

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES
SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

ADOLESCENTS' PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR AND ITS
RELATIONSHIPS TO PARENTING STYLE AND PEER PRESSURE
AMONG ADDIS ABABA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

BY:
ABEL SOLOMON

JUNE, 2015

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES
SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

ADOLESCENTS' PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR AND ITS
RELATIONSHIPS TO PARENTING STYLE AND PEER PRESSURE
AMONG ADDIS ABABA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

BY:

ABEL SOLOMON

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENTAL
PSYCHOLOGY

JUNE, 2015

**ADOLESCENTS' PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR AND ITS
RELATIONSHIPS TO PARENTING STYLE AND PEER PRESSURE
AMONG ADDIS ABABA HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS**

BY:

ABEL SOLOMON

APPROVAL OF BOAR OF EXAMINERS

**CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT GRADUATE
COMMITTEE**

SIGNATURE

ADVISOR

SIGNATURE

INTERNAL EXAMINER

SIGNATURE

EXTERNAL EXAMINER

SIGNATURE

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to my advisor Dr. Seleshi Zeleke for his profound professional and brotherly guidance, comments and advice in the course of this study.

I would also like to thank the principal and teachers of Alpha Keranyo Primary, Secondary and Preparatory School for arranging classes and collaborating in the provision of required data for the study.

My special thanks also go to my dear wife, mother of our children, W/ro Bezaye Girma for her continuous encouragement and share of responsibility for taking care of our beloved children during the whole time of my study.

Last but not least, I place on record, my sincere thank you to my friends and/or coworkers Hannah Gorman, Anastasia M. Kahan, Henok Hailu, Anteneh Tessema, Yodit Girma, Betty Hailemariam and Marisa Stam, who in one way or another rendered their help in the course of writing this thesis.

Table of content

Acknowledgements -----	i
List of tables -----	v
Acronyms -----	vi
Abstract -----	vii
 CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION -----	1
1.1. Background to the problem-----	1
1.2. Problem statement-----	4
1.3. Objective of the study-----	5
1.4. Significance of the study -----	6
1.5. Delimitation of the study -----	6
1.6. Operational definitions-----	7
 CHAPTER TWO	
LITERATURE REVIEW -----	8
2.1. Theoretical framework of the study variables-----	8
2.1.1. Prosocial behavior and its different types-----	8
2.1.2. Parenting style and its components-----	11
2.1.3. Peer Pressure -----	14
2.1.4. Binding theoretical perspectives -----	15
2.2. Review of empirical findings-----	16
2.2.1. Review of empirical findings on prosocial behavior -----	16
2.2.2. Review of empirical findings on parenting style -----	18

2.2.3. Review of empirical findings on peer pressure ----- 19

2.2.4. The relationship between parenting style, peer pressure and prosocial behavior 20

2.2.5. Gender differences in prosocial behavior ----- 21

2.3. Summary on the literature review ----- 22

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD----- 23

3.1. Research design----- 23

3.2. Study variables ----- 23

3.3. Study site and population----- 23

3.4. Sample and sampling technique ----- 23

3.5. Instruments ----- 24

3.6. Pilot Test----- 27

3.7. Procedures ----- 29

3.8. Scoring and analysis----- 29

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS ----- 32

4.1. Demographic characteristics of the study sample----- 32

4.2. Prosocial behaviors commonly observed among adolescents ----- 33

4.3. Interrelation among the study variables ----- 34

4.4. Parenting styles students experience at home ----- 35

4.5. Gender difference in prosocial behavior ----- 36

4.6. Prosocial behavior across the different parenting styles ----- 37

4.7. Prosocial behavior across the different peer pressure types ----- 37

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION	40
5.1. Prosocial behavior among adolescents	40
5.2. Gender differences in prosocial behavior	41
5.3. Parenting styles in adolescents	43
5.4. Prosocial behavior and parenting style.....	44
5.5. Prosocial behavior and peer pressure.....	45
5.6. Summary.....	46

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	48
6.1. Conclusion	48
6.2. Recommendation	49
References	51
Appendixes	58

Appendix A English version of the questionnaires

Appendix B Amharic version of the questionnaires

Appendix C Two sample t-test with equal variance

List of Tables

Tables	Page
Table 1 Coefficient of reliability for prosocial behavior scales	36
Table 2 Coefficient of reliability for parenting style sub scales.....	37
Table 3 Demographic characteristics of the study sample (N=150).....	41
Table 4 Mean and standard deviations on the prosocial behavior subscales.....	42
Table 5 Interrelations among the prosocial behavior of adolescents.....	43
Table 6 Gender differences on overall and sub types of prosocial behavior.....	44
Table 7 Parenting style by sex of the students.....	45
Table 8 The mean prosocial behavior scores for each parenting style along with the F and P values	46
Table 9 Summary of the MANOVA test Results: The mean prosocial behavior scores for each peer pressure category along with the F and P values	47
Table 10 Correlation between altruism and anonymous prosocial behavior and peer pressures.....	48

Acronyms

AK-PSPS:	Alpha Keranyo Primary, Secondary and Preparatory School
FGD:	Focus group discussion
NI:	Negative interaction
PI:	Positive interaction
PII:	Peer interaction inventory
PSS:	Parenting styles scale
PTM:	Prosocial tendency measure
PTM-R:	Prosocial tendencies measure revised
SFP:	Selamta Family Project

Abstract

The current study investigated prosocial behavior, parenting style and peer pressure of adolescent students in secondary school. One hundred fifty adolescents (Mean age = 15.69 years, 48.7% females) measured their own prosocial behaviors, their perceptions of parenting styles of their parents used and positive and negative peer pressure they experienced from best friend(s). Questionnaires were used to collect data. Quantitative analyses (both descriptive and inferential statistics) were used to analyze the obtained data. The study shows that, altruism prosocial behavior is the most dominant type of prosocial behavior. There was no significant gender difference in overall prosocial behavior. The results further indicated that there was a significant gender difference in the parenting style. However, there was no significant mean difference in prosocial behaviors among adolescents from different parenting style background. Whereas there was significant mean difference in some prosocial behaviors of adolescents due to positive and negative peer pressures they experienced from best friend(s). The current study has important implications for parents, schools, government and non government sectors and practitioners who are concerned about promoting adolescents' positive behaviors and discouraging negative behaviors.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the problem

Adolescence is an exciting and dynamic period for young people. As adolescents are faced with changes in their bodies and cognitive development, they are consistently renegotiating their relationship with family, friends, school and community. Ideally, their view of the world expands, and a new orientation to their future as productive independent adults emerges (Elise & Kenneth, 2005).

While these changes and views occur, there is a tendency of adolescents to engage in anti or prosocial behaviors. Different factors can be mentioned as a cause for this. But, researchers believe that their relationship with parents significantly influence on creating preferable behavior in adolescents (Barnes, Hoffman, & Welte, 2006). Hence, parents should support their child's constructive behavior. If they do not reinforce positive behavior and do not effectively control deviance, they are more likely to experience weak bonds with their child (Crosswhite & Kerpelman, 2009)

One of the positive behaviors that need to be supported by parents is prosocial behavior. The term "prosocial behavior" should be distinguished from "altruism". These terms are closely interrelated and used interchangeably. However, they are differentiated for analytic purpose. Altruism behavior is a sub component of prosocial behavior. It refers to intrinsically motivated voluntary acts that are intended to benefit others (Lam, 2011). Whereas, scholars define prosocial behavior as voluntary behavior made with the intention of benefiting others (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). What determines whether or not a prosocial action is considered altruistic is the motive

underlining the behavior – it is the intention of the helper that determines an altruistic act, and motivation is what distinguishes more general prosocial behavior from altruism (Lam, 2011).

Helping others is one of the important measures for positive community functioning. For example, Erikson suggested that the purpose of life is giving prosocial services and establishing relationships with others (Erikson, 1997). He argued that parents should socialize and teach their children responsibility through socialization rituals. These rituals bring about internalized prosocial behavior which Erikson determined has a direct correlation to the growth and development of nations.

Furthermore, the involvement of adolescents in prosocial activities serves the functions of making adolescents aware of, and be able to accept, the social norms and moral standards of society. This involvement will bring positive changes to the adolescents and consequently benefit society as a whole (Lam, 2012).

Similarly, socialization theorists witnessed the way in which parents play an important role in promoting and fostering prosocial behaviors in their children and adolescents (Bandura, 1986; Hoffman, 2000; Staub, 1979). Parents who volunteer have children who volunteer (McLellan & Youniss, 2003), and parenting practices and adolescent's sympathetic responses are related to prosocial involvement (Michalik, 2005). Other scholars determined that the styles parents use in rearing children have an effect on the children's development of prosocial behavior (Lam, 2012).

Developmental scholars have built up quite large knowledge base concerning two major dimensions of parenting styles; Warmth or Support and Control or Demandingness (Barber, Stolz, & Olsen, 2005; Baumrind, 1991). Parental warmth can be defined as the presence of positive affects, responsiveness, and support in parent-child relationships. Parental control, in contrast, refers to the degree of strictness, behavioral rules, and expectations imposed on children

by parents (Carlo, Mestre, Samper, Tur, & Armenta, 2010). Parents assumed to bring significant difference among adolescents based on those two dimensions they use. This study investigated those relationships specific to prosocial behavior.

Bearing this in mind, positive community participation in the form of any activity is important for the development of prosocial behavior during adolescence. Active internalization of prosocial values helps adolescents to engage in voluntary helping activities which can be more facilitated by attentive parenting.

On the other hand, peers also have a great influence on adolescent's behavior. Disclosure between adolescents and their parents is often restricted to discussion of daily issues and they are more likely to share related concerns with peers. It is clear that social support within the adolescent peer group is a valuable environmental resource for adolescents (Zeldin, 2005). The relationship between peer pressure and adolescents prosocial behavior is another issue investigated in this study.

Few studies on helping behavior had been conducted in Ethiopia. However, they treated the topic with variables different from the current study. For example, Abebaw (2003) and Wubishet (2005) conducted studies on the relationship between prosocial behavior and religion. Adugna (2012) also investigated attitude of students towards prosocial behavior. Others examined prosocial behavior and identity statuses among adolescent students in Addis Ababa (Tsehay, Mulatie, Sellakumar, & Begashaw, 2014). Tafetu (2007) on her part, studied factors influencing volunteers' helping behavior among Red Cross Society youth volunteers in Addis Ababa.

On the other hand, parenting style is also studied in relation to identity status, academic self-efficacy, and achievement motivation (Yekoyealem, 2005; Abesha, 2012). All these studies showed the effect or relationship of the parenting dimensions from different behavioral

perspectives of adolescents. Meanwhile, the researcher expressed the belief that prosocial behavior needs to be researched in relation to its possible source of initiations, which are assumed to be parents and peers.

1.2. Problem Statement

Adolescence is a period of enormous opportunities and threats (Lam, 2012).

Comparatively, researches made in relation to the developmental aspects of adolescents give much more emphasis to the negative side of human behaviors like delinquency, aggression, crime and substance abuse, giving little attention to the positive aspects of human behavior.

Consequently, many parents are concerned that their adolescents might fall under negative peer pressure or throw out their families' values and beliefs, and be pressured to engage in high-risk and other negative behaviors (Guzman, 2007). Indeed, they have also the chance to be engaged in positive behaviors, like prosocial activities.

Researches conducted in Ethiopia (Abebaw, 2003, Wubshet, 2005, Tafetu, 2012, Tsehay et al, 2014), have studied prosocial behavior in relation to different variables, but none of them have addressed the relationship of prosocial behavior with parenting style and peer influences.

However, there are some studies conducted in the western and Asian countries in relation to the effects of parenting styles and/or peer pressure over that of prosocial behavior (Ma, Chung, & Shek, 2007; McLellan & Youniss, 2003). But, the target population and the samples used in those studies were peoples from western and Asian countries.

According to moral philosophy and some moral psychologists, moral issues like prosocial behavior should be viewed culturally rather than universally (Gensler, Spurgin, & Swindal, 2004). Hence, due to cultural differences, one can observe in different countries of the world, it will be incomplete to apply the results of those studies to the Ethiopian context. Based on these reasons,

there appears to be a knowledge gap about how prosocial behavior at the age of adolescence is shaped by different parenting styles and peer pressure, particularly with in the Ethiopian socio-cultural context.

The main purpose of this study was, therefore, to assess the various forms of prosocial behaviors among adolescents of Addis Ababa Alpha Keranyo Primary, Secondary and Preparatory School (AK-PSPS) and examine them in relation to the different parenting styles and peer influences.

Accordingly, the study was designed to answer the following questions.

1. Which types of prosocial behaviors are observed commonly among adolescents?
2. Is there a significant gender difference in prosocial behaviors?
3. Which type of parenting style do most students in AK-PSPS experience at home?
4. Is there a statistically significant difference in the prosocial behavior of adolescents from different parenting style backgrounds?
5. Is there a statistically significant difference in the prosocial behavior of adolescents due to different types of peer pressure?

1.3 Objective of the Study

General Objectives

In general, this study investigated the relationship between prosocial behavior with parenting style and peer pressure of secondary school students in Addis Ababa.

Specific Objectives

Based on the above general objective, the study had the following specific objectives.

- To identify commonly observed prosocial behaviors among adolescents.
- To Investigate the types of parenting styles adolescents experience at home

- To find out the difference in prosocial behavior among male and female adolescents.
- To explore the relationship between parenting styles and adolescents prosocial behavior.
- To investigate the relationship between peer pressure and adolescents prosocial behavior.

1.4 Significance of the study

The study on the relationship between prosocial behavior, parenting style and peer pressure help to:

- Make parents aware of fostering positive behavior in their children and adolescents
- Understand how prosocial behavior can be important for the positive development of adolescents.
- Appraise what adolescents have done in relation to prosocial activities and could think of adjusting the parenting style that parent apply.
- Aware adolescents to resist negative peer pressures and collaborate with peers engaged in positive activities.
- Take actions on encouragement, developing programs and searching of opportunities by the AK-PSPS and other similar schools in Ethiopia.
- Contribute in advancing current theories on the relationship among prosocial behavior, parenting style and peer pressure.

1.5 Delimitation of the study

Although there are many things related to prosocial behavior, parenting and peer pressure in adolescent students, this study is delimited to assess the prosocial behavior of grade nine

students in AK-PSPS in relation to different levels of parenting styles and types of peer pressure.

