

# HAYEF: Journal of Education

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

## Predictive Power of Prosocial Behaviors of Mothers and Their Parental Attitudes on 48- to 72-Month-Old Children's Prosocial Behaviors

Ayşe ÇUBUKÇU<sup>1</sup> , Pınar BAĞÇELİ KAHRAMAN<sup>2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Unit Manager, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, Yuvamız Istanbul Children Activity Center, Istanbul, Türkiye

<sup>2</sup>Assoc. Prof. Dr., Department of Primary Education, Preschool Education Program, Bursa Uludag University, Faculty of Education, Bursa, Türkiye

### Abstract

This research is carried out to determine the predictive status of parental attitudes and prosocial behaviors of mothers and the age variable on 48- to 72-month-old children's prosocial behaviors. For this purpose "Personal Information Form" in which demographic information of the sample takes place, "Child Prosocialness Scale—Mother and Teacher Form", "Adult Prosocialness Scale—Mother Form" and "Parent Attitude Scale" were utilized. The sample of the research consists of 198 preschool children, who study in independent kindergarten and official nursery classes, in the central province of Bursa and the mothers and teachers of these children. According to the results of the research, it was determined that the gender variable did not indicate any difference regarding the prosociality of children. In addition, it was observed that the duration of preschool education did not have any effect on child prosociality. Unlike the results of these findings, it was revealed that the age variable indicated a significant difference regarding the prosocial scores of children in favor of the 60- to 72-month-old group. Pearson Correlation Analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between child prosocialness, mother, and teacher form sub-dimensions of parental attitude, adult prosocialness, child's gender, and age variable. Among the scales and sub-dimensions, it was determined that age, adult prosocialness, and authoritarian attitude were related to child prosocialness. A multiple hierarchical regression model was conducted in order to determine to what extent the variables affect child prosocialness, considering these four dimensions that are related. As a result of the research, the authoritarian attitude, adult's prosocialness, and age-predicted child's prosocialness were determined.

**Keywords:** Parental attitude, preschool period, prosocial behavior,

### Introduction

The development process that occurs with the cycle of growth, maturation, and readiness is defined as physiological changes from birth to death. In early childhood, which is the period when development is the fastest, children's cognitive, physical, and language development progress rapidly and children begin to develop behavior patterns by getting to know themselves and their environment. The behaviors described as prosocial occur and develop in the early childhood period. Via the interaction of children with their environment and the synthesis of biologically existing factors in children, the foundation of prosocial behavior is laid (Bayhan & Artan, 2007; Eisenberg et al., 2015; Santrock, 2016).

Prosocial behavior, also known as positive social behavior, refers to the behaviors that an individual performs for the benefit of another person without any obligation (Eisenberg, 2003; Eisenberg et al. 2007). Prosocial behavior is composed of the main factors such as altruism, empathy, sympathy, and perspective taking (Bağcı, 2015). Among these factors, the concept of altruism is defined as the behaviors that an individual performs for another person, which benefits the other person and is performed without waiting for a response (Mater, 1993). Empathy, on the other hand, is defined as interpreting emotions by putting oneself in somebody else's position in order to understand the thoughts of

others and what they feel (Clarke, 2003). Another factor is the concept of sympathy and although it is confused with empathy, they are actually opposite concepts. While empathy is an effort to understand others, a biased perspective is presented in sympathy skills. In sympathy, participation is a matter with the influence of emotions rather than understanding the person (Dökmen, 2013; Eisenberg, 2020; Wispé, 1986). The concept of taking perspective is also a front step that allows the use of empathy and sympathy skills. It is expressed as the ability to perceive others' moods and to understand the uneasy situation they are in (Eisenberg et al. 2007; Griesse, 2011).

While the researchers investigating the factors that influence the development of prosocial behaviors consider the emergence of prosocial behaviors beginning from a young age as biological origin, they attributed these behaviors indicating different developmental in every individual to environmental factors (Bağcı, 2015; Schroeder, 1995). Researches revealed that prosocial behaviors develop in direct proportion to the ages of children. The maturing child begins to show behavioral changes in the development process and these behavioral changes increase the social skills of the child in parallel with the socialization process and provide a basis for the development of prosocial behaviors (Avcıoğlu, 2007; Fabes, 1999). There are also studies that determined that gender (Kirschner & Tomasello, 2010; Wan et al., 2019; Yoleri

This study was made from the first author's master's thesis in 2019.

**Corresponding Author:** Ayşe ÇUBUKÇU, E-mail: cubukcuayse@gmail.com

**Cite this article as:** Çubukçu, A., & Bağçeli Kahraman, P. (2023). Predictive power of prosocial behaviors of mothers and their parental attitudes on 48- to 72-month-old children's prosocial behaviors. *HAYEF: Journal of Education*, 20(2), 170-176.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License  
Available online at <https://hayefjournal.org>

& Seven, 2014), socioeconomic status, and culture affect children's prosocial behaviors (Deckers et al., 2017; Kosse et al., 2020; Köster et al., 2016). Yazgan İnanç et al., 2015 state that another factor, which affects the individual's prosocial behaviors, is educational environment. Providing proper educational environments, especially in the preschool period, contributes positively to the child's self-knowledge and cooperation with other peers.

