: 10.25656/01:12966.
12. Jones H. Sanpei, Michael E. Woolley, Roderick A. Rose, Dennis K. Orthner, & Patrick T. (2013). Advancing Academic Achievement through Career Relevance in the Middle Grades: A Longitudinal Evaluation of Career Start, *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(6), 1309–1335, <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831213488818>
13. Morrison Keith (1998). *Management Theories for Educational Change*. Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd., A Sage Publications Company, London, ISBN: 8539-6414.
14. Raider-Roth, M. B., & Holzer, E. (2009). Learning to be present: How Hevruta learning can Activate teachers' relationships to self, other and text. *Journal of Jewish Education*, 75(3), 216–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15244110903079045>
15. Yayuk Hidayah, Yusuf Faisal Al , Anis Suryaningsih ( 2020). Pro-Social Behaviour Analysis of Students through Students' Organizations, *Journal of Education, Teaching, and Learning*, 5(2), 369-374, p-ISSN: 2477-5924 e-ISSN: 2477-8478.
- 16.
- 17.
- 18.
- 19.
- 20.
- 21.
- 22.
- 23.