The AK-PSPS is located in the suburb of Addis Ababa. Thus, the result of the study may not be generalized to students who live in urban and rural areas of the country. However, there is an indication that the findings of this study can be generalized to members of schools having similar structure or settings and group of adolescents who live in Addis Ababa.

1.6 Operational definitions

The definitions of selected terms as used in present study are as follows.

- **Prosocial behavior:** It is voluntary behavior of the AK-PSPS adolescent students intended to benefit another as measured by prosocial tendency measure revised (PTM-R).
- **Parenting Style:** - It refers to the AK-PSPS adolescent's perception of their parents' way of handling them with respect to parental control and parental warmth as measured by parenting style scale (PSS).
- **Peer Pressure:** - A direct or indirect social pressure by friends or members of the AK-PSPS adolescents' peer group in taking action for participating either in positive or negative activity as measured by peer interaction inventory (PII).

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section presents a review of the theoretical foundations and empirical findings of prosocial behavior, parenting styles and peer pressures. It starts by reviewing the definitions of the important terms and components under each one of them based on the theoretical framework. It then reviews both international and local empirical findings based on the relationship of the variables.

2.1. Theoretical Framework

2.1.1. Prosocial behavior and its different types

Prosocial behavior is defined as a behavior that is primarily aimed at benefiting others (Carlo & Ronadall, 2002; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). It includes both reactive and proactive responses to the needs of others (Hastings, Utendale, & Sullivan, 2007).

Hastings and colleagues (2007) pointed out that the scope of prosocial behavior encompasses different behavioral elements, including sharing, helping, comforting, empathy, sympathy, compassion, concern, volunteering, donating and cooperating. These forms of behavior are characteristic of social competence in childhood and adolescence.

One of the theories governing prosocial behavior is Freud's structures of personality. According to Freud (1961), out of the three structures of personality (i.e., id, ego and superego), superego is the most relevant to an understanding of prosocial involvement. The superego reflects the standard of society and sets a personal moral standards or ideals. Moreover, the superego is related to internalizing humanistic values and patterns of prosocial involvement.

Another theory related to prosocial development is the social learning theory. Social learning theorists maintained that most human behavior is learned and shaped by environmental

events. One of the important factors raised in the social learning theory is reward. Reward is interpreted as a consequence for prosocial involvement. Gelfand and colleague noted that prosocial involvement can be strengthened in children through reward in the form of praise or attention (Gelfand, Hartmann, Cromer, Smith, & Page, 1975). When children start out being more prosocial they become more prosocial over time. Nevertheless, researches suggested that, as children perform more prosocial habits towards family members, peers, and others, they tend to like receiving support and reinforcement for their actions (Hastings et al., 2007).

Furthermore, social cognitive theorists like Bandura (1986), stated that, self evaluation process is important to set internal standards and rules for behavior. Individuals set goals for their behavior, foresee the outcome of their behavior, and then act in ways that bring a desired outcome. Therefore, the interaction between socialization and the individual's cognition enhances moral development, including prosocial involvement.

- **Types of Prosocial Behavior**

Eisenberg and Fabes (1998) have shown different types of prosocial behaviors which are related differently to theoretically related constructs.

Based on prior theories and research (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Hoffman, 1982), four types of prosocial behaviors are identified: altruistic prosocial behaviors, compliant prosocial behaviors, emotional prosocial behaviors, and public prosocial behaviors. On the other hand, Carlo and Randall (2002) proposed six prosocial behaviors. The authors identified the existence of plausible motives underlying the tendency towards a certain type of prosocial behavior which makes the study of different prosocial behavior more concrete. The types of prosocial behaviors are defined as follows.

1. *Altruistic prosocial behaviors:-*

These are voluntary helping behaviors initiated mainly by concern for the needs and welfare of another, often motivated by sympathy responding and internalized norms/principles consistent with helping others (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). More specifically, altruism requires sacrificing one's own gain in order to promote another's well-being (Hastings et al., 2007). In order to explain a tendency to altruism, researchers' used the principles of conditioning and learning from social learning theory (Lam, 2012).

2. *Compliant prosocial behaviors:-*

These behaviors involve helping others in response to verbal or nonverbal request (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998). Researches relate this behavior type with sympathy and other measures of helping (e.g., Carlo & Randall, 2002). This type of prosocial behavior is more frequent compared to spontaneous helping.

3. *Emotional prosocial behaviors:-*

These are the third type of prosocial behaviors which is conceptualized as an orientation toward helping others under emotionally evocative circumstances (Eisenberg et al., 1998). There are some helping situations that can be characterized as highly emotionally charged. For example, a person who has hurt his or her leg but shows little or no distress or injury is less emotionally evocative than a person who is crying and bleeding because of hurting his or her leg. Moreover, the relationship to those who are in need of help and a number of other factors might influence the level of emotional evocativeness and, in turn, perceived emotional evocativeness might influence the observer's emotional response.

4. *Public Prosocial behaviors:-*

Prosocial behaviors conducted in front of an audience are likely to be motivated, at least in part, by a desire to gain the approval and respect of others (e.g., parents, peers) and increase one's self-worth. This type of behavior is termed as public prosocial behavior (Eisenberg et al., 1998).

Based on these basic four types of prosocial behaviors, Carlo and Randall (2002) added the following two prosocial behaviors based on exploratory factor analyses they conducted in three pilot studies.

5. *Anonymous prosocial behavior:-*

Anonymous prosocial behaviors were defined as helping performed without the knowledge of who helped (Carlo & Rondall, 2002).

6. *Dire prosocial behavior:-*

Dire prosocial behaviors were defined as helping in crisis or emergency situations (Carlo & Rondall, 2002).

2.1.2. Parenting Style and its Components

Parenting styles refer to a global construct reflecting the parental behaviors and attitudes towards their children and the qualities of interactions and relationships among parents and children and used to categorize parents typologically (Baumrind, 1966).

Before the 1960's, restrictive versus permissive practices were well known concepts of child rearing. More specifically, from the 1910s to 1930s, the inclination of child rearing was towards restrictive and from the 1930s to 1960s, permissive child rearing was advocated. (Hetherington & Parke, 1979 as cited in Markos, 1996). These two fairly opposite practices were the basis for researchers while developing different parenting style categories discussed below.

- **Types of parenting styles**

Psychologist Diana Baumrind was the first researcher that hypothesized the theoretical model of parenting style. Based on the two aspects of parenting behavior - parental control and parental warmth, she categorized parenting styles into three:

The extent to which parents manage their children's behavior from being very controlling to setting few rules and demands was referred to as parental control. Whereas, Parental warmth refers the extent to which parents are accepting and responsive of their children's behavior as opposed to being unresponsive and rejecting (Baumrind, 1991).

Accordingly, Baumrind categorized parenting style as authoritarian, permissive and authoritative. Authoritarian is a style which reflects firm but not warm. Permissive refers to a style that is warm but not firm. Whereas, authoritative encompasses both warm and firm parenting. Besides, these three categories focus on four important aspects of family functioning, such as, nurturance or warmth, firmness and clarity of control, level of maturity demands, and degree of communication between a parent and a child (Baumrind, 1966).

Other researchers, Maccoby and Martin analyzed Baumrind's conceptualization of parenting styles and later expanded and revised her typologies (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). They modified Baumrind's categorization in which parents are classified based on two dimensions. These are the level of demand and control and the level of acceptance and rejection. According to Maccoby and Martin (1983), these two dimensions together bring one more type of parenting style (i.e, neglecting or uninvolved parenting style- neither warm nor firm) in addition to the first three Baumrind's original classification and conceptualization of parenting styles.

Maccoby and Martin characterize the four types of parenting styles as follows:

1. *Authoritative Parenting Style:-*

This parenting style is characterized by its finest balancing between responsiveness and demandingness; and directing children in a rational, issue-oriented, disciplined manner by clarifying the interpretation behind rules. It is high in all the four dimensions of family functioning (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

As noted by Maccoby and Martin (1983), authoritative parents know and understand children's independence, encourage parent-child verbal communication, allow children to participate in decision making of the family, and want the children to gradually carry out more responsibility for reacting to the needs of other people in the family within their abilities.

2. *Authoritarian Parenting Style:-*

This parenting style is marked by parental behaviors that are extremely restrictive and very demanding. It is high in control and maturity demands, but low in nurturance and bi-directional communication. Authoritarian parents constrain their children's independence and they want their children to go after strict parental rules and commands without any question or complaint. If children violate these rules, severe punishment will follow. (Maccoby & Martin, 1983)

3. *Permissive (Indulgent) Parenting Style:-*

On the other hand, Permissive (Indulgent) parenting style is characterized by non-restrictiveness and high levels of responsiveness. In this parenting style, nurturance is high but maturity demands, supervision, and bi-directional communication between parents and children is low. Baumrind (1991) called parents who failed under this category as careless. They reasoned out that, parents make few demands, encourage their children to express their feelings, and barely use power to gain control over their behavior; and tend not to demand mature behavior from their children, but encourage their children's independence instead.

4. *Neglecting or Uninvolved Parenting Style:-*

The neglectful category of parenting style reflects low in both degree of responsiveness and demandingness of parents. It is also believed to be the most unfavorable of the four types of parenting styles on children's and adolescents' development (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

2.1.3. Peer Pressure

Scholars define peer pressure as a term describing the pressure exerted by a friend, peer or peer group in encountering a person to change their behavior, attitude and/or morals, to conform the friend(s) or group's actions (Clasen & Brown, 1985).

Peers play an increasingly important role in the lives of adolescents. They are one of the most influential parts of adolescents on their activities and behaviors. Therefore, many parents worry that their children might be pressured to or reject their families' values and beliefs, as well as to engage in high-risk and other negative behaviors. However, Lashbrook (2000) confirmed that, peers had a great effect to broaden children's social development but do not replace parents.

According to Guzman (2007), in actuality, peer pressure is more complex than this stereotype of the negative influences from friends. Peer pressure can be positive or negative (Arnett, 2007; Guzman, 2007). As peer pressure can leads adolescents to engage in unhealthy and unsafe behaviors, it can also motivate them to study harder in school, volunteer for community and social services, and participate in sports and other productive actions (Hastings et al., 2007).

Moreover, Castrogiovanni (2002) cites the following positive experiences that peers provide for adolescents: (1) support in defining identity, interests, abilities, and personality; (2) the chance to learn how to work together with others; (3) autonomy without control of adults and parents; (4) opportunities for witnessing the strategies others use to deal with similar problems,

and for observing how effective they are; (5) involved emotional support, and (6) building and maintaining friendships.

Peer pressure is a two way process. Peers who become friends tend to already have a lot of things in common. Peers with similar interests, similar academic standards, and enjoy doing the same things tend to incline towards each other. So while it seems that adolescents and their friends become very similar to each other through peer pressure, much of that similarity was present to begin with (Guzman, 2007).

2.1.4. Binding theoretical perspective

The perfect binding theory that could go with variables of this study is Bronfenbrenner's ecological models of human development (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). Bronfenbrenner emphasized the importance of various levels of environment that influence individual growth and behavior. Mainly, he focused on the influence on children by the level of environment which he termed micro system. Micro system includes the immediate surroundings of the child (i.e., family, peer, teachers and workgroups).

The socialization agents found under the micro system are critical in the development of prosocial predispositions in children and adolescents (Lam, 2011). For instance, a longitudinal study (Carlo et al., 2011) showed that adolescents perception of teachers', parents and peers' expectations for prosocial involvement and their perceived threats of punishment related to prosocial goal pursuit as well as to reasons for behaving prosaically.

Beyond the microsystem, Bronfenbrenner (1994) also brought mesosystems, exosystems and macrosystems as contents of the ecological system. The mesosystem encompasses the connection and process taking place between those found under the microsystems (e.g., the relations between home and school) (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). Whereas, exosystem comprises the

linkages and processes taken place between two or more settings, at least one of which does not contain the developing person, but in which events occur that indirectly influence processes within the immediate setting in which the developing person lives (e.g., for a child, the relation between the home and the parents workplace; for a parent, the relation between the school and the peer group from the neighborhood). In relation to these ecological systems, scholars elaborated the importance of parents in the selection and relationship of friends of their adolescents and the effect of these socialization agents on adolescents prosocial behavior (Hastings et al., 2007).

The fourth systems introduced by Bronfenbrenner are macrosystems. These systems consists of the overarching pattern of micro, meso, and exosystems characteristic of a given culture or subculture, with particular preference to the belief systems, bodies of knowledge, material resources, customs, life styles, opportunity structures, hazards, and life course options that are embedded in each of these broader systems (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). With regard to the cultural factor, it is generally accepted that an individual's actions, motives, orientations, and values are governed by their culture (Lam, 2011). This implies that volunteerism and prosocial involvement also differs widely between cultures of different countries.

2.2. Review of empirical findings

2.2.1 Review of empirical findings on Prosocial behavior

Different scholars found different results regarding the development of prosocial behavior either on its own applicability or in relation to other variables. Some are summarized as follows.

At the individual level, findings from developmental research showed that prosocial involvement is positively related with psychological adjustment in children and adolescents (Eisenber et al., 1988). Also, meta-analysis done by Eisenber and Fabes showed that prosocial tendencies appear to increase from childhood into adolescence; adolescents tend to be higher in

prosocial behavior than children aged seven to twelve years. Thus, adolescents exhibit more prosocial behavior than do younger children; however, this pattern was noted only for particular types of studies. Berndt (1996b) for example, did not find age differences in conformity to prosocial influence in a sample of nine to eighteen years olds.

In the classic cross-cultural study reported by Whiting and Whiting (1975), cooperation with family members (e.g., involvement in family chores) was the key process that contributed to adolescents' prosocial development.

On the other hand, Slaby and Crowley (1977) stated that, other socialization agents such as teachers and the mass media are also critical in the development of prosocial tendency in children and adolescents. Adolescent's perceptions of teachers' expectation for prosocial involvement can be another reason for behaving prosocially.

On the other hand, Carlo and Randall (2002) provided evidence of gender differences in prosocial behavior in late adolescents. More specifically, their study found that adolescent girls scored higher than adolescent boys on altruistic, anonymous, compliant, and emotional types of prosocial behaviors.

Tafetu (2007) found few activities in a form of clubs or association intended to serve those in need. The author reported that, in the Ethiopian Red Cross society, more than 60% of the blood is collected from schools. This may show the tendency of adolescents in understanding and participating in prosocial activities.

Moreover, Tsehay et al., (2014) found that, compared to male students, females participated more in overall prosocial behaviors as well as in most types of prosocial behaviors. It is only in the case of compliant prosocial behavior that male students reported higher than females.