The first environment in which the child begins to socialize is the family. Many variables such as parents being role models for children, their attitudes toward behavior, and reward–punishment approaches are effective in the development of prosocial behaviors. Considering this situation, parents' attitudes in raising children are also very important (Carlo et al., 1999; Grusec, 2011; Yavuzer, 2012). Parents draw different road maps in their minds when their children are born, and every parent tries to direct their child accordingly, just as they want them to have. Sometimes they use reinforcers, sometimes they use disciplinary methods, and they develop different attitudes in accordance with their expectations and goals (Baumrind, 1971; Grusec & Danyliuk, 2014). Among these attitudes, the authoritarian attitude is suppressive, limiting, and compelling to obey the rules of parents unconditionally. Authoritarian or, in other words, oppressive and strict parents set some precise and unchangeable rules for their children and force them to stay in this pattern built by them. Parents with a democratic attitude set the rules and the boundaries with their children. Parents, who are compassionate and sensitive to their children, prepare the children for independence and communicate strongly with the children. Children, whose parents are democratic, become individuals who can make decisions on their own, they are self-confident and have high social skills and also they feel responsible. In another attitude, which is a tolerant attitude, parents take care of their children personally, but control and rules are almost nonexistent. They accept their children's requests without question; their children always act according to their own wishes. Parents with a negligent attitude do not feel any responsibility for their children. Inconsistent parents, who have unstable behaviors, sometimes accept the requests of their children and sometimes prefer to punish them (Baumrind, 1972; Derman & Başal, 2013; Leyendeckera et al., 2011; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Sümer et al., 2010).

Prosocial (positive social) behaviors, which are one of the basic elements of social behavior, are positive behaviors indicated spontaneously without any expectations. Prosocial behaviors started to be examined in the 1990s have also been the subject of many different studies on what kind of changes are revealed in the preschool period. In the literature, there are various studies related to prosocial behaviors mostly with adolescents and preservice teachers (Acar-Bayraktar et al., 2019; Aktaş & Güvenç, 2006; Çalık et al., 2009; Duru, 2002; Gözün-Kahraman & Kurt, 2013; Greitemeyer, 2009; Olagundoye et al., 2018;

Pratt et al., 2004; Quain et al., 2016; Sünbül & Sonay Güçray, 2016). In their study, which was carried out in eight different countries, 57 determined that the prosocial behaviors of 9-year-old children were directly proportional to the quality of the relationship between parents and children. Unlike these studies, there are also studies that investigate the relationship between prosocial behaviors of preschool children and their social skills, parental acceptance–rejection, cognitive, social, and emotional development, moral and social rule perceptions, temperament, biological factors, and emotion regulation skills (Acar, 2013; Bağcı, 2015; Edwards et al., 2005; Eisenberg et al., 1995; Eisenberg et al., 2019; Gülay, 2011; Knafo & Plomin, 2006; Özcan, 2017; Reio et al., 2002; Vaish et al., 2009; Williams & Berthelsen, 2017; Yenidede, 2018; Yoleri & Seven, 2014; ; Zhu et al., 2015; Zimmer-Gembeck et al., 2005). In addition, within the literature there are also studies that provide training to families, children, and teachers on prosocial behaviors ((Irving, 1988), examining prosocial behaviors via the conduction of empathy programs (Özer, 2016), and assessing the influence of illustrated children's books on the prosocial behavior of children (Uzmen & Mağden, 2002).

When studies were examined; no studies investigating the relationship between mothers' child-rearing attitudes and prosocial behaviors and their children's prosocial behaviors were found. This research is important in terms of determining the level of prosociality of children in the 48- to 72-month-old group and revealing the effects of preschool education, age, gender, mother, and teacher prosociality on the prosocial of children. In addition, it will be determined whether there is a relationship between the mother's and teacher's views regarding the same child's prosocial behaviors, thus the consistency of the teacher's and the mother's views will be examined. Therefore, this study aims to reveal the effects of the mother's parental attitudes and prosocial behaviors and the variables of the child's age, gender, and preschool education period on the prosocial behaviors of 48- to 72-month-old children.

To achieve this aim in the research, answers were searched to the following questions:

1. Do the prosocial behavior scores of 48- to 72-month-old children differ according to age?
2. Is there a relationship between mother and teacher forms of child prosociality?
3. Do the behaviors and prosocial behaviors of mothers predict the prosocial behaviors of children?
4. To what extent do the variables, which predict the prosocial behaviors of 48- to 72-month-old children, predict the prosocial behaviors of children?

## Method

### Research Design

In this study, in which the effects of parents' parental attitudes and prosocial behaviors on the prosocial behaviors of 48- to 72-month-old preschool children were examined, a relational screening model was used, which is one of the quantitative research methods that examined the co-variation of two or more variables (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012).

The relational survey model, which is one of the quantitative research methods that examine the covariance of two or more variables, was used in this study, in which the relationship between parental attitudes and prosocial behaviors of mothers and the prosocial behaviors of their 48- to 72-month-old preschool children and the predictive levels of the related variables were investigated. (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012).

### Study Group

The study group was chosen according to the “appropriate sampling” approach, which is one of the “non-random sampling” methods.

Table 1.  
Study Group

	Groups	Frequency (n)	Percentage
Gender	Male	103	52
	Female	95	48
Age	48–60 months	89	44.9
	60–72 months	109	55.1
Preschool education duration	1 year	96	48.5
	2+ years	102	51.5
Mother age	20–30	27	13.6
	31–40	142	71.7
	41+	29	14.6
Mother education status	Elementary	22	11.1
	High school	69	34.8
	University	107	54.0

In the appropriate sampling method, units are selected according to their accessible and applicable conditions due to material and moral restrictions (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012).

Since the sample range to support the research findings is difficult to reach due to time and distance limitations; the random sampling method was preferred for this research, and units that could be assumed as equal were selected in this direction.

