

PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF THE COLLEGE OF TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS OF OCCIDENTAL MINDORO STATE COLLEGE

**Camille A. Limos, Ian D. Parle, Jessica T. Tasani, Christine A. Adre, Pauline
Grace M. Domingo, Mary Nicole B. Ducado, Joanne D. Gorospe**
College of Teacher Education, Occidental Mindoro State College
camillelimos22000@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between prosocial behaviors and academic achievement among students at the College of Teacher Education, Occidental Mindoro State College-San Jose Campus. The primary objective was to determine whether levels of prosocial behavior correlate significantly with academic performance, and to explore potential differences based on demographic variables such as age, sex, year level, and program. A descriptive research design was employed, involving a sample of 103 students from various education programs for the academic year 2022-2023. Data were collected using the bifactor model of the 16-item new prosociality scale and academic performance records. The analysis revealed that while prosocial actions did not show a significant correlation with academic achievement ($r = 0.158$, $p = 0.111$), prosocial feelings were positively associated with academic performance ($r = 0.267$, $p = 0.006$). Significant differences were observed in prosocial behaviors based on year level and academic program, with first-year students showing lower levels of prosocial actions and feelings compared to their senior peers. Additionally, students in the Bachelor of Elementary Education program exhibited higher levels of prosocial behaviors than those in other programs. No significant differences were found based on age or sex. These findings suggest that while specific prosocial actions may not directly impact academic success, greater emotional sensitivity and empathy are beneficial. The study highlights the importance of fostering prosocial feelings and recommends targeted interventions to enhance student support, promote empathy, and address the unique needs of various student groups. Future research should consider longitudinal studies and include diverse educational contexts to validate and expand upon these findings.

Keywords: *prosocial behavior, prosocial action, prosocial feelings, academic achievement*

INTRODUCTION

Students exhibit a range of positive behaviors, including helping, sharing, caring, donating, and volunteering, collectively referred to as prosocial behavior (Eisenberg et al., 2013). Prosocial behavior, a complex construct, is foundational to positive mental traits and is essential for fostering healthy personalities and facilitating interpersonal interactions (Gou, 2017). Initially defined in contrast to "antisocial" behavior, prosocial actions are recognized by society as beneficial and counteract disruptive and aggressive tendencies (Kruglanski & Stroebe, 2012).

In educational contexts, the significance of prosocial behavior for academic achievement has been extensively investigated (Latorre-Coscolluela et al., 2022). Numerous correlational studies have demonstrated a strong association between prosocial behavior and academic success across gender and grade levels (Oberle & Schonert-Reichl, 2013). Consistent findings link prosocial tendencies in children to favorable academic outcomes, highlighting its role as a predictor of success and its contribution to positive peer relationships and learning behaviors (Wentzel, 2012). Notably, prosocial behavior continues to be a significant predictor of academic achievement even when controlling for personality traits and intelligence quotient (Gerbino et al., 2017).

Among college students, particularly those transitioning from parental support, prosocial behavior plays a critical role in influencing interpersonal relationships, mental well-being, school satisfaction, and social adjustment (Padilla-Walker & Nielson, 2015). Its importance is heightened within the demanding academic environment of colleges, where academic setbacks can have significant consequences for both individuals and institutions (Senter, 2023). Prosocial behavior acts as a psychological buffer, helping students manage feelings of isolation, anxiety, helplessness, and competitive pressures associated with rigorous academic and social experiences (Lu et al., 2022).

Although previous research has explored the relationship between prosocial behaviors and academic achievement in various contexts, there is a notable gap in understanding this relationship among college students, particularly within the College of Teacher Education (Aytaç & Kartal, 2016). Existing studies have primarily focused on the impact of prosocial behavior on the academic success of adolescents and the factors influencing such behavior (Gupta & Thapilyal, 2015). Given the pivotal role educators play in shaping the future of society, examining the prosocial behaviors of Teacher Education students is of particular importance due to their future responsibilities in nurturing and guiding young minds (Longobardi et al., 2021).

Therefore, this study aims to investigate the relationship between prosocial behaviors and academic achievement among students in the College of Teacher Education at Occidental Mindoro State College-San Jose Campus. Specifically, it seeks to determine whether students' levels of prosocial behavior are significantly correlated with their academic performance. Additionally, the study will explore potential differences in prosocial behavior based on demographic variables such as age, sex, year level, and program, as these factors are theorized to influence students' engagement in prosocial behaviors

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design to examine the relationship between prosocial behavior and academic achievement. The design also aimed to explore how individual student profiles might influence this relationship and to identify any significant differences when students were categorized based on demographic factors.