Penner et al., (cited in Lam, 2012), found external factors (situation conditions and social context) such as the school environment, the circumstances confronting the individual, and the presence or absence of opportunities may all explain much of prosocial involvement. Examples can be the occurrence of crisis or calamities such as the famine in Wello of Ethiopia, the flood in Dire Dawa town of Ethiopia, the 9/11 attack in the United States arouses people's emotional processes of empathy and the genetic drive for helping. Such type of situations pushes people out of their comfort zones and encourage them to involve themselves in helping and volunteering activities.

Researches indicate individual differences in prosocial responses in specific settings, or at particular points in time, and that prosocial moral behavior shifted from situation to situation. This study examined those situational prosocial behaviors (i.e., public, compliant, emotional, dire, anonymous and altruism) with specific reference to adolescent students of the AK-PSPS.

2.2.2. Review of empirical findings on Parenting Style

Much of the research has examined the result of parenting on the different developmental outcomes of children, adolescents, and young adults by employing the three or four typological approach, in which the influences of the main dimensions of parenting behavior are combined to form the four types of parenting styles or specific dimensions of parenting behavior approach.

These studies have contributed consistent evidence that parenting plays an important role in enhancing or justifying best possible developmental outcomes in children and adolescents.

According to Baumrind (1971), the authoritative parenting style is positively correlated to academic achievement and social behaviors of children. Another research by Holmbeck (Holmbeck, 1996) noted that, authoritative parenting style is the most beneficial for children and adolescents because it is positively correlated to self-esteem and self-reliance.

Some researches showed that children with authoritarian parents, as noted by Baumrind (1971) tend to be anxious, socially withdrawn, and unhappy. Other researches has documented that children and adolescents from the families of authoritative parents are more competent and efficient socially and academically compared to those whose parents are non-authoritative (Baumrind, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Moreover, there are many studies conducted in Ethiopia in relation to parenting style. For example: Yekoyealem (2005) reported that an authoritative parenting style was predominantly employed among the families of adolescents. Some other studies have also shown that the most commonly practiced parenting styles differ as a function of gender differences. For example, a study by Kassahun (2005) with a sample of high school students reported that an authoritative parenting style was the most commonly employed parenting style for daughters whereas neglectful parenting style was the most predominantly adopted parenting style for sons. Similarly, Seleshi and Sentayehu's study with a sample of junior secondary school students have showed that parents were authoritative for their daughters, but authoritarian for their sons (Seleshi & Sentayehu, 1998).

2.2.3. Review of empirical findings on peer pressure

The majority of researches focused on peer pressure were related to anti social behaviors and expectations on adolescents' antisocial behaviors (Browen, Clasen, & Eicher, 1986). These researchers found that peer pressure was more related to positive than negative behaviors. However, author's focus was only on pressure to not to engage in negative behaviors, pressure to get along with parents and do well in education.

Several field experiments have shown that the presence of peers can have a strong influence on the choice between selfish and selfless behavior in doing prosocial activities.

(Reyniers & Bhalla, 2013). Another research by Daniel and Kipkemboi (2014) noted that, school environment and peer influence made significant contribution to the students' academic performance.

On the other hand, a study conducted by Tome (2012) on students of grade six to ten showed that, the negative influence of the peer group is more connected to the involvement in risk behaviors, whereas the positive influence is more connected with protective behaviors.

2.2.4. The relationship between Prosocial behavior, Parenting style and Peer Pressure.

There are studies that shows the relationship and effect of parenting style and peer pressure over prosocial behavior. Some are reviewed as follows;

Ma et al.'s (2007) indicated two factors affecting the prosocial behavior of adolescents; one is contextual (family and peer) and personal (personality and sex). This study focuses on the contextual factors that affect prosocial behavior.

Parents are very influential over their child's behavior and are models towards their children as well (Simons, Whitbeck, Conger, & Conger, 1991). Previous scholars have found that parents have the aptitude to directly influence their children and adolescents behavior through the parenting techniques they use. Starting from the birth of a child, parents mold and sharpen behaviors through childrearing to make it suitable to the norms of society. (Barnes et al., 2006).

Eisenberg and Fabes did a lot of researches in relation to prosocial behavior. In this research, they found that qualities of social interactions with parents and peers have been linked to displays of prosocial behavior (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1995, 1998).

Developmental scholars emphasize that parents are important in fostering prosocial behavior in adolescents. Similarly, one longitudinal study showed that parental warmth is a more

reliable predictor of prosocial development than strict parental control. Specifically, mothers' warmth was more predictive than fathers' warmth (Carlo et al., 2010)

Similarly, Kidron and Feischman (2006) cited in their article on promoting adolescent's prosocial behavior found that, children whose parents express warmth and responsiveness to their needs are more likely to develop prosocial behavior. Some researchers (Lam, 2012) suggested direct modeling effect and the promotion of prosocial norms by parents helps to foster adolescent prosocial involvement. In contrast, Tafetu (2007) reported, no significant correlation between helping behavior and parental modeling.

Peer pressure is also another factor that has been researched to understand its effect in the development of prosocial behavior on adolescents. For example, Kidron and Fleischman (2006) showed that adolescents whose best friends display prosocial behavior also tend to engage in such behavior themselves. When there is a better affective quality of the friendship, the more influential friends are to each other's prosocially (Wantzel, McNamara, & Caldwell, 2004). Moreover, Reyniers and Bhalla (2013) found that, peer pressure has a significant effect on giving behavior. Perceptions of the expectations of others (i.e., peers), may initiate and increase involvement in prosocial behavior (Padilla-walker & Carlo, 2006).

On the other hand, Ma and colleague (2007) investigated that, prosocial behavior was associated negatively with peer negative influence and peer delinquent behavior, and positively with peer positive influence.

2.2.5. Gender differences in Prosocial behavior

Gender is one of the most consistent correlates of prosocial behavior. Different methods of data gathering and questionnaire reports show girls and women as more prosocial than boys and

men. However, observational techniques tend to provide less consistence evidence of gender differences in prosocial characteristics (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998).

Hastings and colleague (2007) found no gender difference between boys and girls in there prosocial behavior. Contrary to this result, Argaw (2001) showed a significant gender difference in prosocial behavior, female were more altruistic than males.

On a research conducted in one of the high schools of Addis Ababa, female students found as the most participants in an overall prosocial behavior than male students. Female students reported greater involvement in emotional, altruism, anonymous and public prosocial behaviors (Tsehay et al., 2014). Similarly, Carlo and colleague (2003) reported that female adolescents show more public and emotional prosocial behaviors as compared to male adolescents. Conversely, Carlo and Rondall (2002) reported that male adolescents tend to engage in public forms of prosocial behavior than did adolescent girls.

2.3. Summary on the literature review

Research has clearly supported the importance of fostering prosocial behavior in counteracting anti social behavior. The home and schools are found to be the two important environments in influencing on children and adolescents' prosocial behaviors. A number of studies conducted in the West (Pedilla-Walker & Carlo, 2006; Carlo et al., 2010; Carlo & Rondall, 2002), Asian (Ma et al., 2007) and Ethiopia (Tsehay et al., 2014; Tafetu, 2007) in relation to prosocial behavior were reviewed in this study. Parents and significant others, such as peers were reported to act as prosocial models for children and adolescents. Researchers argue that, parents should socialize and teach their children responsibility through socialization rituals (Eisenburg & Fabes, 1998; Erikson, 1997).

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

3.1. Research Design

In this study data were reported using quantitative analysis. A descriptive survey design was used as data were systematically collected from a relatively large sample. As a survey design typically utilizes a questionnaire or an interview to collect data from a specific population, a questionnaire was used to collect data.

3.2. Study variables

The relationships between the variables of the study were described accordingly. Prosocial behavior of students was the dependent variable, whereas parenting style and peer pressures were the independent variables.

3.3. Study site and population

The study was conducted in Alpha Keranyo Primary, Secondary and Preparatory School (AK-PSPS) which is located in the city of Addis Ababa Kolfe Keranyo Sub City, Wereda 05. The school has a total of 2841 students enrolled from Nursery to grade 12. Out of these, 850 were high school students, including 193 were grade nine students.

3.4. Sample and Sampling technique

The target population of this study was adolescents of AK-PSPS. Out of the total population, 54.4% were male and the remaining were female students. Alpha Keranyo Primary, Secondary and Preparatory School (AK-PSPS) was purposefully selected due to two reasons: one was that the school encompasses students from families having different economic backgrounds because of its relatively reasonable price of school fee. And, the other was, the researcher had a good working contact with the school administration that makes data collection much easier.

A proportional stratified random sampling technique was employed to select 150 (male=77 and female=73) grade nine students. A list of grade nine students was used to divide population of the study in to two groups (male and female). A proportional random sample was taken from both male and female strata. Stratified random sampling technique was used, because one of the intention of the researcher is to investigate the difference between male and female subgroups in their prosocial behavior. With techniques like simple random sampling, one cannot be sure whether the subgroups are represented equally or proportionately within the sample.

Furthermore, grade nine is an exciting time but can be overwhelming as students begin secondary school with a new class environment, new teachers, new friends, extra-curricular opportunities and more. However, grade nine students have less curricular pressure compared to the next grade levels so as increased focus on skill and competency development. These situations specify grade nine to be chosen by the researcher as pivotal time for adolescents' prosocial involvement.

3.5.Instruments

The measures of the study were four sets of self-reported questionnaires. The first set consisted of four items on students' background characteristics (i.e., demographic variables). The next two sets of items were adapted from the work of previous researchers and consisted of *Prosocial Tendencies Measure Revised (PTM-R)* and *Parenting Styles Scale (PSS)*. The remaining other was a *Peer Interaction Inventory (PII)* developed by the researcher.

(a) Demographic Data

Prior to responding to the three scales, the respondents were requested to provide information on their gender, age and living condition (i.e., with whom they are living).

(b) The questionnaires

The three questionnaires were translated into Amharic, the administration's working language. Description of each of the instruments is presented as follows.

Prosocial Tendency measure (PTM-R): At first, PTM-R was developed by Carlo and Rondall (2002) to assess late adolescents self-report of the six types of prosocial behaviors (anonymous, dire, altruism, emotional, public and compliant). Later, Carlo and his colleagues modified it to be used with younger adolescents and add two items based on suggestions they got from young adolescents (Carlo et al., 2003). The revised instrument, Prosocial tendency measure - revised (PTM-R), consists of 25 items developed in the form of Likert type scale.

Parenting styles scale (PSS): PSS was developed by Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch (1991) based on Maccoby and Martin's (1983) revision of Baumrind's (1966, 1971) parenting style scale. This scale has 35 items in which students asked to rate their parents in terms of the two parenting dimensions: Acceptance/involvement (19 items) and strictness/supervision (16 items).

Peer interaction inventory (PII): Peer pressure was measured using a scale developed by the researcher. Twelve grade nine students (seven male and five female) from two different places participated in focus group discussions (FGD) intended to identify the types of positive and negative peer pressures adolescents' experience in Addis Ababa. The students were selected from a charitable organization which supports orphan and abandoned children, named Selamta Family Project (SFP). Those students were learning in the AK-PSPS school. The purpose of the FGD was to help the researcher identify items that can measure peer pressure specifically in the Ethiopian context.

The FGD was conducted in a classroom with the presence of the researcher. First, the aims of the research together with the research questions were explained to the participants to help them understand the purpose of the study. Then, the researcher forwarded the discussion questions.

The following questions were raised as a base for the discussion and in order to collect data to develop the inventory.

1. What types of positive pressures do you experience from friends or peer groups?
2. Can you tell me the types of negative pressures you have experienced from friends or peer groups?

After collecting the responses and jotting down main points of the discussions, the researcher asked participants to think more with the help of different peer pressure items that other researchers used in their studies (Brown et al., 1986; Ma et al., 2007). The whole FGD process took approximately one hour.

Later, the researcher refined the data gathered and came up with a list of questions categorized as positive (PI) and negative (NI) (16 and 15 items, respectively) peer pressure experienced by adolescents.

Best friend/friends found to be the most influential peers. This led previous researches to measure peer pressure in relation to best friends (Ma et al., 2007). Therefore, the PII measures the participant's perception of his/her best friend influences in doing positive and/or negative activities. Participants were asked to rate each item on a 4-point scale (none, seldom, sometimes and frequently) how often his/her best friend would encourage him/her to perform the activities.

The final PII was checked for its reliability and validity. The reliability result of the PII is presented in the pilot study section of this study. To check validity of the PII, face validity was used. The questionnaire was judged by two developmental psychology graduate students. They were asked to categorize the items as appropriate or inappropriate. In addition they were asked to give comments on them and suggest additional items to be included. Based on their rating, the researcher made a slight modification on the items. There was no suggestion given for adding new items.

3.6. Pilot Test

The objective of the pilot study was to test and improve the adapted instruments and the instrument developed by the researcher. Besides, it was used to check the proper ways of administering the questionnaire. The two questionnaires (PTM-R and PSS) were tested on a sample of 30 students (16 male and 14 Female). The responses of the respondents were scored and the reliabilities were found to be good. The Cronbach alpha reliability for prosocial subscales compared with those obtained in the main study and other previous studies are presented in Tables 1.

Table 1

Coefficients of reliability for prosocial sub scales (Chronbach alpha values)

	<i>Pilot study</i>	<i>Main Study</i>	<i>Carlo and Brandy*</i>	<i>Tsehay and colleague**</i>	<i>Azimpour and colleague ***</i>
Altruism	0.673	0.791	0.74	0.60	0.643
Public	0.778	0.899	0.78	0.83	0.717
Emotional	0.749	0.737	0.75	0.64	0.696
Dire	0.533	0.727	0.63	0.64	0.771
Compliant	0.613	0.740	0.80	0.76	0.865
Anonymous	0.749	0.829	0.85	0.65	0.586

Note. * (Carlo & Brandy 2002). ** (Tsehay et al., 2014). *** (Azimpour et al., 2012).

As one can see from table one, the alpha values obtained in the pilot study ranges from alpha=0.53 to =0.77. Higher alpha values were obtained in the pilot study for public (0.77) and anonymous (0.74) sub scales. On the other hand, alpha values obtained in the main study ranges from 0.72 (dire) to 0.89 (public). The alphas obtained for altruism (0.79) and that for public prosocial behavior were larger than the previous studies results including that of the pilot study. In general, as the alpha values in the main study are greater than .70 which is considered as the minimum alpha to be considered for psychological research all the items are acceptable.