The study group consists of 198 children in the kindergartens and nursery classes in Nilüfer and Osmangazi districts in the city of Bursa, and their mothers in the 2017–2018 academic year. 52% of the children participating in the research are male and 48% are female. In addition, 44.9% of children were 48–60 months old and 55.1% of them were 60–72 months old. In addition, 48.5% of those who have 1 year of pre-school education; those who have two years or more had 51.5% distribution. Considering the demographic information of mothers, 13.6% of mothers were at the age of 20–30 years, 71.7% of mothers were at the age of 31–40 years, and 14.6% of mothers were at the age of 41 years and more, and according to mothers' education level mothers who had primary education graduation indicated 11.1%, high school graduates indicated 34.8%, and university graduates indicated 54% distribution. Before starting the data analysis, it was checked whether all variables indicated normal distribution, and the data numbered 187 and 146 were excluded because they had extreme values. Therefore, the analysis process, which started with 200 data, was continued with 198 data.

#### Data Collection Tools

In the research, the Child Prosocialness Scale, Adult Prosocialness Scale, and Parental Attitudes Scale were used.

**Child Prosocialness Scale.** “Child Prosocialness Scale,” which was developed and validity and reliability studies were performed by Bağcı (2015), was created based on Child Rating Questionnaire developed by Strayer (1985) and formed by Bower and also Prosocial Behavior Questionnaire developed by Weir et al., (1980). The “Child Prosocialness Scale—Mother Form” consisted of 21 one-dimensional items, and the “Child Prosocialness Scale—Teacher Form” consisted of 22 one-dimensional items. The reliability coefficient of the mother form was found as 91) and the reliability coefficient of the teacher form was found as 96 by Bağcı (2015). The “Child Prosocialness Scale”, which was scored by both teacher and mother, was ranked according to the frequency of 1 (never) to 5 (always) in a 5-point Likert type. The high scores obtained from the scale state that the prosocial behaviors of children are high.

Within the scope of the research, the reliability of the “Child Prosocialness Scale” was examined; the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Mother Form was found as 90; it was determined as 97 for the teacher form. Accordingly, it can be stated that the “Child Prosocialness Scale” is reliable for this research group.

**Adult Prosocialness Scale.** “Adult Prosocialness Scale” which was developed and validity and reliability studies were conducted by Bağcı (2015), was developed by Caprara et al., (2005). The high scores obtained from the scale reveal that prosocial behaviors are high.

The “Adult Prosocialness Scale—Mother Form” consists of 16 one-dimensional items. The reliability coefficient of the scale, which was ranked according to the frequency between 1 (never) and 5 (always) in 5-point Likert type, was found as 70 by Bağcı (2015). As a result of the analysis made for this research, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of the “Adult Prosocialness Scale” was determined as 85. Accordingly, it can be stated that the scale is reliable for this research.

**Parental Attitude Scale.** “Parental Attitude Scale” was developed by 42 to determine the parenting behavior of parents who have children between the ages of 2 and 6. The scale consists of 46 items in the 5-point Likert types, ranging from 1 (always) to 5 (never), and consists of four sub-dimensions: “democratic, authoritarian, overprotective and permissive”.

According to the results of the reliability analysis conducted by researchers, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of sub-dimensions was determined as 83 for democratic attitude, 76 for authoritarian attitude, 75 for overprotective attitude, and 74 for permissive attitude.

As a result of the reliability analysis conducted within the scope of this research, Cronbach's alpha values of sub-dimensions were determined as 87 for “democratic attitude,” 79 for “authoritarian attitude,” 82 for “overprotective attitude,” and 72 for “permissive attitude.” In this regard, it can be stated that all sub-dimensions are reliable for the research group.

#### Data Collection Process

Necessary permissions were obtained from the developers regarding the use of scales determined by the researcher, and then passed through the Bursa Uludag University Ethics Committee (November 24, 2017, 2017/16) process and sent to the Bursa Provincial Directorate of National Education for application permission. After obtaining approval from the Bursa Provincial Directorate of National Education, the data collection process was started by going to the schools beginning from December 2018 with the permission document received. In the interviewed schools, firstly the necessary approval was obtained from school administrators, and then the teachers of classes who complied with the age criteria were interviewed. Firstly teachers were asked to deliver the “Personal Information Form,” “Adult Prosocialness Scale,” “Child Prosocialness Scale,” and “Parental Attitude Scale” to mothers on a voluntary basis. Besides the scales, a written form was sent to mothers as well, explaining the scope of the research, and it was stated that when they fill in the scales, their children would be evaluated by their teachers, but no interviews would be held with the children and their information would be kept confidential. Codes were given to mothers and children. In addition, teachers were given a “Child Prosocialness Scale—Teacher Form” for each form filled by mothers. Two hundred sixty forms were handed, and feedback was received from 200 forms.

#### Data Analysis

The data obtained from the study were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences 22.0 program. In this study, in which the relationship between preschool children's prosocial behaviors and parental attitudes and prosocial behaviors was examined, firstly descriptive statistics of the variables were determined and it was checked whether all the data were filled completely or not. Then, the normality of distribution was examined in terms of all variables, scales, and sub-dimensions, and it was determined that the data numbers 187 and 146 were at extreme values and these were extracted. Therefore, the analysis process, which started with 200 data, continued with 198 data.