Study Site

The research was conducted at Occidental Mindoro State College-San Jose Campus, located on Rizal Street in San Jose, Occidental Mindoro, during the Academic Year 2022-2023.

Respondents of the Study

Participants were selected from the College of Teacher Education at Occidental Mindoro State College-San Jose Campus for the Academic Year 2022-2023. Out of 424 enrolled students, 103 were chosen as respondents. The sample included 34 students from the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) program, 42 from the Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSEd) program, 12 from the Bachelor of Technological and Livelihood Education (BTLEd) program, and 15 from the Bachelor of Physical Education (BPEd) program. Proportional stratified random sampling was employed to ensure representation from each program, accounting for the varying sizes of student populations and achieving balanced participation.

Research Instrument

Data were collected using questionnaires. The Bifactor Model of the 16-item New Prosociality Scale, developed by Kanacri et al. (2021), was used to assess the extent of students' prosocial behavior. This scale included 12 items measuring prosocial actions and 4 items assessing prosocial feelings. The reliability coefficients for the prosocial action and prosocial feelings sections were 0.91 and 0.87, respectively, indicating high internal consistency and reliability.

Data Collection

A formal request for permission to conduct the study was submitted to the dean of the College of Teacher Education. Alongside this request, a validated checklist for collecting data on respondent profiles and academic achievements was developed. Data collection was carried out through face-to-face distribution of survey questionnaires by the researchers. The importance of accurate and honest responses was emphasized, and terms in the questionnaire were explained to ensure participants' understanding.

Ethical Considerations

Participants were informed that their participation was voluntary and that they could choose whether to complete the questionnaire. The confidentiality and anonymity of all participants were strictly maintained, with personal details and academic records protected.

Data were coded, and access was restricted to the researcher to uphold ethical standards and ensure the integrity of the research.

Data Analysis

Data were organized and analyzed using statistical software, including Microsoft Excel and the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage were used to present the demographic profile and academic achievement of the respondents. Prosocial behavior was analyzed using mean and standard deviation. Pearson Product Moment Correlation was employed to test the relationship between prosocial behavior and academic achievement. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to assess significant differences between prosocial behavior and academic achievement. The hypothesis was tested at a 0.05 level of significance. The Tukey Honestly Significant Difference test was applied to identify the minimum difference required for statistical significance and to pinpoint specific differences among the variables.

RESULTS

The result reveals that the majority of respondents (67.00%) are 20 years old or younger, while 33.00% are 21 years old or older. In terms of gender distribution, 33.00% of respondents are male, and 67.00% are female. Regarding academic year, 32.04% are first-year students, 34.95% are second-year students, and 33.01% are third-year students. For academic programs, 33.01% are enrolled in the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) program, 40.78% are pursuing a Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSEd), 14.56% are in the Bachelor of Physical Education (BPed), and 11.65% are studying Bachelor of Technological and Livelihood Education (BTLEd) [Table 1].

Table 1. Demographic profile of the students (n=103).

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	FREQUENCY (F)	PERCENTAGE (%)
Age		
20 years old and below	69	67.00%
21 years old and above	34	33.00%
Sex		
male	34	33.00%
female	69	67.00%
Year Level		
1st year	33	32.04%
2nd year	36	34.95%
3rd year	34	33.01%
Program		
BEEd	34	33.01%
BSEd	42	40.78%
BPed	15	14.56%
BTLEd	12	11.65%

The data reveals that students exhibit a high level of prosocial behavior (4.13±0.56) and feelings (4.19±0.72). They frequently engage in helping others, sharing resources, and volunteering, and show strong empathy and emotional sensitivity. The highest scores are associated with helping and sensing others' discomfort, indicating robust prosocial tendencies. However, lending money or resources is slightly less frequent but still rated highly (Table 2).

Table 2. Extent of prosocial behavior of the students.