Table 2

Coefficients of reliability for parenting style sub scales(Chronbach alpha values)

		<i>Main</i>	<i>Abesha*</i>	<i>Kassahun**</i>	<i>Markos***</i>	<i>Lamborn****</i>
	<i>Pilot study</i>	<i>Study</i>				
Acceptance/Involvement	0.905	0.940	0.88	0.91	0.83	0.72
Control /Demanding	0.898	0.847	0.86	0.78	0.81	0.76

Note. * (Abesha, 2012). ** (Kassahun, 2005). *** (Markos, 1996). **** (Lamborn et al., 1991).

As shown in Table 2, compared to alpha values reported in past researches, the ones obtained in the pilot study were larger for both the acceptance/involvement and control/demanding sub scales and thus acceptable.

After entering the data on SPSS, reliability coefficients of each PTM-R and PSS sub scales were obtained. Eight items (each from PTM-R and PSS scales) were found defective and removed from the scales. The final questionnaires administered for the main study are presented in Appendix A.

A separate pilot testing was made for the thirty one items of the PII on a sample of 30 grade nine students (18 male and 12 female). Three of the students participated in the evaluation of the instrument's language and format.

The coefficient of reliability obtained was 0.83 and 0.89 for PI and NI sub scales, respectively. Eight items were removed (three items from the PI and five items from the NI sub scales). Minor changes in wording were made to clarify confusing or ambiguous items. The results indicate that the internal consistency reliability of the PII was acceptable.

3.7.Procedures

First, the questionnaires were translated into Amharic by the researcher. In order to make the questionnaire appropriate for the participants of the study, instructions and each item of the translated questionnaire were checked by one English language instructor from Unity University and one graduate student from the department of developmental psychology at the Addis Ababa University. Also, items of the PSS questionnaire were cross checked with previous Amharic version used by other researcher (Abesha, 2012).

All the three questionnaires were administered to 150 randomly selected students in the AK-PSPS classrooms. Participants were oriented about the purpose of the research, how to fill the questionnaire and were requested to respond honestly to items. The high school director and coordinators of the AK-PSPS were very helpful during the administration process. Questions raised by some participants were answered. Some students experienced problems giving the required attention and proper filling of the questionnaires. This whole process lasts approximately an hour.

3.8. Scoring and analysis

The sub scales items of the PTM-R questionnaire were categorized into the six types of prosocial behaviors (Public: *four items*, Anonymous: *four items*, Dire: *two items*, Emotional: *two items*, compliant: *two items* and Altruism: *three items*) manually (Carol et al., 2003). All items of the altruism subscale were reverse scored.

The complete quantitative data were analyzed using statistical package for social science (SPSS version 20). Demographic variables were analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean and percentage). Independent sample t-test was used to analyze gender differences in the overall prosocial behavior as well as in the sub types mean score. To examine relations among variables, Pearson Product Moment Correlation was computed. ANOVA was computed for comparing parenting styles across the six types of prosocial behaviors. MANOVA was also performed to compare the two types of peer pressure across the six types of prosocial behaviors.

Students rated their parents in terms of two dimensions (acceptance/involvement and control/demanding). Using the median score, parents were classified into one of the four categories of parenting style (authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful) based on the theoretical model of parenting style set forth by Maccoby and Martin (1983). A similar approach was used in previous studies (e.g., Lamborn et al., 1991; Markos, 1996; Abesha, 2012). After checking for the skewness of the distribution of responses, the median split method was used and the four parenting styles were derived as follows:

- Authoritative parents were those whose children scored above or equal to the sample median on both acceptance/involvement and control/demanding indices.
- Authoritarian parents were those whose children scored below the sample median on the acceptance/involvement index but above or equal to the sample median on the control/demanding index.
- Permissive/indulgent parents were those whose children scored above or equal to the sample median on the acceptance/involvement index but below the sample median on the control/demanding index.
- Neglectful parents were those whose children scored below the sample median on both acceptance/involvement and control/demanding indices.

For the analysis, the four parenting styles were coded as 1=authoritative, 2=authoritarian, 3=indulgent and 4=neglectful.

The other independent variable was peer pressure. Participants rated their perception of their best friends' influences in doing positive and/or negative activities. All items of the negative peer pressure subscale were reverse scored. Using the mean score, respondents were classified into one of the two categories of peer pressure. Mean split was used because the scores were normally distributed. Scores positioned at the mean point and some above and below the mean point were excluded. This has been done in order to categorize respondents with a meaningful cut off point.

For the analysis, the two peer pressure types were coded as 1=positive peer pressure and 2= negative peer pressure.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the study. First, the demographic characteristics of the study sample are described. This is followed by the results of gender differences in the prosocial behaviors of students. Next, the types of prosocial behaviors reported by the adolescents and the types of parenting styles experienced at home are presented. Similarly, results of the types of prosocial behaviors reported by the adolescents and the types of peer pressures are presented. Finally, results of the correlations between the dependent variable (prosocial behavior) and the independent variables (peer pressure) are explained.

4.1. Demographic characteristics of the Study Sample

The demographic characteristics of the study sample are presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3
Demographic characteristics of the study sample (N=150)

<i>Demographic characteristics</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	
Sex	Female	73	48.7
	Male	77	51.3
Age	14-15	71	47.3
	16-17	79	52.6
Family structure	Intact	108	72.5
	Non-Intact	41	27.5
Living condition	Live together	130	87.2
	Separate	19	12.8

As can be seen from Table 3 above, the sample size of female and male students are considerably proportional. The age range of participants was between 14 and 17 with a mean age of 15.69. Moreover, the majority (87.2%, N=130) of participants reported that they are residing with both biological parents all the times (intact families). All 150 participants were responding to

the whole items in the demographic section of the instrument, except one participant missed responding to family structure and living conditions.

4.2. Prosocial behaviors commonly observed among adolescents.

Table 4

Prosocial behavior observed among adolescents

Subscales	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>SD</i>
Public (Total)	150	2.0517	1	4	.93095
Compliant (Total)	150	2.5033	1	4	.86795
Dire (Total)	150	2.4933	1	4	.84342
Anonymous (Total)	150	2.3872	1	4	.86867
Emotional (Total)	150	2.7300	1	4	.88354
Altruism (Total)	150	3.1378	1	4	.85851

The means and standard deviations for the prosocial behavior subscales are presented in Table 4. Adolescents reported altruism prosocial behaviors ($M=3.13$) as commonly observed type of prosocial behavior followed by emotional ($M=2.73$) prosocial behavior. Compliant ($M=2.50$), dire ($M=2.49$) and anonymous ($M=2.38$) prosocial behaviors were found as the third commonly observed types of prosocial behaviors. Whereas, public ($M=2.05$) prosocial behaviors was the type of prosocial behavior rarely observed among adolescents.

Based on the sequence on mean differences showed in Table 4, mean difference between each subtype of prosocial behavior was examined using two sample test (see **Appendixes C**). STATA computer software was used for this analysis. The result showed a high variability between the commonly observed type of prosocial behavior (i.e., altruism) and the remaining others (i.e., compliant, emotional, dire, anonymous and public). Similarly, the result showed a

high variability between the rarely observed prosocial behavior (i.e., public) and the remaining other types of prosocial behaviors.

4.3. Interrelation among the study variables

Table 5

Interrelation among the study variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Peer pressure	1										
2. Altruism	.197*	1									
3. Anonymous	.201*	.111	1								
4. Public	-.048	-.360**	-.122	1							
5. Compliant	-.036	-.239**	-.053	.265**	1						
6. Dire	-.008	-.096	.261**	.117	.199*	1					
7. Emotional	.109	-.116	.138	.127	.146	.256**	1				
8. Authoritative	.441**	.048	.049	.020	.021	.006	.135	1			
9. Authoritarian	-.031	.109	.084	-.111	-.111	.055	-.096	-.370**	1		
10. Indulgent	-.264**	-.190*	-.144	.111	.068	-.058	.006	-.362**	-.224**	1	
11. Neglectful	-.240**	.017	-.002	-.021	.015	-.004	-.069	-.458**	-.284**	-.278**	1

Note. * $p < 0.05$, two tailed. ** $p < 0.01$, two tailed

Bivariate correlations were computed to examine the interrelations among the study variables (i.e., parenting style, peer pressure and adolescents prosocial behaviors) (see Table 5).

Significant results are summarized as follows:

1. Peer pressure was significantly and positively correlated with altruism and anonymous prosocial behaviors and authoritative parenting style; it was also significantly and negatively correlated with indulgent and neglectful parenting styles.
2. The public prosocial behavior was significantly and negatively correlated with the altruism prosocial behavior; it is also significantly and positively correlated with the compliant prosocial behavior;
3. The dire prosocial behaviour was positively and significantly correlated with the compliant, emotional and anonymous prosocial behaviors;

4. The altruism prosocial behavior was negatively and significantly correlated with the compliant and public prosocial behaviors and with that of indulgent parenting style.
5. Authoritative parenting style was significantly and negatively correlated with authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful parenting styles.

4.4. Parenting styles students experience at home

Table 6
Parenting style by sex of the students

<i>Parenting Styles</i>	<i>Overall</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>
Authoritative	56 (37.3%)	32 (43.8%)	24 (31.2%)
Authoritarian	28 (18.7%)	17 (23.3%)	11 (14.3%)
Indulgent	27 (18.0%)	8 (11.0%)	19 (24.7%)
Neglectful	39 (26.0%)	16 (21.9%)	23 (29.9%)

One can observe from Table 6 that among the 150 parents of the AK-PSPS students, 37.3% were authoritative, 18.7% were authoritarian, 18.0% were indulgent, and 26.0% were neglectful. The chi-square test indicates that there is a substantial difference in the relative predominance of the parenting styles in overall gender groups ($\chi^2 = 8.01$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.05$). More specifically, the 56 number of students who rated their parents as authoritative was substantially higher than the number of students who rated their parents as authoritarian, indulgent, or neglectful. Thus, the data indicate that whereas authoritative style of parenting is most common among members of the two gender groups, indulgent style is least common.

On the other hand, let us consider the relative predominance of each parenting style separating the two gender groups. Table 6 shows that except the indulgent parenting style presented under the female group, slight differences exist in the remaining cell percentages across male and female groups. Nevertheless, these differences are not substantial and we can say that each parent of the students employs authoritative, authoritarian and neglectful parenting styles more or less to the same extent for both gender groups. However, there is a substantial difference in the indulgent parenting styles across male and female groups ($\chi^2 = 4.77$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.05$). More specifically,

indulgent parenting styles were the least common for daughters whereas; there is no substantial difference in the relative predominance of the parenting styles in male group.

4.5. Gender differences in prosocial behavior

Table 7

Gender differences on overall and sub types of prosocial behavior

Group		N	M	SD	t	p
Public	Female	73	1.7820	.83190	-3.603	.000*
	Male	77	2.3074	.95257		
Compliant	Female	73	2.4521	.90586	-.703	.483
	Male	77	2.5519	.83345		
Dire	Female	73	2.4315	.82628	-.873	.384
	Male	77	2.5519	.86063		
Anonymous	Female	73	2.4532	.85741	.905	.367
	Male	77	2.3247	.88021		
Emotional	Female	73	2.6849	.92236	-.607	.545
	Male	77	2.7727	.84894		
Altruism	Female	73	3.4247	.61177	4.250	.000*
	Male	77	2.8658	.96769		
Overall_Prosocial	Female	73	2.5381	.35434	-.378	.706
	Male	77	2.5624	.42827		

Note. * $p < 0.05$

Independent sample t-test was conducted to examine gender differences in the types of prosocial behaviors (See Table 7). There was no statistically significant mean difference ($t = 0.37$, $p > 0.05$) between female and male adolescents on the overall prosocial behavior. However, there was statistically significant mean difference in the public ($t = 3.60$, $p < 0.05$) and altruism ($t = 4.25$, $p < 0.05$) sub-types of prosocial behaviors between male and female adolescents. As shown in Table 4 above, female adolescents scored higher on altruism prosocial behavior ($M = 3.42$) than male adolescents ($M = 2.86$). In contrast, male adolescents scored higher on public prosocial behavior ($M = 2.05$) than female adolescents ($M = 1.78$).

For the significant differences in the sub types of prosocial behaviors between males and females, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not met for two out of seven comparisons. For these two comparisons, the researcher thus used the results associated with the “Equal variances not assumed”.

4.6. Prosocial behaviors across the different parenting styles

Table 8

The mean prosocial behavior scores for each parenting style along with the F and P values.

	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Authoritative	56	2.6032	.39533		
Authoritarian	28	2.5258	.27939		
Indulgent	27	2.4902	.36909	.601	.616*
Neglectful	39	2.5345	.47230		
Total	150	2.5506	.39291		

Note. Parenting styles was categorical variable and coded as authoritative = 1, authoritarian = 2, indulgent = 3, and neglectful = 4. * $p > 0.05$

Results in Table 8 above showed that there was no statistically significant mean difference in the overall prosocial behavior ($F = 0.60$, $p > 0.05$) among adolescents from different parenting style backgrounds (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful).

4.7. Prosocial behaviors across the different peer pressure types

Because there were six dependent variables (subscales of prosocial behavior), the appropriate statistical test is MANOVA. Thus, MANOVA was run to see if there were significant mean differences in each of the six prosocial behavior subscales between those who reported positive and negative peer interaction (or pressure). But before running MANOVA, the data were examined to verify if all the assumptions of MANOVA were met. This examination indicated that all the assumptions of MANOVA (e.g., normality, linearity, multicollinearity, homogeneity of

variance) were met except multivariate outliers. A total of 12 cases were found to be outliers and these cases were excluded from analysis.

Table 9

Multivariate (MANOVA) on Subtypes of Prosocial Behaviors across peer pressures

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Pillai's Trace	.14	2.64 ^b	6	93	.021
Wilks' Lambda	.85	2.64 ^b	6	93	.021
Hotelling's Trace	.17	2.64 ^b	6	93	.021
Roy's Largest Root	.17	2.64 ^b	6	93	.021

Note * $p < 0.05$

The MANOVA test showed a significant mean difference in the six types of prosocial behaviors among participants facing positive and negative peer pressure from their best friends (See Table 9 above). For instance, using Pillai's Trace, there was significant mean difference in prosocial behaviors among participants who were categorized under the two peer pressure types, $F = 2.64$, $p < 0.05$. Similarly, the difference was significant using the other MANOVA tests.