As is seen in Table 2, skewness kurtosis values of all scales and their sub-dimensions are between -1 and +1 values and indicate normal distribution (Büyüköztürk, 2011). Since child prosocial behaviors were examined with regard to both mother and teacher perspectives, both mother and teacher forms of the Child Prosocialness Scale were included in the analysis. In addition, Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between child prosocialness mother and teacher form, sub-dimensions of parental attitude, adult prosocialness, child's gender, and age variable. Among the scales and sub-dimensions, it was found that age, adult prosocialness, and authoritarian attitude were related to child prosocialness. A multiple

Table 2.  
*Normality Distributions of All Scales and Subscales*

Variables	$\bar{X}$	<i>S</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis
Adult Prosocialness Scale	66.08	6.96	-.382	-.009
Child Prosocialness Scale	77.63	11.72	-.356	.430
Teacher Prosocialness Scale	83.11	16.38	-.630	.547
Permissive Attitude	34.15	4.65	-.180	-.289
Protective Attitude	21.41	6.14	.436	-.339
Democratic Attitude	26.74	7.31	.889	.304
Authoritarian Attitude	45.38	5.25	-.714	.364

hierarchical regression model was conducted in order to determine to what extent the variables affect child prosocialness regarding these four dimensions that are related. The reason for using multiple hierarchical regression was to determine the variables that explain the child's prosocialness best, which is the dependent variable. Before conducting the multiple hierarchical regression model, it was checked whether the data indicated multicollinearity. Correlation values meeting multiple connection conditions, tolerance values (lowest .965), and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values (highest 1.037) were checked, and it was determined that there was no multiple connection problem (Büyüköztürk, 2011). In addition, Mahalanobis distances were examined and it was determined whether they were extreme values or not. Determining that all the assumptions required to implement the model were provided, Multiple Hierarchical Regression was performed.

### Findings

In this part of the study, the factors affecting the prosocial behavior of preschool children are examined.

Considering Table 3, it is seen that there is a moderate positive linear relationship between child prosocial behaviors and adult prosocial behaviors ( $r=.324$ ;  $p < .01$ ). At the same time, there is a weak positive linear relationship between the scores of Child Prosocialness Scale and the teacher prosocialness scale ( $r=.198$ ;  $p < .01$ ). In addition, when the scores of child prosocialness and parental attitudes are analyzed, it is seen that there is a weak positive linear relationship between authoritarian attitude and child prosocialness ( $r=.239$ ;  $p < .01$ ).

When the results of the stepwise regression analysis in Table 4 were analyzed, it was seen that the first stable age corresponded to 6.5% of the variance ( $F(1-196)=13.57$ ;  $p < .05$ ). When adult prosocialness, which was the second stable, was included in the analysis, the influence rate on variance increased to 16.6% ( $F(1-195)=19.46$ ;  $p < .05$ ). When the third stable, authoritarian attitude, was included in the analysis, it was seen that the stables corresponded 19.4% of the total variance ( $F(1-194)=15.52$ ;  $p < .05$ ).

### Discussion and Results

In this study, which aims to examine the predictive status of the 48- to 72-month-old preschool children's mothers' prosocial behaviors, their parental attitudes, and child's age, it was determined that

Table 4.  
*Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Regarding Child Prosocialness, Adult Prosocialness, and Authoritarian Attitude*

Child Prosocialness	<i>B</i>	SHB	<i>B</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$
(Stable)	68.35	2.64		25.849	13.579	.255a	.065	.060
Age	5.98	1.62	.255	3.685				
(Stable)	33.12	7.64		4.33	19.466	.408b	.166	.158
Age	5.84	1.53	.248	3.798				
Adult prosocialness	.537	.110	.319	4.876				
(Stable)	19.45	9.24		2.105	15.529	.440c	.194	.181
Age	5.34	1.52	.227	3.497				
Adult prosocialness	.498	.110	.296	4.541				
Authoritarian	.375	.147	.168	2.559				

Note: Dependent variable: child prosocialness. SHB: Standart Hata B.

<sup>a</sup>Predictor: (stable), age.

<sup>b</sup>Predictor: (stable), age, adult prosocialness.

<sup>c</sup>Predictor: (stable), age, adult prosocialness, authoritarian.

the authoritarian attitude, which is one of the parents' attitudes, adult prosocialness, and age predicted the child's prosocialness. It was determined that the level of all these variables predicting child prosocialness was 19% and the relationship between them was .44. In addition, it was determined that adult prosocialness affects child prosocialness at higher levels of compared to age and authoritarian attitude. As the parents' prosocial behaviors increase, the child's prosocial behaviors increase as well. In this case, it can be stated that mothers' prosocial behaviors affects their children's prosocial behaviors. In the study of Bağcı (2015), in which the relationship between child and adult prosocialness was examined, it was revealed that there was a positive relationship between both mother's and father's prosocial behavior scores and their children's prosocial behavior scores. Researches indicate that positive parental behaviors are associated with children's prosocial behaviors (Jeon & Neppel 2016; Pastorelli et al., 2016), and the application of emotional socialization activities of the parents is an important factor in this relationship (Acar-Bayraktar et al., 2019). Therefore, supportive social behaviors such as parent's playing, caring, and chatting affect the child's prosocial behaviors positively.