INDICATORS	MEAN	SD
Prosocial Action		
I am pleased to help my friends/schoolmates in their activities	4.22	0.83
I share the things that I have with my friends	4.26	0.82
I try to help others	4.35	0.74
I am available for volunteer activities to help those who are in need	4.02	0.89
I help immediately those who are in need	4.09	0.78
I do what I can to help others avoid getting into trouble	4.18	0.79
I am willing to make my knowledge and abilities available to others	4.26	0.75
I try to console those who are sad	4.07	0.86
I easily lend money or other things	3.55	1.00
I try to be close to and take care of those who are in need	4.17	0.81
I easily share with friends any good opportunity that comes to me	4.20	0.77
I spend time with those friends who feel lonely	4.12	0.83
<i>Overall Mean</i>	4.13	0.56
Prosocial Feelings		
I am emphatic with those who are in need	4.14	0.86
I intensely feel what others feel	4.07	0.87
I easily put myself in the shoes of those who are in discomfort	4.24	0.91
I immediately sense my friends' discomfort even when it is not directly communicated to me	4.31	0.85
<i>Overall Mean</i>	4.19	0.72

Legend: 1.00 - 1.49 - Very Low; 1.50 - 2.49 - Low; 2.50 - 3.49 - Moderate; 3.50 - 4.49 - High; 4.50 - 5.00 - Very High

Result shows that the majority of students fall into the "Very Satisfactory" (51.5%) and "Satisfactory" (45.6%) academic levels. The overall mean academic achievement is 89.25±1.88, indicating a generally satisfactory level of performance. (Table 3).

Table 3. Level of academic achievement of the students.

LEVEL OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT	FREQUENCY (N)	PERCENTAGE (%)
Outstanding (95 - 100)	0	0.0
Very Satisfactory (90 - 94)	53	51.5
Satisfactory (85 - 89)	47	45.6
Fairly Satisfactory (80 - 84)	3	2.9
Unsatisfactory (79 & below)	0	0.0
Mean±SD	89.25±1.88	

Result shows that the relationship between prosocial action and academic achievement is not significant ($r = 0.158$, $p = 0.111$), indicating no strong correlation. However, there is a significant positive relationship between prosocial feelings and academic achievement ($r = 0.267$, $p = 0.006$), suggesting that higher levels of empathy and emotional sensitivity are associated with better academic performance (Table 4).

Table 4. Relationship between prosocial behavior and academic achievement.

PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR	ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT		
	n	r	p-value
Prosocial Action	103	0.158	0.111
Prosocial Feelings	103	0.267	0.006

Legend: p -value < 0.05 - Significant

The analysis reveals significant differences in prosocial behavior and feelings based on year level and program, but not by age group or sex. Specifically, first-year students' prosocial action (3.93 ± 0.43) and prosocial feelings (3.89 ± 0.75) exhibit significantly lower levels of prosocial behavior and feelings compared to their second-year's prosocial action (4.06 ± 0.61) and prosocial feelings (4.13 ± 0.76) and third-year's prosocial action (4.38 ± 0.55) and prosocial feelings (4.54 ± 0.47). Additionally, students in the BEEd program show higher levels of prosocial action (4.29 ± 0.47) and feelings (4.42 ± 0.47) compared to those in other programs. No significant differences were found based on age ($p = 0.132$ for prosocial action; $p = 0.032$ for prosocial feelings) or sex ($p = 0.354$ for prosocial action; $p = 0.732$ for prosocial feelings) [Table 5].

Table 5. Comparison of prosocial action and prosocial feelings by age group, sex, year level, and program.

VARIABLE	PROSOCIAL ACTION			PROSOCIAL FEELINGS		
	Mean±SD	t	p-value	Mean±SD	t	p-value
Age group						
20 years old and below	4.07±0.56	-1.519	0.132	4.09±0.78	-2.183	0.032
21 years old and above	4.25±0.56			4.38±0.54		
Sex						
Male	4.05±0.59	-0.932	0.354	4.15±0.74	-	0.732
Female	4.16±0.55			4.21±0.71	0.344	
Year Level						
1st year	3.93±0.43			3.89±0.75		
2nd year	4.06±0.61	6.183	0.003	4.13±0.76	7.748	0.001
3rd year	4.38±0.55			4.54±0.47		
Program						
BEEd	4.29±0.47			4.42±0.47		
BSEd	4.00±0.56	3.750	0.013	4.17±0.73	4.669	0.004
BPEd	4.35±0.62			4.23±0.88		
BTLEd	3.84±0.60			3.56±0.78		

DISCUSSION

The demographic analysis of this study reveals a significant presence of respondents aged 20 years and below, which aligns with the common trend of students enrolling in tertiary education immediately after completing secondary school. Additionally, the predominance of female respondents reflects the global trend of higher female enrollment in higher education institutions (Johnson et al., 2016). The diverse academic levels represented among respondents, spanning various years of study, and the distribution across programs such as Bachelor of Elementary Education, Bachelor of Secondary Education, Bachelor of Physical Education, and Bachelor of Technological and Livelihood Education highlight the interdisciplinary nature of contemporary universities (Galán-Muros et al., 2023; Fensham et al., 2012).