Table 10

Summary of the MANOVA test Results: The mean prosocial behavior scores for each peer pressure category along with the F and P values

	Peer pressure	Mean	SD	N	F	Sig.
Public	Negative Peer Pressure	2.00	.88	48	.025	.875
	Positive Peer Pressure	1.97	.97	52		
Compliant	Negative Peer Pressure	2.40	.83	48	.805	.372
	Positive Peer Pressure	2.56	.86	52		
Dire	Negative Peer Pressure	2.28	.87	48	.472	.494
	Positive Peer Pressure	2.39	.77	52		
Anonymous	Negative Peer Pressure	2.16	.91	48	4.588	.035
	Positive Peer Pressure	2.55	.89	52		
Emotional	Negative Peer Pressure	2.49	.82	48	2.806	.097
	Positive Peer Pressure	2.78	.90	52		
Altruism	Negative Peer Pressure	3.24	.61	48	7.951	.006
	Positive Peer Pressure	3.54	.49	52		

Note * $p < 0.05$

In addition to the results of the general MANOVA tests, The associated results are summarized in Table 10 below. The results indicated only two statistically significant differences out of six. That is, the mean differences for those with positive and negative peer interaction or pressure were statistically significant for the anonymous ($F = 4.588, p < 0.05$) and altruism ($F = 7.951, p < 0.05$) prosocial behaviors. In each case, the group which reported positive peer interaction had significantly better anonymous and altruism prosocial behaviors than those who reported negative peer pressure.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to identify the types of prosocial behaviors experienced by adolescent students at the AK-PSPS and examine the influence of parenting styles and peer pressure on the prosocial behavior of students.

5.1. Prosocial behavior among adolescents

Taking Carlo and Rondall's (2002) assertion, one may expect a negative correlation between public and altruism prosocial behavior dimensions. As expected, this study showed negative and significant correlation between public and altruism prosocial behaviors ($r = -0.360$, $p < 0.01$). The reason can be those adolescents who engage frequently in altruistic prosocial behavior might not be motivated by different or additional concerns like adolescents who tend to be more prosocial in public settings (Carlo & Rondall, 2002). This all mean that, students tend to altruistic prosocial behavior are less interested in public prosocial behaviors and vice versa.

Additionally, altruism prosocial behavior negatively related to all prosocial subscales, except anonymous. The reason might be how altruism assesses behaviors. As noted by Azampour, Neasi, Shehni-Yailagh, & Arshadi (2012), altruism assess motivation or reason behind the prosocial behavior but other types more directly assess behaviors of behavioral situations.

There was another significant positive correlation between public and compliant prosocial behaviors ($r = 0.265$, $p < 0.01$) which was not reported by previous researchers (for example, Carlo & Rondall, 2002; Azampour et al., 2012). Helping others in response to verbal or non verbal request (i.e., compliant) is mostly seen in children than adolescents (Carlo & Randall, 2002). It is also well understood that, children prefer to act in front of others with a desire to gain approval of parents or others (i.e., public). This may be a reason for the result obtained regarding the correlation between public and compliant prosocial behaviors.

With regard to all results, distinction between prosocial sub scales might be conceptually important. For instance, emotionally evocative signs may be presented in dire or extreme circumstances. However, direness cannot be observed under emotional charged circumstances. Besides, there might be a situation in which these motives conflict with each other. For example, adolescents might have tendencies to perform helping behavior in front of others (i.e., public prosocial behavior) as well as helping behaviors with a relatively high cost to the self (i.e., altruistic prosocial behavior).

5.2. Gender differences in prosocial behavior

Regarding the overall prosocial behavior, this study showed that there was no significant mean difference between male and female students ($t = 0.37, p > 0.05$). Similarly, previous researches (Tsehay et al., 2014; Bierhoff, 2002) did not show sex difference in levels of prosocial behavior between males and females. The adolescents' exposure to prosocial activities in school or at home can partly explain the lack of difference.

However, a study by Tafetu (2007) showed that, there was significant mean difference in prosocial behavior between male and female students that female students scored more on overall prosocial behavior than male students. This might be explained as a result of females being more socialized to be nurturing and caring in interpersonal relationship.

On the other hand, the result of this study showed statistically significant difference in the public ($t = 3.60, p < 0.05$) and altruism ($t = 4.25, p < 0.05$) subtypes of prosocial behaviors between male and female respondents. The mean public prosocial behavior score of males ($M = 2.30$) was greater than that of females ($M = 1.78$); and the mean altruism prosocial behavior score of females ($M = 3.42$) was greater than that of males ($M = 2.86$). This finding is partly consistent with results of previous researches (Carlo & Randall, 2002; Tsehay et al., 2014).

A number of scholars have shown that adolescent boys are more concerned with gaining others' approval (Carlo, Roesch, and Koller, 1999b) and heroic actions (Carlo & Rondall, 2002) than adolescent girls. The finding that adolescent boys reported more public prosocial behavior than adolescent girls could be due to these concerns. Besides, individuals who engage in more altruistic prosocial behaviors might be influenced by different motives. For instance, sympathy or strong internalized norms can be mentioned (Carlo et al., 2010). As noted by some previous researchers, girls exhibit more sympathy (Eisenberg et al., 1995) and some higher level forms of internalized prosocial moral reasoning (Carlo & Rondall, 2002) than boys. Therefore, the fact that adolescent girls reported more altruistic prosocial behavior than adolescent boys could be consistent with male and female differences in sympathy and some higher level forms of internalized prosocial moral reasoning.

Moreover, scholars have noted strong gender role stereotypes about such behavioral differences between boys and girls (Carlo & Rondall, 2002). In cultures of countries like Ethiopia, females engaged more in household activities to serve other members of the family than males did. These can be a factor for females for engaging in voluntary helping motivated primarily by concern for the need and welfare of others (i.e., altruism).

Contrary to the result of this study, a research conducted in the west by Carlo and colleague (2003) reported that female adolescents show more public prosocial behaviors as compared to male adolescents.

Generally, the result obtained in relation to differences on prosocial behavior among male and female adolescents, biological predispositions, experience of socialization adopted from parents and peers, received gender-typed expectations from the media, and other conveyers of cultural norms (Hastings et al., 2007) can be put as underlining reasons.

5.3. Parenting style in Adolescents

The study revealed that, authoritative parenting styles were the most predominantly practiced parenting styles. This finding echoes the results of previous studies conducted with a sample of elementary (Kassahun, 2005), junior secondary (Seleshi & Sentayehu, 1998), high school (Berhanu, 1996; Markos, 1996; Abesha, 1997; Yekoyealem, 2005) and undergraduate first year students (Abesha, 2012). One reason for the predominance of an authoritative parenting style, particularly in the Ethiopian cultural context, might be because parents are required to give special attention and care when their children leave the childhood period and enter the adolescence period. If they are not treated well and supervised by their parents, they may be exposed to different harmful cultural and traditional practices (Seblework, 2004).

Another possible explanation could be the increasing awareness of parents about the influence of child rearing methods on children's all aspects of development. Here, the role of both electronic and print media played a great role. The information regarding parenting methods and associated outcomes transmitted through the FM radios, TV shows, books, magazines and news papers may have helped.

On the other hand, the result showed that neglectful parenting style was the second predominant parenting style among adolescents. Similarly, Kassahun's (2005) result showed neglectful parenting style was found predominant. His explanation was that when adolescents enter high school the parents may believe that their children can manage themselves, and thus they reduce their control as well as their close relationships. However, giving similar explanation and conclusion with this one may not be sensible when Ethiopian cultural beliefs regarding children's development are concerned (Atsede, 1994 as cited in Abesha, 2012) and given parenting is biological. Therefore, the researcher believed that this specific result may relate with the study's methodological limitation.

Beside the explanations stated above, the obtained result in relation to parenting style can be subject to the present study's methodological limitation. Classifications, such as the median split, used in this study restricts variance in treating participants as high or low on acceptance/involvement and control/demanding dimensions. To overcome this limitation, the researcher was trying to exclude those resided in and closer to the border line. But, due to short sample size only 45 participants would have been left for further analysis. The use of parenting style allows an easy interpretation more than the use of continuous scores and it is very common in parenting literature (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). However, further work is needed to find answers to such type of limitation.

5.4. Prosocial behavior and parenting style

To compare overall prosocial behavior across parenting styles, a one-way ANOVA test result showed no significant mean difference in prosocial behavior among students experiencing different parenting styles at home. Similar to this finding, a study conducted in Ethiopian Red Cross Society by Tafetu(2007) showed no significant correlation between helping behavior and parental modeling. In addition, the result partly is consistent with a research result by Carlo and colleague (2010). These researchers showed parent's strict control as relatively, weakly and generally not linked to prosocial behaviors.

Contrary to these findings, Lam (2012) showed that parents play an important role in promoting and fostering prosocial involvement in their children and in adolescents. On the other hand, Hastings et al. (2007) found an authoritative parenting style to be associated with more prosocial behavior. These analyses showed that parenting styles make great contribution to prosocial behavior.

However, in comparison of the study result with previous contrary results, one should consider that, socialization research on these broad parenting styles has its limits (Hastings et al., 2007). Grusec and colleague (as cited in Hastings et al., 2007) argued that parenting actions may differ widely across contexts and depend on parent's goals. Parents will not always behave in ways that match with a single defined style. In addition, the complexity of parenting styles and the many of its aspects require measuring parenting behavior with parental attitudes and emotions, such that it can be difficult to infer the likely processes or mechanisms that explain association between parenting styles and prosocial behaviors of children or adolescents.

5.5. Prosocial behavior and peer pressure

The study result depicts a significant mean difference in the anonymous and altruism types of prosocial behaviors among participants due to the types of peer pressures. This finding is partly inconsistent with the findings of Zaffe et al. (as cited in Hastings et al., 2007), which demonstrated that youths who saw their high school peers as positive influences were more likely to engage in subsequent prosocial behavior. Also, the positive significant difference found between altruism prosocial behavior and peer pressure is inconsistent with results of Berndt (1996b) as in the present study; adolescents who were engaged in friendships were altruistic and maintain positive peer status.

One possible explanation could be the significant correlation that anonymous and altruistic prosocial behaviors could have with high level of reasoning and negative relationship they could have with hedonistic reasoning (Eisenburg et al., 1995).

Another explanation for the positive relationship between altruistic prosocial behavior and positive peer pressure could be the timely situation at which peers engaged in doing more positive activities than negative activities.

Another interesting finding of this study is the correlation that altruism and anonymous prosocial behaviors had with the two types of peer pressures. Inconsistent result was also found on Brown et al.'s (1986) study that peer pressure was found as more consistently related to adolescents' positive than negative behavior. Positive friends discouraged drug and alcohol use, delinquent activities and other types of antisocial behavior; they also encouraged studying hard in school, being positive and supportive to others and participating in other positive social activities (Guzman, 2007). The altruistic behavior of adolescents can be due to their friends' strong pressure in doing general positive social activities.

The significant result obtained for the relationship of peer and prosocial behavior can also be a reflection that could show the importance of understanding the microsystem of Bronfenbrenner's (1994) ecological model of human development. Relationship needs of adolescents differ or change in comparison to earlier ages. For instance, shift in attachment may occur from parents to peer relation. This in turn makes adolescents to be influenced by their high school peers to do volunteer work or prosocial activities (Hastings et al., 2007).

5.6.Summary

The primary objective of the current study was to investigate the relationship between prosocial behavior with parenting style and peer pressure of secondary school students in Addis Ababa. To achieve this objective, the following specific questions were formulated for investigation.

1. Which type of prosocial behavior observed commonly among adolescents?
2. Is there significant gender difference in prosocial behavior?
3. Which type of parenting style do most students in AK-PSPS experience at home?

4. Is there a statistically significant difference in the prosocial behavior of adolescents from different parenting style backgrounds?
5. Is there a statistically significant difference in the prosocial behavior of adolescents due to different types of peer pressure?

A total of 150 (Male = 77 & Female = 73) adolescent students participated in the study.

The subjects were randomly selected from the AK-PSPS. Quantitative method or research was used, and a number of questionnaires were employed to collect data. Focus group discussion was also parts of the research process used for the development of peer interaction instrument. Before collecting data for the main study, all questionnaires were administered for a pilot study.

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used for the analysis of data gathered. Independent t-test, one way ANOVA, MANOVA, univariate ANOVA and bivariate correlation were employed to analyze the data.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

6.1 Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were derived.

- (a) Adolescents in AK-PSPS engage more frequently in altruism prosocial behaviors than public, compliant, anonymous, dire and emotional prosocial behaviors. These adolescents are not much interested in a prosocial act performed in front of others (i.e., public prosocial behavior). Thus we can conclude that adolescents of the AK-PSPS are experiencing prosocial behavior with the intention of sacrificing their own gain in order to promote another's well-being (altruistically) than other alternatives of prosocial behavior.
- (b) There was no significant difference between male and female adolescents of the AK-PSPS in their overall prosocial behavior. But, a significant mean difference was obtained in the subscales of prosocial behavior. These finding imply that adolescent girl might be most likely to engage in prosocial behavior when internalized, sympatric motives are applicable and when there are fewer concerns with gaining others' approval such as altruistic prosocial opportunities. Whereas, adolescent boys tend to more concerned with gaining others approval.
- (c) Authoritative parenting style was the most commonly practiced parenting styles students in AK-PSPS experience at home. Following authoritative parenting style, there was a difference in the second predominantly practiced parenting styles based on the gender of the adolescent students. Specifically, authoritarian parenting style was the second predominantly employed parenting style for daughters and neglectful for sons.

- (d) There was no significant difference found in prosocial behavior of the AK-PSPS students experiencing different parenting styles at home.
- (e) Positive peer interaction among the AK-PSPS adolescents has a significant effect on prosocial behavior, more specifically to the altruistic type of prosocial behavior. The result implies that positive peer interaction is an important factor for the development of prosocial behavior.

6.2 Recommendations

1. All concerned parties surrounding adolescents (i.e., parents, peers, teachers, neighbors, religious leaders, government and non government bodies) need to seek ways to enhance prosocial behavior. T
2. The school can promote awareness. All should be caution that, early prosocial behavior protects against later antisocial behavior and early emerging antisocial behavior problems seem to be a risk factor for late deficits in prosocial behavior (Hastings et al., 2007).
3. Parents should encourage their children and adolescents and be models in promoting prosocial acts. They need to show their children about how they can be community minded citizens. There are stories in Ethiopia that parents could tell to their children and adolescents about people that were doing things with the intention to benefit others. Parents also advised to take their children to places where they can see or act prosocially and understand the direct and positive effect of their contribution on others.
4. Close friends may have particularly strong influence on adolescent's prosocial development. Parents better help and educate their children in the selection of friends.