It is seen that the age of children has an effect on their prosocial behaviors. As the age increases, the social behaviors of children increase as well. Many studies in the literature reveal that the frequency of prosocial behaviors increases with age (Diener & Kim, 2004; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Olagundoye et al., 2018; Özdemir, 2010; Romano et al., 2005). Some studies in the literature contradict with the findings of this research. Zhu et al. (2015) examined the effect of intergroup competition on prosocial behaviors in terms of two age groups, 2.5–3.5 and 5.5–7.5. As a result of the research, it was seen that the 5.5–6.5 age group behaved more fair; it was observed that the 2.5–3.5 age group was more prosocial in intergroup competing. In studies in the literature and also in this study, in general, it was seen that prosocial behaviors increase as age increases. It can be thought that the self-perception that

Table 3.  
*Correlation Analysis Results Regarding Child Prosocialness*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Adult Prosocialness Scale	1	.324**	.198**	.057	-.083	.239**	-.012
Child Prosocialness Scale	.324**	1	-.036	.140*	-.255**	.140*	.170*
Teacher Prosocialness Scale	.198**	-.036	1	.043	-.053	.172*	.080
Permissive	.057	.140*	.043	1	-.233**	.272**	.204**
Democratic	-.083	-.255**	-.053	-.233**	1	-.437**	.030
Authoritarian	.239**	.140*	.172*	.272**	-.437**	1	.193**
Protective	-.012	.170*	.080	.204**	.030	.193**	1



increases with age, perspective on events, developing personality, and experiences gained affect the behaviors of children during events.

Considering the findings of the research, it was determined that there was a positive relationship between mothers' authoritarian attitudes and children's prosocial behaviors and authoritarian attitude had a significant effect on a child's prosocialness. Researches in the literature refer to the opposite of this situation. In Farrant et al.'s (2011) study, in which the importance of parenting practices regarding the development of prosocial behaviors of children, it was found that a warm and sensitive parenting style improves children's empathic point of view and facilitates the development of prosocial behaviors. In McGrath et al.'s (2003) research, in which the effect of peers and parents on the prosocial behavior of children at the age of 6, 8, and 10, it was revealed that the parenting style with a sensitive and positive attitude was positively associated with the prosocial behaviors of children and that the parenting style with a punitive attitude affected prosocial behaviors of the children negatively. In another study; Ogelman et al. (2013) examined the effects of maternal attitudes on children at the age of 5–6 and revealed a negative relationship between mothers with authoritarian attitudes and their children's behavior scores. In some studies, it was determined that authoritarian attitudes have effects on children such as having introversive and shy temperaments (Paulussen-Hoogbeem et al., 2008) and showing externalization behaviors (Jewell et al., 2008). Unlike the findings of this study, in Nicholson et al.'s (2005) study, in which the change of parental attitudes toward children's behaviors was investigated, it was revealed that the positive social behaviors of children between the ages of 2–5 do not differ according to their parental attitudes. It is also seen that in the literature, there are studies that are consistent with the findings of this study. In Fatima et al.'s (2020) study, in which they examined the relationship between adolescents' prosocial behaviors and parenting styles, it was found that fathers' authoritarian attitude positively predicted children's prosocial behaviors. In another study in which the target orientation of high school students was examined, Gonzales et al. (2002) concluded that authoritarian attitudes of mothers positively affect the performance of children and provided motivation. Baumrind (1972) states that parents' authoritarian attitude affects girls' self-confidence and independence. In Yağmurlu & Sanson's (2009) study, which was conducted regarding Austrian and Turkish children, it was stated that Austrian mothers' behaving warmly affects their children's prosocialness positively; on the other hand, it was determined that obedience expecting behavior of Turkish mothers positively affected the child prosocialness. In this study, it was determined that the authoritarian attitudes of mothers predicted the prosocial behaviors of their children. Kağıtçıbaşı (2010) states that the love and control of parents can be considered independent of each other, in Turkish family culture. In Turkish family culture, the authoritarian attitudes of parents can be considered together with love for their children, and this situation can be positively received by their children. Thus, the prosocial behaviors of children can increase. In this context, it can be stated that social values and cultural structure also affect the attitude toward raising children.

In this study, it was determined that gender did not have a relationship with child prosocialness. However, in some studies, it was concluded that girls are more collaborative, helpful, and therefore prosocial than boys (Kirschner & Tomasello, 2010; Yoleri & Seven, 2014). However, in the study of Wan et al. (2019) it was determined that Chinese boys are more prosocial than girls. From the past to the present, girls and boys have different gender roles due to social norms, and sociological and cultural structures. A number of gender stereotypes imposed on girls and boys can also influence the development of prosocial behaviors. Especially in early childhood, gender-related color, and toy choices, and also in the later ages, raising girls more emotionally and domestically and raising boys more freely and harder can direct the behaviors of individuals (Trawick-Swith, 2013).

A significant relation was found between teachers' level of determining the prosocial behaviors of children and mothers' prosocial behaviors. In this case, it is an expected result that mothers and teachers have similar opinions. It is seen that the view of parents and teachers about the child is similar. In this respect, it is thought that parents' perceiving their children positively is avoided.

The results obtained from this study are important in terms of revealing the effects of parents' prosocial behaviors, authoritarian attitudes, and the child's age on the prosocial behaviors of children in the Türkiye sample. In our country, it is observed that the studies carried out regarding prosocial behaviors in the preschool period are limited. The number of studies conducted regarding the factors affecting the prosociality of preschool children is not adequate both in Türkiye and abroad. Studies in the literature reveal contradictory results in terms of variables that affect children's prosociality.

The lack of studies also makes it difficult to make inferences about the variables that affect child prosociality. The findings of this study revealed the variables that are thought to have an effect on prosociality of preschool children. It can be stated that this study, which offers suggestions that can be studied on child prosociality, especially in the preschool period, contributes to the field, as well as leads to future studies.