The prosociality test results for the College of Teacher Education students at Occidental Mindoro State College (San Jose Campus) reveal a high level of prosocial behavior, suggesting a strong sense of empathy and compassion among the student population. This finding is consistent with research emphasizing the importance of these qualities within teacher education programs (Noddings, 2012). The positive responses to empathic feelings reflect students' inclination towards altruistic actions, supported by the correlation between heightened prosocial feelings and a greater willingness to engage in such behaviors (Batson et al., 2014). Furthermore, the respondents demonstrated a satisfactory level of academic achievement.

However, the small percentage of students with a "fairly satisfactory" level of academic achievement underscores the variability in student performance. While intelligence is a key factor influencing academic success, other factors such as academic self-efficacy, cognitive and learning styles, goal orientation, and motivation also play crucial roles (Cassidy, 2012). Recognizing this variability is essential for educational institutions to provide targeted support and resources to students facing academic challenges (Lodge et al., 2018).

The study found a significant and positive correlation between prosocial feelings and academic achievement, suggesting that students with positive social emotions tend to perform better academically. Conversely, no significant correlation was observed between prosocial actions and academic achievement, indicating that while positive social emotions are associated with better academic performance, engaging in specific prosocial actions may not directly impact academic success. This supports the notion that emotional and social factors can influence academic performance (Latorre-Coscolluela et al., 2022).

The results also indicate that prosocial behaviors tend to increase with age during adolescence and early adulthood. Higher prosocial feelings among students aged 21 years and above suggest that as students mature, they develop a greater sense of empathy and concern for others (Eisenberg, 2014). However, no statistically significant difference in prosocial actions was observed between the two age groups, implying similar levels of willingness to engage in prosocial actions across ages.

Although no statistically significant differences were found in the extent of prosocial behavior between male and female students, the results align with Social Role Theory, which posits that women are more likely to engage in caring and nurturing activities (Eagly & Wood,

2012). This theory is supported by the slightly higher mean prosocial behavior scores for female students compared to their male counterparts.

Significant differences were observed in prosocial actions and feelings among students at different year levels. Specifically, mean scores for both prosocial actions and feelings increased from first-year to third-year students. This indicates that students in higher year levels exhibit greater willingness to engage in prosocial behaviors and report stronger prosocial emotions compared to those in lower year levels (Poepfel & Schroeder, 2018).

Lastly, significant differences were found in prosocial actions and feelings based on the students' enrolled programs. This suggests that the type of educational program may influence students' engagement in prosocial actions and their expression of prosocial emotions. These findings support Social Identity Theory, which posits that individuals derive a sense of identity and self-esteem from their group memberships, which can shape their behaviors and attitudes, including prosocial behavior (Sotnik et al., 2023).

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the sample was drawn from a single institution, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other educational settings or geographical locations. The use of self-reported questionnaires to measure prosocial behavior and academic achievement may also introduce response biases, as participants may provide socially desirable answers or misunderstand some questions. Additionally, the cross-sectional nature of the study prevents the establishment of causal relationships between prosocial behavior and academic achievement. Future research should consider longitudinal designs and include multiple institutions to enhance the generalizability and depth of the findings. Finally, while the study examined various demographic factors, other potential influences on prosocial behavior and academic achievement, such as socio-economic status or family background, were not explored, which could provide additional insights into the observed relationships.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study provide a detailed profile of students within the College of Teacher Education, revealing a predominantly female student body enrolled in the Bachelor of Secondary Education program. These students exhibit commendable levels of prosocial behavior, including both actions and feelings. Academic performance is generally satisfactory, with a notable positive correlation between prosocial feelings and academic achievement. However, a negative correlation was observed between prosocial actions and academic performance. Age and sex did not significantly influence prosocial behavior, though variations were found across different year levels and academic programs.

These insights suggest the need for tailored interventions within the college. It is recommended that the institution implement targeted programs to further develop prosocial behaviors, provide specialized academic support services, and promote empathy through social-emotional learning initiatives. Customized interventions should address the specific needs of different student groups. Ongoing research is essential to adapt strategies to evolving student demographics and needs, ensuring a responsive and effective educational

environment. Other colleges and academic programs should consider these findings to identify and address the unique needs and behaviors of their student populations.