5. The researcher believes that more studies need to be conducted in Ethiopia to enhance prosocial behavior (which is addressed as one important behavior for the reduction of anti social behaviors). Future researches are recommended to be made on other social variables, like siblings, teachers, and community organizations in relation to their effect on prosocial behavior. Culture, religion and media can also be other important variables to be researched for their effect on prosocial behavior. Moreover, studying prosocial behavior in relation to parenting style, parental practices, parental modeling and peer pressure effects are also other recommendations to be researched across different cultures. Conducting researches on prosocial behavior in all age groups is also recommended to investigate the possible foundations and development of the variable.
6. Schools should also think and act on helping adolescents to interact more in prosocial activities. Encouraging students to form and/or participate in school volunteer service clubs, organizing campaigns to promote prosocial activities, programs for students to do regular helpful and caring community activities are recommended. Moreover, scaling up peer learning and mutual reinforcement programs can also be keys to enhance prosocial behaviors in schools.

References

- Abebaw, A. (2003). Special form of child abuse: Using children for begging and its psychological effects on the behavior of children. *Unpublished Masters thesis*. Addis Ababa University.
- Abesha, A. (1997). Impact of parenting practices on scholastic performance of high school students in Wolayta and Amhara Cultures. *Unpublished Masters Thesis*. Addis Ababa University.
- Abesha, A. (2012). Effects of parenting styles, academic self-efficacy, and achievement motivation on the academic achievement of university students in Ethiopia. *Unpublished dissertation*. Perth. Western Australia.
- Adugna A. (2012). Attitude of Students towards Prosocial Behavior: the case of Debre-Markos Preparatory School. *Unpublished Masters Thesis*. Addis Ababa University.
- Argaw, B. (2001). The altruistic behavior of home reared, institutionalized and street children. *Unpublished Masters Thesis*. Addis Ababa University.
- Arnett, J.J. (2007). The myth of peer influence in adolescent smoking initiation. *Health Education and Behavior*. 34, 594-607.
- Azimpour, A., Neasi, A., Shehni-Yailagh, M., & Arshadi, N. (2012). Validation of prosocial tendencies measure in Iranian university students. *J.Life Science Biomed*. 2(2), 34-42.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Barber, B. K., Stolz, H.E., & Olsen, J.A.(2005). Parental support, psychological control, and behavioral control: Assessing relevance across time, culture, and method. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 282, 70. Boston, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

- Barnes, G. M., Hoffman, J. H., and Welte, J. W. (2006). Effects of Parental Monitoring and Peer Deviance on Substance Use and Delinquency. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 1084-1104.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development*. 37, 887-907.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*. 4 (1, Pt.2).
- Baumrind, D. (1991). Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. *Advances in family research*. 2. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Berhanu, A. (1996) The relationship of parenting styles with academic achievement among senior secondary school students with particular reference to the Kaffecho Zone. *Unpublished Masters Thesis*. Addis Ababa University.
- Berndt, T. J. (1996b). Exploring the effects of friendship quality on social development. In W.M. Bukowski, A. F. Newcomb, & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *The company they keep: Friendship in childhood and adolescence* (pp. 346-365). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Bierhoff H.W. (2002). *Prosocial behavior*. Psychology Press. New York..
- Brown, B. B., Clasen, D. R., Eicher, S. E. (1986). Perceptions of peer pressure, peer conformity dispositions, and self-reported behavior among adolescents. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 22, 521-530.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. In *International Encyclopedia of Education*, Vol.3, 2nd. Ed. Oxford: Elsevier. Reprinted in : Gauvain, M.

- & Cole, M. (Eds.), *Readings on the development of children*, 2nd Ed (1993, pp.37-43).
NY:Freeman.
- Carlo, G., & Randall, B.A. (2002). The development of a measure of prosocial behavior for late adolescents. *Faculty publication, department of psychology*, P70.
- Carlo, G., Hausmann, A., Christiansen, S., & Randall, B. A. (2003). Sociocognitive and Behavioral Correlates of a Measure of Prosocial Tendencies for Adolescents. *Faculty Publications, Department of Psychology*, P4.
- Carlo, G., Mestre, M.V., Samper, P., Tur, A., & Armenta, B.E. (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.
doi:10.1170/0165025410375921.
- Carlo, G., Roesch, S. C., & Koller, S.H. (1999b). Similarities and differences in prosocial moral reasoning between Brazilian and Anglo-American college students. *Interam. Journal of Psychology*, 33.151-172.
- Castrogiovanni, D. (2002). *Adolescence: Peer groups*. Retrieved from
<http://www.ianr.unl.edu/pubs/family/nf211.htm>
- Clasen, D. R., & Brown, B.B. (1985). The multidimensionality of peer pressure in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 14,6. Doi. 0047.2891/85/1200-0451504.50/0.
- Crosswhite, J. M., & Kerpleman, J. L. (2009). Coercion theory, self-control, and social information processing: Understanding potential mediators for how parents influence deviant behavior. *Deviant Behavior*, 30(7): 611-46.

- Daniel, K.K., & Kipkemboi, F. (2014). The impact of school environment and peer influences on students' academic performance in Vihiga country Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 4, 5(1).
- Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R.A. (1998). Prosocial development. *Handbook of child psychology. Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp 701–778). New York, John Wiley and Sons.
- Eisenberg, N., Carlo, G., Murphy, B., & Van Court, P. (1995). Prosocial development in late adolescence: A longitudinal study. *Child Development*, 66, 1179-1, 197
- Elise, R. D., & Kenneth G. R. (2005). The proactive effect of good parenting on adolescents. *Division of Adolescent/young Adult Medicine, Children's Hospital*, 17, 460-465 Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Boston.
- Erikson, E.H. (1997). *The life cycle completed*. Norton and company. New York.
- Frued, S. (1961). *The ego and the id*. The standard edition of the complete psychological work of Sigmund Freud. 19. Hogarth Press. London, UK.
- Gefland, D.M., Hartmann, D.P., Cromer, C.C., Smith, C.L., & Page, B.C. (1975). The effects of instructional prompts and praise on children's donation rates. *Child Development*. (V, 46, pp. 980-983).
- Gensler, H.J., Spurgin, E. W., & Swindal, J. C., (2004). *Ethics, a contemporary introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Guzman, M. (2007). Friendships, peer influence, and peer pressure during teen years. *UNL Extension publications. G1751*. University of Nebraska.
- Hastings, P. D., Utendale, W., T, & Sullivan, C. (2007). The socialization of prosocial development. *Handbook of Socialization* (pp638-664). Guilford publication.

- Hoffman, M. L. (1982). Development of prosocial motivation: Empathy and guilt. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *The development of prosocial behavior* (pp. 281-313). New York: Academic Press
- Hoffman, M. L. (2000). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holmbeck, G. N. (1996). A model of family relational transformations during the transition to adolescence: Parent-adolescent conflict and adaptation. In J. A. Graber, J. Brooks-Gunn, & A. C. Petersen (Eds.), *Transitions through adolescence: Interpersonal domains and context* (pp. 167-199). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kassahun, H. (2005). The relationship of parenting styles and academic performance among primary and secondary school students in Debre-Markos town. *Unpublished M.A Thesis*. Addis Ababa University.
- Kidron, Y., & Fleischman, S. (2006, April 1). Promoting adolescents' prosocial behavior. *Educational Leadership*, 63(7), 90-91.
- Lam, C. M. (2012). Prosocial involvement as a positive youth development construct: A conceptual review. *The Scientific World Journal*, 8, doi:10.1100/2012/769158
- Lamborn, S., Mounts, N., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful families. *Child development*. 62(5), 1049-1065.
- Lashbrook, J. T. (2000). Fitting in: exploring the emotional dimension of adolescent peer pressure. *Adolescence*, 35, 747-757.
- Ma, H.K., Cheung, P.C., & Shek, D.T. (2007). The relation of prosocial orientation to peer interactions, family social environment and personality of Chinese adolescents.

- International Journal of Behavioural Development*, 31(1), 12-18. Doi: 10.1177/0165025406073504.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent child interaction. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.), *Hand book of child psychology: Socialization, personality, and social development* (vol. 4, pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.
- Markos, T. (1996). The relationship between parenting style and school performance among high school students in Makalle. *Unpublished M.A thesis*. Addis Ababa University.
- McLellan, J. A., & Youniss, J. (2003). Two systems of youth service: Determinants of voluntary and required youth community service. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 32(1), 47-58.
- Michalik, N. M. (2005). Determinant of adolescent behaviour: parental personality and socialization, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66-02, 0490.
- Padilla-Walker, L.M, & Carlo, G. (2006). Personal values as a mediator between parent and peer expectations and adolescent behavior. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21:3,538-541.doi:10.1037/0893-3200.21.3.538
- Reyniers, D. & Bhalla, R. (2013). Reluctant altruism and peer pressure in charitable giving. *Judgment and Decision Making*. 8. 7-15.
- Seblework, T. (2004). Assessment of sexual coercion among Addis Ababa University female Students. *Unpublished Masters Thesis*. Addis Ababa University.
- Seleshi, Z., & Sentayehu T. (1998). Parenting style differences among selected ethnic groups in Ethiopia. *Unpublished Research Paper*, Forum on Street Children–Ethiopia in Cooperation with Radda Barnen (Swedish Save the Children). Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

- Simons, R. L., Whitbeck, L. B., Conger, R. D., & Conger, K. J., (1991). Parenting Factors, Social Skills, and Value Commitments as Precursors to School Failure, Involvements with Deviant Peers, and Delinquent Behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 20(6): 645-64.
- Slaby, R. G., & Crowley, C. G. (1977). Modification of cooperation and aggression through teacher attention to children's speech. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 23 (3), 442-458.
- Staub, E. (1979). Positive social behavior and morality: *Socialization and development* (Vol. 2). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Tafetu, S. (2007). Factors influencing volunteers helping behavior: the case of Red Cross Society Youth Volunteers in Addis Ababa. *Unpublished Masters thesis*. Addis Ababa University.
- Tome, G. (2012). How can peer group influence the behavior of adolescents: explanatory model. *Global Journal of Health Science*. 4(2). doi:10.5539/gjhs.v4n2p26.
- Tsehay, D.S., Mulatie, M.W., Sellakumar, G.K., & Begashaw, G.A. (2014). Pro-social behaviors and identity statuses among adolescent students, Addis Ababa Ethiopia. *Innovare Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(1), 2347-5544.
- Wantzel, K. R., McNamara, B. C., & Caldwell, K. A. (2004). Friendships in middle school: influences on motivation and school adjustments. *Journal of Educational Research Journal*, 25, 527-554
- Whiting, B. B., & Whiting, J. M. (1975). *Children of six cultures: A psychocultural analysis*. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.
- Wubshet, D. (2005). Begging as means of livelihood: conferring with the poor at the orthodox religious ceremonial days in Addis Ababa. *African study monographs. Department of sociology and social anthropology*. Addis Ababa University.

Yekoyealem, D. (2005). The relationship between parenting style and identity status of secondary and preparatory school adolescents at Debre Birhan. *Unpublished thesis*. Addis Ababa.

Zeldin, S. (2005). Intergenerational relationships and partnerships in community programs: Purpose, practice, and directions for research. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 33(1), 1-10.

Appendix C

Two sample t-test with equal variance

Table 12

Two-sample t test with equal variances

<u>t test, unpaired</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
Altruism = Emotional	**0.000
Emotional = Compliant	*0.012
Compliant = Dire	0.459
Dire = Anonymous	0.142
Anonymous = Public	**0.007

Note. * $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$

Appendix A

English version of the questionnaires

Background Information (BGI)

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information for a study leading to MA degree in developmental psychology. Including this demographic information, there are 4 questionnaires provided. Information you provide would be very crucial for the success of the study. Therefore, you are kindly requested to be honest towards all the items provided in this questionnaire. The information you provide will be kept confidential. You are not required to write your name.

Direction:- write the necessary information in the blank space provided or circle for questions who has choices.

1 **Sex:** (1) Female (2) Male

2 **Age** _____

3 **With whom are you living now?**

(1) With both father and mother

(5) With mother and step farther

(2) With father

(6) With other relative

(e. g., grand parents, aunts, uncle, etc.)

(3) With mother

(7) With foster parents who are no relatives

(4) With father and step mother

(8) Others

(specify): _____

4 **Does your parent/Parents always live with you**

(1) Yes

(2) No

Part 2: Prosocial Behavior Measure

Below are a number of statements that may or may not describe you. Please indicate **HOW MUCH EACH STATEMENT DESCRIBES YOU** by using the following scale:

1. Does not describe me at all,
2. Describes me a little,

3. Describes me well, and
4. Describes me greatly

		Does not describe me at all	Describes me a little	Describes me well	Describes me greatly
1	I can help others best when people are watching me.				
2	When other people are around, it is easier for me to help others in need.				
3	I think that one of the best things about helping others is that it makes me look good.				
4	I tend to help people who are in a real crisis or need.				
5	When people ask me to help them, I don't hesitate.				
6	I prefer to donate money without anyone knowing.				
7	I tend to help others in need when they do not know who helped them.				
8	Helping others when I am being watched is when I work best.				
9	It is easy for me to help others when they are in a bad situation.				
10	I believe I should receive more rewards for the time and energy I spend on volunteer service.				
11	I respond to helping others best when the situation is highly emotional.				
12	I never wait to help others when they ask for it.				
13	I think that helping others without them knowing is the best type of situation.				
14	One of the best things about doing charity work is that it looks good on my resume.				
15	Emotional situations make me want to help others in need.				
16	I often make donations without anyone knowing because they make me feel good.				
17	I feel that if I help someone, they should help me in the future.				

Part 3: Parenting Styles Scale (PSS)

Direction: Please read each of the following statements carefully and for each item from 1-13, think about your parents"/guardians" attitudes and behaviors in raising you, and rate them using the scale below by putting a check mark (✓) on a choice that indicates the alternative which you believe best describes your response.