With this study, it was determined that the prosocial behaviors of adults affect the prosocial behaviors of children. Although child prosocialness increases with age, parental prosocial behaviors affect the child's prosocialness in the early period. In this context, it is thought that it is important to organize training programs for parents to develop prosocial behaviors. Considering the fact that prosocial behaviors increase with age, the development of prosocial behaviors in early childhood can be examined via longitudinal studies in Türkiye sample. Researches can be conducted by considering variables such as cultural factors and socioeconomic level that are not discussed in this research.

**Ethics Committee Approval:** Ethics committee approval was received for this study from the ethics committee of Bursa Uludağ University (Date: November 24, 2017, Number: 2017/16).

**Informed Consent:** Written informed consent was obtained from patients/ patients' parents/ the parents of the patients/patient who participated in this study.

**Peer-review:** Externally peer-reviewed.

**Author Contributions:** Concept – A.Ç., P.B.-K.; Design – A.Ç.; Supervision – P.B.-K.; Resources – A.Ç.; Materials – A.Ç.; Data Collection and/or Processing – A.Ç.; Analysis and/or Interpretation – A.Ç., P.B.-K.; Literature Search – A.Ç.; Writing Manuscript – A.Ç., P.B.-K.; Critical Review – A.Ç., P.B.-K.

**Declaration of Interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

**Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency.

## References

- Acar-Bayraktar, A. V., Cakmak, Z., & Saritas-Atalar, D. (2019). Parenting and children's prosocial and problem s in middle childhood: The role of Turkish mothers' emotion socialization practices. *Social Development*, 28(2), 333–346. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Acar, G. (2013). *Predictors of preschool children's peer interactions: Temperament and prosocial* [Master's Thesis]. Lincoln: Faculty of the Graduate College at the University of Nebraska.