REFERENCES

- Aytaç, K. Y., & Kartal, M. (2016). Analyzing the prosocial tendency of students studying at physical education and sports department. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 26, 01047. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20162601047>
- Batson, C. D., Lishner, D. A., & Stocks, E. L. (2015). The empathy–altruism hypothesis. In *Oxford University Press eBooks*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195399813.013.023>
- Cassidy, S. (2012). Exploring individual differences as determining factors in student academic achievement in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(7), 793–810. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.545948>
- Eisenberg, N., & Larson, R. (2013). The relation of prosocial behavior to children's social and emotional development. In *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development*. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2013-01013-013>
- Eisenberg, N., Hofer, C., Sulik, M. J., & Liew, J. (2014). The development of prosocial moral reasoning and a prosocial orientation in young adulthood: concurrent and longitudinal correlates. *Developmental psychology*, 50(1), 58–70. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032990>
- Fensham, P. J., & Harlen, W. (2012). Changing conceptions of science education and science curriculum development. In *B. J. Fraser, K. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second International Handbook of Science Education*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci3030326>
- Galán-Muros, V., Bouckaert, M., Roser, J. (2023). The representation of women in academia and higher education management positions. *UNESCO-IESALC policy brief series*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386876>
- Gerbino, M., Zuffianò, A., Eisenberg, N., Castellani, V., Luengo Kanacri, B. P., Pastorelli, C., & Caprara, G. V. (2018). Adolescents' prosocial behavior predicts good grades beyond intelligence and personality traits. *Journal of personality*, 86(2), 247–260. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12309>
- Guo, Y. (2017). The Influence of Social Support on the Prosocial Behavior of College Students: The Mediating Effect based on Interpersonal Trust. *English Language Teaching*, 10(12), 158. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n12p158>
- Gupta D. (2015). A Study of Prosocial Behaviour and Self Concept of Adolescents. *Journal on Educational Psychology*, 9(1), 38-45. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1098159>
- Johnson, M. L., Taasoobshirazi, G., Clark, L., Howell, L., & Breen, M. (2016). Motivations of traditional and nontraditional college students: from self-determination and attributions, to expectancy and values. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 64(1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07377363.2016.1132880>
- Kanacri, B. P. L., Eisenberg, N., Tramontano, C., Zuffiano, A., Caprara, M. G., Regner, E., Zhu, L., Pastorelli, C., & Caprara, G. V. (2021). Measuring prosocial behaviors: Psychometric properties and cross-national validation of the prosociality scale in five countries. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.693174>

- Kruglanski, A. W. (2012). Handbook of the History of Social Psychology. In *Psychology Press eBooks*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203808498>
- Latorre-Coscolluela, C., Sierra-Sánchez, V., Rivera-Torres, P., & Liesa-Orús, M. (2022). Emotional well-being and social reinforcement as predictors of motivation and academic expectations. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 115, 102043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.102043>
- Lodge, J. M., Kennedy, G., Lockyer, L., Arguel, A., & Pachman, M. (2018). Understanding difficulties and resulting confusion in learning: an integrative review. *Frontiers in Education*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2018.00049>
- Longobardi, C., Settanni, M., Lin, S., & Fabris, M. A. (2021). Student-teacher relationship quality and prosocial behaviour: The mediating role of academic achievement and a positive attitude towards school. *The British journal of educational psychology*, 91(2), 547–562. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12378>
- Lu, T. C., Wang, C. X., Tao, B. L., Sui, H. R., & Yan, J. (2022). The relationship between physical activity and prosocial behavior of college students: A mediating role of self-perception. *PLoS one*, 17(8), e0271759. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0271759>
- Noddings, N. (2012). The caring relation in teaching. *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(6), 771–781. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2012.745047>
- Oberle, E., & Schonert-Reichl, K. A. (2013). Relations among peer acceptance, inhibitory control, and math achievement in early adolescence. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 34(1), 45–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2012.09.003>
- Padilla-Walker, L. M., Carlo, G., & Nielson, M. G. (2015). Does helping keep teens protected? Longitudinal bidirectional relations between prosocial behavior and problem behavior. *Child development*, 86(6), 1759–1772. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12411>
- Senter, M. S. (2023). The Impact of social relationships on college student learning during the pandemic: implications for sociologists. *Teaching Sociology*, 52(1), 39–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092055x231178505>
- Sotnik, G., Choporov, S., & Shannon, T. (2023). The role of social identity in a population's adoption of prosocial Common-Pool behavior. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, 26(3). <https://doi.org/10.18564/jasss.5132>
- Wentzel, K. R. (2012). School adjustment. *Handbook of Psychology, Second Edition*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118133880.hop207010>