(1) Strongly Disagree (2) Disagree (3) Agree (4) Strongly Agree

	Items	Father /Male Guardian	Mother /Female Guardian
1	I trust my parents/guardians to help me out, if I have any kind of problems.	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8
2	My parents/guardians keep pushing (helping) me to do my best in what I do.	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8
3	My parents/guardians allow me to tell them if I think my ideas are better than theirs.	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8
4	My parents/guardians always speak to me with a warm and friendly voice (manner).	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8
5	When my parents/guardians want me to do something, they explain why.	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8
6	When I get good grades in school, my parents/ guardians praise me.	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8
7	When I get poor grades in school, my parents/ guardians encourage me to work harder.	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8
8	My parents/guardians are involved in my education (e.g., helping with assignments when asked).	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8
9	My parents/guardians know who my friends are.	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8
10	My parents/guardians spend time taking with me when there is an issue (a case) of interest.	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8
11	My parents/guardians enjoy staying home with me more than going out with friends.	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8
12	My parents/guardians give me a lot of care, attention, and support.	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8
13	My parents emphasize that every members of the family should have some say in family decisions.	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8
14	My parents give me a lot of support and are involved in my life decisions.	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8
15	My parents believe that children know more about something than adults do.	1 2 3 4	5 6 7 8

16 In a typical week, what is the latest time your parents/ guardians allow you to stay out on school nights (Monday-Friday)?

1. Your father/male guardian

- (1) As late as I want
- (2) 9:00 P.M - Mid-night
- (3) 7:00- 9:00 P.M
- (4) Doesn't allow me out

2. Your mother/Female guardian

- (1) As late as I want
- (2) 9:00 P.M - Mid-night
- (3) 7:00- 9:00 P.M
- (4) Doesn't allow me out

17 In a typical week, what is the latest time your parents/guardians allow you to stay out during weekend (Non-school) nights (Friday, Saturday or Sunday)?

1. Your father/male guardian

- (1) As late as I want
- (2) 9:00 P.M - Mid-night
- (3) 7:00- 9:00 P.M
- (4) Doesn't allow me out

2. Your mother/Female guardian

- (1) As late as I want
- (2) 9:00 P.M - Mid-night
- (3) 7:00- 9:00 P.M
- (4) Doesn't allow me out

18 How much do your parents/guardians try to know exactly where you are and what you are doing?

1. Your father/male guardian

- (1) Doesn't try
- (2) Tries a little
- (3) Tries a lot

2. Your mother/Female guardian

- (1) Doesn't try
- (2) Tries a little
- (3) Tries a lot

19 How much do your parents/guardians try to know what you do with your free time?

1. Your father/male guardian

- (1) Doesn't try
- (2) Tries a little
- (3) Tries a lot

2. Your mother/Female guardian

- (1) Doesn't try
- (2) Tries a little
- (3) Tries a lot

20 How much do your parents/guardians try to know where you are most afternoons after school?

1. Your father/male guardian

- (1) Doesn't try
- (2) Tries a little
- (3) Tries a lot

2. Your mother/Female guardian

- (1) Doesn't try
- (2) Tries a little
- (3) Tries a lot

21 How much do your parents/guardians try to know what you do with your money?

1. Your father/male guardian

- (1) Doesn't know
- (2) Knows a little
- (3) Knows a lot

2. Your mother/Female guardian

- (1) Doesn't know
- (2) Knows a little
- (3) Knows a lot

22 How much do your parents/guardians really know exactly where you are and what you are doing?

1. Your father/male guardian

- (1) Doesn't know
- (2) Knows a little
- (3) Knows a lot

2. Your mother/Female guardian

- (1) Doesn't know
- (2) Knows a little
- (3) Knows a lot

23 How much do your parents/guardians really know exactly whether you go to school or not?

1. Your father/male guardian

- (1) Doesn't know
- (2) Knows a little
- (3) Knows a lot

2. Your mother/Female guardian

- (1) Doesn't know
- (2) Knows a little
- (3) Knows a lot

24 How much do your parents/guardians really know exactly what you do with your free time?

1. Your father/male guardian

- (1) Doesn't know
- (2) Knows a little
- (3) Knows a lot

2. Your mother/Female guardian

- (1) Doesn't know
- (2) Knows a little
- (3) Knows a lot

25 How much do your parents/guardians really know exactly where you are most afternoons after school?

1. Your father/male guardian

- (1) Doesn't know
- (2) Knows a little
- (3) Knows a lot

2. Your mother/Female guardian

- (1) Doesn't know
- (2) Knows a little
- (3) Knows a lot

26 How much do your parents/guardians really know exactly what you do with your money?

1. Your father/male guardian

- (1) Doesn't know
- (2) Knows a little
- (3) Knows a lot

2. Your mother/Female guardian

- (1) Doesn't know
- (2) Knows a little
- (3) Knows a lot

27 How much do your parents/guardians supervise and monitor you?

1. Your father/male guardian

- (1) Never at all
- (2) Sometimes
- (3) Always

2. Your mother/Female guardian

- (1) Never at all
- (2) Sometimes
- (3) Always

Peer Interaction Inventory (PII)

Direction:- The following Statements describing Peer pressure which is when your best friends encourage you to do something. Read each statement and CIRCLE in one of the boxes depending on HOW OFTEN your best friends encourage you to do that ("Frequently," "Sometimes," "Seldom," or "None"). If you think there's no pressure from friends regarding the statement, CIRCLE zero from the "None" box.

	how often does your best friend encourage you to	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	None
1	Study Hard, do homework, etc	3	2	1	0
2	Smoke Cigarette	3	2	1	0
3	Smoke "Weed"	3	2	1	0
4	Give attention to your education and Finish High school	3	2	1	0
5	drink alcoholic drinks and get Drunk	3	2	1	0
6	Be nice to teachers	3	2	1	0
7	Not Just go out with one guy or girl	3	2	1	0
8	Chew Chat	3	2	1	0
9	Have sexual intercourse	3	2	1	0
10	Be clean and good looking	3	2	1	0
11	Be religious and participate in religious activities	3	2	1	0
12	volunteer in different humanitarian activities	3	2	1	0
13	Be social and participate in social activities	3	2	1	0
14	Pick fights	3	2	1	0
15	participate in different school clubs (reading, sport, discussion, discovery, science etc)	3	2	1	0
16	Go to games at school (Football, volleyball, etc)	3	2	1	0
17	Show respect for adults	3	2	1	0
18	do what your parents tell you to do	3	2	1	0
19	Tell your parents where you went and what you did	3	2	1	0
20	To not to tell the truth or to Lie	3	2	1	0
21	watch pornographic pictures and movies	3	2	1	0
22	Disturb class	3	2	1	0
23	Help others	3	2	1	0

Appendix B

Amharic version of the questionnaires

ክፍል 1 አጠቃላይ መረጃ

የዚህ መጠይቅ ዓላማ በሥነ ዕድገት ሥነ ልቦና የትምህርት ዘርፍ የማስትሬት ዲግሪ መርሐ ግብር ለሚሠራ ጥናት መረጃ ለማሰባሰብ የተዘጋጀ ነው። ይህንን መሠረታዊ መረጃ ጨምሮ አራት ልዩ ልዩ መጠይቆች ተዘጋጅተዋል።

አንተ/አንቺ የምትሰጠው/ጩው መረጃ ለጥናቱ ስኬታማነት በአጅጉ ጠቃሚ ነው። ስለዚህ በዚህ መጠይቅ ላይ ከዚህ በታች ለቀረቡት ጥያቄዎች ግልጽ በመሆን (እውነተኛውን) ምላሽ እንድትሰጥ/ጩ በትኩረትና እጠይቃለሁ።

የሚሞላው መረጃ በሙሉ ምስጢራዊነቱ የተጠበቀ ይሆናል። ስምህን/ሽን መጻፍ አያስፈልግልኝም።

መመሪያ:-

አስፈላጊውን ምላሽ በክፍት ቦታው በመጻፍ ወይም ምርጫ ላላቸው ጥያቄዎች በማክበብ መልስ/ሽ

1 ጾታ: (1) ሴት (2) ወንድ

2 ዕድሜ:- _____

3 አሁን ከማን ጋር እየኖርህ/ሽ ነው?

(1) ከእናቴና ከአባቴ ጋር

(5) ከእናቴና ከእንጅራ አባቴ ጋር

(2) ከአባቴ ጋር

(6) ከሌሎች ዘመዶቼ ጋር

(ለምሳሌ:- ከአያቶች፣ ከአክስት፣ ከአጎት ...ወዘተ)

(3) ከእናቴ ጋር

(7) የሥጋ ዝምድና ከሌላቸው አሳዳጊዎች ጋር

(4) ከአባቴና ከእንጅራ እናቴ ጋር

(8) ሌሎች (ምን እንደሆኑ ግለፅ/ጩ):

4 ወላጆችህ/ሽ ሁልጊዜ ከአንተ/ቺ ጋር ይኖራሉ

(1) አዎ

(2) አይኖሩም

ክፍል 2 ሌሎችን የመርዳት ጠባይ መለኪያ

መመሪያ:-

ከዚህ በታች የተቀመጡት አረፍተ ነገሮች አንተን/አንቺን ሊገልጹ ወይም ላይገልጹ ይችላሉ። እባክህን/እባክሽን አረፍተ ነገሮቹ አንተን/አንቺን ምን ያህል እንደሚገልጹ የሚከተሉትን መለኪያዎች በመጠቀም ከሳጥኖቹ በአንዱ ቁጥር ላይ ብቻ በማክበብ አመልክት/ቺ።

- 1. በፍፁም አይገልጸኝም
- 2. በጥቂቱ ይገልጻል
- 3. በጣም ይገልጻል
- 4. እጅግ በጣም ይገልጻል

		በፍፁም አይገልጸኝም	በጥቂቱ ይገልጻል	በጣም ይገልጻል	እጅግ በጣም ይገልጻል
1	ሰዎች የሚመለከቱኝ ከሆነ በተሻለ ሁኔታ ሌሎችን እረዳለሁ።	1	2	3	4
2	እርዳታ የሚፈልጉ ሰዎችን ለመርዳት ሌሎች ሰዎች በዙሪያዬ ካሉ ይቀልለኛል	1	2	3	4
3	እንደማስበው ከሆነ፤ ሌሎችን መርዳትን ጥሩ ከሚያደርጉት ነገሮች አንዱ እኔን በሌሎች ዘንድ ጥሩ ዕይታ እንዲኖረኝ ስለሚያደርግ ነው	1	2	3	4
4	በእውነተኛ ቀውስ ወይም የመረዳት ፍላጎት ውስጥ ያሉትን ወደ መርዳት አመዘናለሁ	1	2	3	4
5	ሰዎች እንድረዳቸው ሲጠይቁኝ ምንም አላቅማማም	1	2	3	4
6	ማንም ሰው ሳያውቅ ገንዘብ መለገስን እመርጣለሁ	1	2	3	4
7	ሰዎች ማን እንደረዳቸው ሳያውቁ ብረዳቸው የተሻለ እመርጣለሁ	1	2	3	4
8	ሌሎች ሰዎች ሊያዩኝ በሚችሉበት ቦታ ላይ ሆኜ ሰዎችን መርዳት የተሻለ ነው	1	2	3	4
9	በአደገኛ ሁኔታ ውስጥ ያሉ ሰዎችን መርዳት ለእኔ ቀላል ነው	1	2	3	4
10	ለበጎ አድራጎት ሥራዎች ለማወጣው ጊዜና ጉልበት የተሻለ ማበረታቻ (ሽልማት) እፈልጋለሁ	1	2	3	4
11	ሌሎችን የምረዳበት ምክንያት በከፍተኛ ሁኔታ ስሜትን የሚነካ ከሆነ በቶሎ ምላሽ እሰጣለሁ	1	2	3	4
12	ሌሎች እንድረዳቸው ሲጠይቁኝ በፍጹም ለመርዳት ጊዜ አላባክንም	1	2	3	4
13	እንደሚመስለኝ ከሆነ ሰዎች ሳያውቁን መርዳት ከሌሎች አማራጮች የተሻለ ነው።	1	2	3	4
14	የበጎ አድራጎት ሥራን ጥሩ ከሚያደርጉት ነገሮች መካከል አንዱ በሥራ ልምድ ማስረጃዬ ላይ ጥሩ ሆኖ ስለሚታይ ነው	1	2	3	4
15	ስሜት ቀስቃሽ ሁኔታዎች ሌሎች መረዳት ያለባቸውን ሰዎች መርዳት እንድፈልግ ያደርጉኛል	1	2	3	4
16	ጥሩ ስሜት እንዲሰማኝ ስለሚያደርገኝ አልፎ አልፎ ማንም ሰው ሳያውቅ ዕርዳታዎችን እሰጣለሁ	1	2	3	4
17	አንድን ሰው አሁን ከረዳሁት፤ ወደፊት እኔን ሊረዳኝ ይገባል የሚል ስሜት አለኝ	1	2	3	4

ክፍል 3 የወላጆች/አሳዳጊዎች/ የልጅ አስተዳደግ ልምዶች መለኪያ

መመሪያ

የሚከተሉትን ጥያቄዎች በጥንቃቄ አንብቦ/ሽ ወላጆች/ህ/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎች/ህ/ሽ) አንተን/ቺን ሲያሳድጉ ስለአንተ/ቺ አስተዳደግ ያላቸው አመለካከትና ጠባይ አስቦ/ሽ ምን ያህል ትስማማበት/ሚበት እንደሆነ ከታች ከተሰጡት አማራጮች ወላጆች/ህ/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎች/ህ/ሽ) ለአንተ/ቺ የሚያሳዩህን/ሽን አመለካከትና ጠባይ በሚገባ ይገልጻል የምትለውን/ይውን ቁጥር በማክበብ መልስ/ሺ።

* ለእያንዳንዱ ጥያቄ አባት/ህን/ሽን (ወንድ አሳዳጊህን/ሽን) እንዲሁም እናት/ህን/ሽን (ሴት አሳዳጊህን/ሽን) በተመለከተ በየተራ መልስ መስጠት እንዳለብህ/ሽ አትዘንጋ/ረ።