3. Aktaş, V., & Güvenç, B. G. (2006). Kız ve erkek ergenlerde saldırgan ve olumlu sosyal davranışlar ile yaş, ilişkisel bağlam ve kişiler arası duyarlılık arasındaki ilişkiler. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2, 233–264.
4. Avcıoğlu, H. (2007). Sosyal becerileri değerlendirme ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması (4–6 yaş). *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(2), 87–101.
5. Bağcı, B. (2015). *Çocuk ve yetişkin prososyallik ölçeklerinin geçerlik güvenirlik çalışması ve çocuk ile anne baba prososyal davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Aydın: Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
6. Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, 4(1, Pt.2), 1–103. [CrossRef]
7. Baumrind, D. (1972). An exploratory study of socialization effects on black children: Some black-white comparisons. *Child Development*, 43(1), 261–267. [CrossRef]
8. Bayhan, P., & Artan, İ. (2007). *Çocuk gelişimi ve eğitimi*. Morpa Kültür Yayınları.
9. Büyükoztürk, Ş. (2011). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı* (14. Baskı). Pegem Akademi.
10. Büyükoztürk, Ş., Kılıç, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (13. Baskı). Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Caprara, G. V., Steca, P., Zelli, A., & Capanna, C. (2005). A new scale for measuring adults' prosocialness. *European Journal of psychological assessment*, 21(2), 77–89. [CrossRef]
- Çalık, T., Özbay, Y., Özer, A., Kurt, T., & Kandemir, M. (2009). İlköğretim okulu öğrencilerinin zorbalık statülerinin okul iklimi, prososyal davranışlar, temel ihtiyaçlar ve cinsiyet değişkenlerine göre incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 60(60), 555–576.
- Clarke, D. (2003). *Pro-social and anti-social behavior*. Psychology Press, Routledge.
- Deckers, T., Falk, A., Kosse, F., Pinger, P., & Schildberg-Hörisch, H. (2017). *Socioeconomic status and inequalities in children's iq and economic preferences*. Institute of Labor Economics. Retrieved from <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/208066/1/1670147231.pdf>
- Derman, M. T., & Başal, H. A. (2013). Okulöncesi çocuklarında gözlenen davranış problemleri ile ailelerinin anne-baba tutumları arasındaki ilişki. *Amasya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(1), 115–144.
- Diener, M. L., & Kim, D. Y. (2004). Maternal and child predictors of preschool children's social competence. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 25(1), 3–24. [CrossRef]
- Dökmen, Ü. (2013). *Sanatta ve günlük yaşamda iletişim çatışmaları ve empati* (51. Baskı). Remzi Kitabevi.
- Duru, E. (2002). *Öğretmen adaylarının kişi-durum yaklaşımı bağlamında yardım etme davranışı, empati ve düşünme stilleri ilişkisi ve bu değişkenlerin bazı psikososyal değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* [Doktora tezi]. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi eğitim bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Edwards, C. P., de Guzman, M. R. T., & Carlo, G. (2005). Prosocial s in context: A study of the Gikuyu children of Ngecha Kenya. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 26, 542–558. [CrossRef]
- Eisenberg, N. (2000). Emotion, regulation, and moral development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51(1), 665–697. [CrossRef]
- Eisenberg, N. (2003). Prosocial, empathy, and sympathy. In M. H. Bornstein, L. Davidson, C. L. M. Keyes & K. A. Moore (Eds.). *Well-Being: Positive development across the life course* (pp. 253–265). Earlbaum.
- Eisenberg, N., Carlo, G., Murphy, B., & Van Court, P. (1995). Prosocial development in late adolescence: A longitudinal study. *Child Development*, 66(4), 1179–1197. [CrossRef]
- Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. (1998). Prosocial development. In W. Damon & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Social, Emotional, and Personality Development* (pp. 701–778). Wiley.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L. (2007). Prosocial development. In *Handbook of child psychology*, 3. [CrossRef]
- Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T. L., & Knafo-Noam, A. (2015). Handbook of child psychology and developmental science: Socioemotional processes, chap. *Prosocial Development*, 2015, 610–656.
- Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T. L., Taylor, Z. E., & Liew, J. (2019). Relations of inhibition and emotion-related parenting to young children's prosocial and vicariously induced distress. *Child Development*, 90(3), 846–858. [CrossRef]
- Fabes, R. A., Carlo, G., Kupanoff, K., & Laible, D. (1999). Early adolescence and prosocial/ moral I: The role of individual processes. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 19(1), 5–16. [CrossRef]
- Farrant, B. M., Devine, T. A. J., Maybery, M. T., & Fletcher, J. (2012). Empathy, perspective taking and prosocial behavior: The importance of parenting practices. *Infant and Child Development*, 21(2), 175–188. [CrossRef]
- Fatima, S., Dawood, S., & Munir, M. (2020). Parenting styles, moral identity and prosocial s in adolescents. *Current Psychology*. [CrossRef]
- Gonzalez, A. R., Doan Holbein, M. F., & Quilter, S. (2002). High school students' goal orientations and their relationship to perceived parenting styles. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 27(3), 450–470. [CrossRef]
- Gözün-Kahraman, Ö., & Kurt, G. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının olumlu sosyal ve saldırgan davranış eğilimlerinin incelenmesi. *Journal of Higher Education and Science/Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 3(3), 236–243.
- Greitemeyer, T. (2009). Effects of songs with prosocial lyrics on prosocial thoughts, affect, and behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(1), 186–190. [CrossRef]
- Griese, E. R. (2011). Prosocial as a protective factor for children's peer victimization. *Open access theses and dissertations from the College of Education and Human Sciences Education and Human Sciences, college of (CEHS). University of Nebraska*.
- Grusec, J. E. (2011). Socialization processes in the family: Social and emotional development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62, 243–269. [CrossRef]
- Grusec, J. E., & Danyliuk, T. (2014). Parents' attitudes and beliefs: Their impact on children's development. *Encyclopedia on early childhood development*. Retrieved from <http://www.child-encyclopedia.com/parenting-skills/according-experts/parentsattitudes-and-beliefs-their-impact-childrens-development>
- Gülay, H. (2011). Assessment of the prosocial s of young children with regard to social development, social skills, parental acceptance-rejection and peer relationships. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 38(3), 164–172.
- Hastings, P. D., McShane, K. E., Parker, R., & Ladha, F. (2007). Ready to make nice: Parental socialization of young sons' and daughters' prosocials with peers. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 168(2), 177–200. [CrossRef]
- Irving, V. (1988). *Promoting prosocial to nurture caring in head start teachers and children*. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED307053>
- Jeon, S., & Neppel, T. K. (2016). Intergenerational continuity in economic hardship, parental positivity, and positive parenting: The association with child behavior. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 30(1), 22–32. [CrossRef]
- Jewell, J. D., Krohn, E. J., Scott, V. G., Carlton, M., & Meinz, E. (2008). The differential impact of mothers' and fathers' discipline on preschool children's home and classroom. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 10(1).
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2010). *Benlik, aile ve insan gelişimi (kültürel psikoloji)* [Self, family and human development (cultural psychology)]. Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Karabulut-Demir, E., & Şendil, G. (2008). Ebeveyn tutum ölçeği (ETÖ). *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 11(21), 15–25.
- Kirschner, S., & Tomasello, M. (2010). Joint music making promotes prosocial in 4-year-old children. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31(5), 354–364. [CrossRef]
- Knafo, A., & Plomin, R. (2006). Prosocial from early to middle childhood: Genetic and environmental influences on stability and change. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(5), 771–786. [CrossRef]
- Kosse, F., Deckers, T., Pinger, P., Schildberg-Hörisch, H., & Falk, A. (2020). The formation of prosociality: Causal evidence on the role of social environment. *Journal of Political Economy*, 128(2), 434–467. [CrossRef]
- Köster, M., Cavalcante, L., de Carvalho, V. C., R., Dôgo Resende, B., & Kärtner, J. (2016). Cultural influences on toddlers' prosocial : How maternal task assignment relates to helping others. *Child Development*, 87(6), 1727–1738. [CrossRef]
- Leyendeckera, B., Jäkel, J., Kademoğlu, S. O., & Yagmurlu, B. (2011). Parenting practices and pre-schoolers' cognitive skills in Turkish immigrant and German families. *Early Child Development and Care*, 181(8), 1095–1110. [CrossRef]
- Maccoby, E. & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (4th ed). Wiley.
- Mateer, N. H. (1993). *Altruism in teachers: An exploratory study* [Dissertation]. PA: Penn State University.

- McGrath, M. P., Zook, J. M., & Weber-Roehl, L. (2003). Socializing prosocial in children: The roles of parents and peers. In S. P. Shohov (Ed.), *Advances in psychology research*, 20 (pp. 53–59). Nova Science Publishers.
- Nicholson, B. C., Fox, R. A., & Johnson, S. D. (2005). Parenting young children with challenging behavior. *Infant and Child Development*, 14(4), 425–428. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ogelman, H. G., Önder, A., Seçer, Z., & Erten, H. (2013). Anne tutumlarının 5–6 yaş çocuklarının sosyal becerilerini ve okula uyumlarının yordayıcı etkisi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 29, 143–152.
- Olagundoye, F. H., Fagbenro, D. A., & Kenku, A. A. (2018). Role of sociodemographic factors on prosocial behavior among fresh undergraduates in Nigeria. *IFE Psychologia: An International Journal*, 26(2), 146–152.
- Özcan, A. (2017). *Okul öncesi eğitim kurumuna devam eden 60–72 aylık çocukların ahlaki ve sosyal kural algıları prososyal davranışları ile duygu düzenleme becerileri arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Özdemir, Z. (2010). *Lise öğrencilerinin prososyal davranışlarının mizah, öfke, ve utangaçlık düzeylerine göre incelenmesi* [Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Özer, G. (2016). *Empati eğitim programının anaokulu çocuklarının empatik ve prososyal becerilerine etkisinin incelenmesi* [Doktora tezi]. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Pastorelli, C., Lansford, J. E., Luengo Kanacri, B. P., Malone, P. S., Di Giunta, L., Bacchini, D., Bombi, A. S., Zelli, A., Miranda, M. C., Bornstein, M. H., Tapanya, S., Uribe Tirado, L. M., Alampay, L. P., Al-Hassan, S. M., Chang, L., Deater-Deckard, K., Dodge, K. A., Oburu, P., Skinner, A. T., & Tapanya, S. (2016). Positive parenting and children's prosocial in eight countries. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 57(7), 824–834.
- Paulussen-Hoogbeem, M. C., Stams, G. J. J., Hermanns, J. M., Peetsma, T. T., & van den Wittenboer, G. L. (2008). Parenting style as a mediator between children's negative emotionality and problematic in early childhood. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 169(3), 209–226. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Pratt, M. W., Skoe, E. E., & Arnold, M. L. (2004). Care reasoning development and family socialisation patterns in later adolescence: A longitudinal analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28(2), 139–147. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Quain, S., Yidana, X. D., Ambotumah, B. B., & Mensah-Livivstone, I. J. N. A. (2016). Pro-social amongst students of tertiary institutions: An explorative and a quantitative approach. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(9), 26–33.
- Reio Jr., T. G., Maciolek, C. L., & Weiss, E. M. (2002). *The prevalence of anxiety and pro-social s in child-centered and basic skills preschool classrooms*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED476914>.
- Romano, E., Tremblay, R. E., Boulerice, B., & Swisher, R. (2005). Multilevel correlates of childhood physical aggression and prosocial behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 33(5), 565–578. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Santrock, J. W. (2016). *Yaşam boyu gelişim* (13. Basım; Çev. Ed. Yüksel, G.). Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Schroeder, D. A., Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., & Piliavin, J. A. (1995). *The psychology of helping and altruism* (P. G. Zimbardo, Ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Strayer, J. (1985). *Child rating questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada.
- Sümer, N., Gündoğdu Aktürk, E., & Helvacı, E. (2010). Anne-baba tutum ve davranışlarının psikolojik etkileri: Türkiye'de yapılan çalışmalara toplu bakış. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 42–59.
- Sünbül, Z. A., & Sonay Güçray, S. (2016). Ergenlerde olumlu sosyal davranışları yordamada koruyucu faktörler ve bazı kişisel değişkenlerin rolü. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 6(45), 101–114.
- Trawick-Swift, J. (2013). *Erken çocukluk döneminde gelişim: Çok kültürlü bir bakış açısı. (Early childhood development: A multicultural perspective)* (Çev. B. Akman, Ed.). Nobel Yayınları.
- Uzmen, S., & Mağden, D. (2002). Okul öncesi eğitim kurumlarında devam eden altı yaş çocuklarının prososyal davranışlarının resimli çocuk kitapları ile desteklenmesi. *M.Ü. Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 15, 193–212.
- Vaish, A., Carpenter, M., & Tomasello, M. (2009). Sympathy through affective perspective taking and its relation to prosocial in toddlers. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(2), 534–543. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Wan, Y., Fu, H., & Tanenhaus, M. K. (2019). Effects of coordination and gender on prosocial in 4-year-old Chinese children. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 26(2), 685–692. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Weir, K., Stevenson, J., & Graham, P. (1980). Behavioral deviance and teacher ratings of prosocial behavior. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 19, 68–77.
- Williams, K. E., & Berthelsen, D. (2017). The development of prosocial behavior in early childhood: Contributions of early parenting and self-regulation. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 49(1), 73–94. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Wispé, L. (1986). The distinction between sympathy and empathy: To call forth a concept, a word is needed. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(2), 314–321. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Yağmurlu, B., & Sanson, A. (2009). Parenting and temperament as predictors of prosocial behavior in Australian and Turkish Australian children. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 61(2), 77–88. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Yavuzer, H. (2012). *Doğum öncesinden ergenlik sonuna çocuk psikolojisi*. Remzi Kitabevi.
- Yazgan İnanc, B., Bilgin, M., & Kılıç Atıcı, M. (2015). *Gelişim psikolojisi: Çocuk ve ergen gelişimi*. Pegem Akademi.
- Yenidede, E. E. (2018). *60-72 aylık çocukların prososyal davranışlarına sosyal, duygusal ve bilişsel gelişimlerinin etkisinin incelenmesi* [Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. İstanbul: Maltepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Yoleri, S., & Seven, S. (2014). Analyzing effect of age and sex differences on prosocial behavior of preschool children. *International Journal of Social Science*, 29, 261–270.
- Zhu, Y., Guan, X., & Li, Y. (2015). The effects of intergroup competition on prosocial s in young children: A comparison of 2.5–3.5 year-olds with 5.5–6.5 year-olds. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 9, 16. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Geiger, T. C., & Crick, N. R. (2005). Relational and physical aggression, prosocial, and peer relations: Gender moderation and bidirectional associations. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 25(4), 421–452. [\[CrossRef\]](#)