(1) አጥብቄ አልስማማም (2) አልስማማም (3) እስማማለሁ (4) አጥብቄ እስማማለሁ

ተ.ቁ	ጥያቄዎች	አባት/ወንድ አሳዳጊ	እናት/ሴት አሳዳጊ
1	ችግር ሲገጥመኝ ወላጆቼ/አሳዳጊዎቼ እንደሚረዱኝ አምናለሁ።	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
2	ወላጆቼ/አሳዳጊዎቼ በምሠራው ሥራ ሁሉ የተሻለ እንድሠራ ዘወትር ያበረታቱኛል።	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
3	ወላጆቼ/አሳዳጊዎቼ የእኔ ሀሳብ ከእነርሱ የተሻለ መሆኑን ለመግለጽ ስፈልግ ይፈቅዱልኛል።	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
4	ወላጆቼ/አሳዳጊዎቼ ከእኔ ጋር የሚነጋገሩት በፍቅርና በጓደኝነት ስሜት ነው።	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
5	ወላጆቼ/አሳዳጊዎቼ አንድን ሥራ እንድሠራ ሲፈልጉ ለምን መሥራት እንዳለብኝ ይገልጹልኛል።	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
6	ወላጆቼ/አሳዳጊዎቼ በትምህርቴ ጥሩ ውጤት ሳገኝ ያሞግሱኛል/ይሸልሙኛል፡	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
7	ወላጆቼ/አሳዳጊዎቼ በትምህርቴ መጥፎ ውጤት ሳገኝ የተሻለ ለማግኘት ጠንክራ እንድሠራ ያበረታቱኛል።	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
8	ወላጆቼ/አሳዳጊዎቼ በእኔ ትምህርት ይሳተፋሉ (ለምሳሌ፡ ያልገባኝን ስጠይቅ ያስረዱኛል)	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
9	ወላጆቼ/አሳዳጊዎቼ ጓደኞቼ እነማን እንደሆኑ ያውቋቸዋል።	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
10	ወላጆቼ/አሳዳጊዎቼ ከእኔ ጋር ለመነጋገር/ለመወያየት ጊዜ ይሰጣሉ።	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
11	ወላጆቼ/አሳዳጊዎቼ ብዙውን ጊዜ ከጓደኞቻቸው ጋር ወደ ውጪ ወጣ ብለው ከመዘናናት ይልቅ ከእኔ ጋር ቤት በመቆየት ይደሰታሉ።	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
12	ወላጆቼ/አሳዳጊዎቼ ለእኔ ከፍተኛ እንክብካቤና ትኩረት ይሰጡኛል።	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
13	ወላጆቼ/ አሳዳጊዎቼ ሁሉም የቤተሰቡ አባል በቤተሰብ ውሳኔዎች ላይ የተወሰነ ተሳትፎና ድርሻ እንዲኖረው ትኩረት ያደርጋሉ።	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
14	ወላጆቼ/አሳዳጊዎቼ ከፍተኛ የሆነ ድጋፍ ያደርጉልኛል፤ በሕይወቴ በምወስናቸው ነገሮችም ላይ ይሳተፋሉ።	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
15	ልጆች አንዳንድ ነገሮችን ከአዋቂ ሰዎች የበለጠ እንደሚያውቁ ወላጆቼ ወይም አሳዳጊዎቼ ያምናሉ።	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

መመሪያ

ከቁጥር 16 እስከ 27 ላሉት ጥያቄዎች ወላጆች/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎች/ሽ) ስለ አንተ/ስለ አንቺ ያላቸውን አመለካከትና ጠባይ በሚገባ የሚገልጸውን አማራጭ የያዘውን ቁጥር በመክበብ መልስ/ሺ።

16 በሳምንት ውስጥ (ከሰኞ እስከ አርብ) ባሉት ቀናት ማታ አምሸተህ/ሽ እንድትገባ/ቢ ወላጆች/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎች/ሽ) የሚፈቅዱል/ሽ እስከ ስንት ሰዓት ነው?

አባትህ/ሽ (ወንድ አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. እስከ ፈለግሁት ሰዓት
2. ከምሽቱ ሦስት ሰዓት እስከ ስድስት ሰዓት
3. ከምሽቱ አንድ ሰዓት እስከ ሦስት ሰዓት
4. እንዳመሽ አይፈቀድልኝም

እናትህ/ሽ (ሴት አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. እስከ ፈለግሁት ሰዓት
2. ከምሽቱ ሦስት ሰዓት እስከ ስድስት ሰዓት
3. ከምሽቱ አንድ ሰዓት እስከ ሦስት ሰዓት
4. እንዳመሽ አይፈቀድልኝም

17 በሳምንቱ መጨረሻ ባሉት ቀናት (ቅዳሜ እና እሁድ) ለማምሽት ወላጆች/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎች/ሽ) የሚፈቅዱል/ሽ እስከ ስንት ሰዓት ነው?

አባትህ/ሽ (ወንድ አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. እስከ ፈለግሁት ሰዓት
2. ከምሽቱ ሦስት ሰዓት እስከ ስድስት ሰዓት
3. ከምሽቱ አንድ ሰዓት እስከ ሦስት ሰዓት
4. እንዳመሽ አይፈቀድልኝም

እናትህ/ሽ (ሴት አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. እስከ ፈለግሁት ሰዓት
2. ከምሽቱ ሦስት ሰዓት እስከ ስድስት ሰዓት
3. ከምሽቱ አንድ ሰዓት እስከ ሦስት ሰዓት
4. እንዳመሽ አይፈቀድልኝም

18 ወላጆች/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎች/ሽ) የት እንዳለህ/ሽና ምን እንደምትሠራ/ሪ ለማወቅ ምን ያህል ይሞክራሉ/ይጥራሉ?

አባትህ/ሽ (ወንድ አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. አይሞክሩም/አይጥሩም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ
3. ብዙ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ

እናትህ/ሽ (ሴት አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. አይሞክሩም/አይጥሩም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ
3. ብዙ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ

19 ወላጆች/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎች/ሽ) በትርፍ ጊዜህ/ሽ ምን እንደምትሠራ/ሪ ለማወቅ ምን ያህል ይሞክራሉ/ይጥራሉ?

አባትህ/ሽ (ወንድ አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. አይሞክሩም/አይጥሩም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ
3. ብዙ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ

እናትህ/ሽ (ሴት አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. አይሞክሩም/አይጥሩም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ
3. ብዙ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ

20 ወላጆች/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎች/ሽ) በአብዛኛው ከሰዓት በኋላ (ከትምህርት በኋላ) የት እንዳለህ/ሽ ለማወቅ ምን ያህል ይሞክራሉ/ይጥራሉ?

አባትህ/ሽ (ወንድ አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. አይሞክሩም/አይጥሩም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ
3. ብዙ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ

እናትህ/ሽ (ሴት አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. አይሞክሩም/አይጥሩም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ
3. ብዙ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ

21 ወላጆች/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎች/ሽ) ባለህ/ሽ ገንዘብ ምን እንደምታደርግበት/ቢበት ለማወቅ ምን ያህል ሞክራሉ/ይጥራሉ?

እናትህ/ሽ (ሴት አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. አይሞክሩም/አይጥሩም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ
3. ብዙ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ

አባትህ/ሽ (ወንድ አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. አይሞክሩም/አይጥሩም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ
3. ብዙ ይጥራሉ/ይሞክራሉ

22 ወላጆች/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎች/ሽ) የት እንዳለህ/ሽ እና ምን እንደምትሠራ/ሪ በእርግጠኝነት ምን ያህል ያውቃሉ?

እናትህ/ሽ (ሴት አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. ምንም አያውቁም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ያውቃሉ
3. ብዙ ያውቃሉ

አባትህ/ሽ (ወንድ አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. ምንም አያውቁም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ያውቃሉ
3. ብዙ ያውቃሉ

23 ወላጆችህ/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎችህ/ሽ) ትምህርት ቤት መሔድህን/ሽን በእርግጠኝነት ምን ያህል ያውቃሉ?

እናትህ/ሽ (ሴት አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. ምንም አያውቁም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ያውቃሉ
3. ብዙ ያውቃሉ

አባትህ/ሽ (ወንድ አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. ምንም አያውቁም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ያውቃሉ
3. ብዙ ያውቃሉ

24 ወላጆችህ/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎችህ/ሽ) በትርፍ ጊዜህ/ሽ የምታደርገውን/ጊውን በእርግጠኝነት ምን ያህል ያውቃሉ?

እናትህ/ሽ (ሴት አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. ምንም አያውቁም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ያውቃሉ
3. ብዙ ያውቃሉ

አባትህ/ሽ (ወንድ አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. ምንም አያውቁም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ያውቃሉ
3. ብዙ ያውቃሉ

25 ወላጆችህ/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎችህ/ሽ) በአብዛኛው ከሰዓት በኋላ (ከትምህርት ሰዓት በኋላ) የት እንዳለህ/ሽ በእርግጠኝነት ምን ያህል ያውቃሉ?

እናትህ/ሽ (ሴት አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. ምንም አያውቁም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ያውቃሉ
3. ብዙ ያውቃሉ

አባትህ/ሽ (ወንድ አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. ምንም አያውቁም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ያውቃሉ
3. ብዙ ያውቃሉ

26 ወላጆችህ/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎችህ/ሽ) ባለህ/ሽ ገንዘብ ምን እንደምታደርግበት/ጊበት በእርግጠኝነት ምን ያህል ያውቃሉ?

እናትህ/ሽ (ሴት አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. ምንም አያውቁም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ያውቃሉ
3. ብዙ ያውቃሉ

አባትህ/ሽ (ወንድ አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. ምንም አያውቁም
2. ትንሽ ትንሽ ያውቃሉ
3. ብዙ ያውቃሉ

27 ወላጆችህ/ሽ (አሳዳጊዎችህ/ሽ) ምን ያህል ይቆጣጠሩሃል/ሻል (ይከታተሉሃል/ሻል)?

እናትህ/ሽ (ሴት አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. ምንም
2. አንድ አንድ ጊዜ
3. ሁል ጊዜ

አባትህ/ሽ (ወንድ አሳዳጊህ/ሽ)

1. ምንም
2. አንድ አንድ ጊዜ
3. ሁል ጊዜ

ክፍል 4 የአቻ ግንኙነት መመዘኛ

መመሪያ:-

የሚከተሉት አረፍተ ነገሮች የቅርብ ዳደኛ/ሽ አንድን ነገር እንድትሠራ/ሪ ሊያሳድርብህ/ሽ የሚችለውን የአቻ ተጽዕኖ ይገልጻሉ። እያንዳንዱን አረፍተ ነገር በማንበብ አንተን/አንቺን የቅርብ ዳደኛ/ሽ በምን ያህል ጊዜ ተጽዕኖ እንደሚያሳድርብህ/ሽ ለመግለጽ ከተቀመጡት የአማራጭ ሳጥኖች (በተደጋጋሚ፣ አንዳንድ ጊዜ፣ ወይም እምብዛም) መካከል በአንዱ ላይ ብቻ በማክበብ መልስ/ሽ።

ምንም ዓይነት ተጽዕኖ አይመጣብኝም የምትል/ይ ከሆነ “ምንም ተጽዕኖ የለብኝም” በሚለው ሳጥን ላይ ዜሮን በማክበብ መልስ/ሽ።

	የአንተ/ቺ የቅርብ ዳደኛ የሚከተሉትን እንድታደርግ/ጊ በምን ያህል ጊዜ ተጽዕኖ ያሳድርብሃል/ሻል	በተደጋጋሚ	አንዳንድ ጊዜ	እምብዛም	ምንም ተጽዕኖ የለብኝም
1	በርትተህ/ሽ እንድታጠና/ኚ፣ የቤት ሥራህን/ሽን እንድትሠራ/ሪ ወዘተ...	3	2	1	0
2	ሲጋራ እንድታጨስ/ሽ	3	2	1	0
3	ሐሽሽ እንድታጨስ (ለምሳሌ፡- ዊድ)	3	2	1	0
4	ለትምህርትህ/ሽ አስፈላጊውን ትኩረት እንድትሰጥ/ጩና የሁለተኛ ደረጃ ትምህርትህን/ሽን እንድትጨርስ/ሽ	3	2	1	0
5	የአልኮል መጠጥ ጠጥተህ/ሽ እንድትሰክር/ሪ	3	2	1	0
6	ለመምህራኖቻህ/ሽ ጥሩ እንድትሆን/ኝ	3	2	1	0
7	ቋሚ (አንድ) የወንድ ዳደኛ/የሴት ዳደኛ ብቻ እንዳይኖርህ/ሽ (ከአንድ በላይ እንዲኖርህ/ሽ)	3	2	1	0
8	ጫት እንድትቅም/ሚ	3	2	1	0
9	የግብረ ሥጋ ግንኙነት እንድትፈጽም/ሚ	3	2	1	0
10	ንጹሕ በመሆን በሌሎች ዘንድ ጥሩ ዕይታ እንዲኖርህ/ሽ	3	2	1	0
11	ሃይማኖታዊ እንድትሆን/ኝና በሃይማኖታዊ እንቅስቃሴዎች እንድትሳተፍ/ፊ	3	2	1	0
12	በልዩ ልዩ የበጎ ፈቃድ ሥራዎች ላይ እንድትሳተፍ/ፊ	3	2	1	0
13	ማኅበራዊ እንድትሆን/ኚና በልዩ ልዩ ማኅበራዊ እንቅስቃሴዎች እንድትሳተፍ/ፊ (ለምሳሌ፡- ሰዎች መጠየቅ፣ ለቅሶ መድረስ፣ አካባቢን ማልማት፣ ...ወዘተ)	3	2	1	0
14	ተደባዳቢ (ፀብ ጫሪ) እንድትሆን/ኚ	3	2	1	0
15	በልዩ ልዩ የትምህርት ቤት ክበባት እንድትሳተፍ/ፊ (ለምሳሌ፡- የንባብ፣ የስፖርት፣ የውይይት፣ የሳይንስ...ወዘተ)	3	2	1	0
16	በትምህርት ቤት ወደሚደረጉ ልዩ ልዩ ውድድሮች እንድትሔድ/ጅ (ለምሳሌ፡- የእግር ኳስ፣ የሾሊቦል፣ ወዘተ)	3	2	1	0
17	ለትልልቅ ሰዎች አክብሮት እንድታሳይ/ዩ	3	2	1	0

18	ወላጆችህ/ሽ አሳዳጊዎችህ/ሽ አድርግ ያሉህን እንድታደርግ/ጊ	3	2	1	0
19	ለወላጆችህ/ሽ ወይም አሳዳጊዎችህ/ሽ ወዴት እንደምትሔድ/ጂና ምን እንደምታደርግ/ጊ እንድትነግራቸው/ሪያቸው	3	2	1	0
20	እውነት ከመናገር ይልቅ መዋሽትን እንድትመርጥ/ጭ	3	2	1	0
21	ልቅ የወሲብ ፊልሞችንና ፎቶግራፎችን እንድትመለከት/ቸ	3	2	1	0
22	ክፍል ውስጥ እንድትበጠብጥ/ጭ	3	2	1	0
23	ሌሎችን እንድትረዳ/ጅ	3	2	1	0

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university, and that all sources of materials used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name : Abel Solomon Mamo

Signature : -----

Date of Submission : June, 2015