

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND ASSERTIVENESS AS FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR AMONG NIGERIAN POLICE

NDUBISI, Ifesinachi Loveth

Department of Sociology/Psychology
Godfrey Okoye University, Enugu, Nigeria.

ISIWU, Prisca Ifeoma*

Department of Sociology/Psychology
Godfrey Okoye University, Enugu, Nigeria.

OGBUKA, Ikenna Matthew

Department of Political Science and
International Relations
Godfrey Okoye University, Enugu, Nigeria.

Correspondence: pisiwu@gouni.edu.ng

Abstract

The study examines emotional intelligence and assertiveness as factors that influence prosocial behavior among Nigerian Police. One hundred and twenty-two (122) police officers comprising of 78 males and 44 females (mean age = 36.8, SD = 9.68) selected from police stations in Enugu metropolis participated in the study. A questionnaire comprising demographic information and three scales: Prosociality Scale; emotional Intelligence Scale and Assertiveness Schedule was used for data collection. Hierarchical multiple regression was used for analysis of data. Results reveal emotional intelligence ($\beta = .327$, $t = 3.65$, $p < .05$) and assertiveness ($\beta = .273$, $t = 2.85$, $p < .05$) as factors that significantly influence prosocial behavior among the Nigerian Police. Useful implications and conclusion were made.

Key Words: Prosocial behavior, emotional intelligence, assertiveness

Introduction

Obvious cases of police brutality and consequential Nigerians lack of confidence in

the Nigerian Police is evidenced in the 2020 demand for an end to a unit of Nigerian Police force known as Special Anti-Robbery Squad (SARS). The “EndSARS” protest seems to be an indicator of low prosocial behavior among the Nigerian Police. Prosocial behavior has been variously conceptualized. Afolabi (2013) views prosocial behaviors as voluntary actions that are put in place to help another individual or set of people. It is voluntary behaviour that is intended to benefit another without expectation of external reward, (Eisenberg et al., 2010). It plays positive role in promoting mental health of those who engage in it and receive it, as well as in the development of human society (Kou et al., 2007; Yang et al., 2016; Anowor and Ogbe, 2019; El-Khodary & Samara, 2019). Hence, prosocial behavior among Nigerian Police will obviously promote their psychosocial wellbeing. However, people seem to live in a selfish environment in which they seek personal accomplishments and ignore others (Finkelstein, 2010;). Low prosocial behavior could have negative effects on personal and social lives of individuals (Carlo et al., 2014). It could also lead to an imbalance in social relations, (McDonald, et al., 2011; Onodugo et al, 2014), increases in level of violence and aggression (McMahon et al, 2013) as well as crimes (Hamalainen & Pulkkinen, 1995). Hence, the need for improvement of prosocial behavior among Nigerian police. Studies have examined the two main factors (external social factors and internal individual factors) affecting Prosocial behavior, (Xiao et al., 2014; Wentzel et al., 2007; Yuan et al., 2019)/ However, there is paucity of studies on influence of internal individual factors particularly emotional intelligence and assertiveness on prosocial behavior among the Nigerian police.

Emotional intelligence has been linked to prosocial behavior, (Bentacur-Arias, 2022; Marti-Vilar, et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2021; Ayooluwa & Olubango, 2019). Emotional intelligence (EI) is the ability of individuals to monitor their own and others' emotions, and to identify and use this information to guide their thoughts and behaviors (Salovey & Mayer, 1989). Vrbach and Foster (2002) studied the relationship between emotional components (identifying others' emotions, emotional regulation) and social components (relationship quality and prosocial behavior) and found that the ability to identify others' emotions is correlated positively with prosocial behavior but negatively with aggressive behavior. In the need-awareness stage of prosocial behavior, the individual pays attention to whether others need help and this involves the perception and evaluation of the emotional perception and expression ability of emotional intelligence on the environment of others and the emotions of others (Wang, et al. 2021). Simultaneously, after determining that the other person needs help, the individual needs to choose whether to help the seeker. At this time, the understanding and management dimensions of emotional intelligence are called on so the individual can organize and analyze the information they have and assess whether their intentions to engage in prosocial behavior are in line with the current situation (Xu & Li, 2020). Emotional management dimension of emotional intelligence also plays a significant role in the final stage of connection between intentions and behavior (Glazer, 2021). Therefore, in the process of prosocial behavior production, emotional intelligence plays an important role. The higher a person's emotional intelligence, the stronger their emotional perceptions of others will be, and the higher the probability that they will engage in prosocial behavior (Wang, et al., 2021). This is supported by numerous studies, (Marc et al., 2004; Marti-Vilar et al., 2019; Mayer & Salovey 2000; Kaltwasser et al., 2016)). Charbonneau and

Nicol (2002) found that emotional intelligence is positively correlated with good social relations and has a significant predictive effect on prosocial behavior. Individuals with high emotional intelligence show more prosocial behavior, better empathy, and fewer negative behaviors in interactions with peers (Ciarrochi et al., 2002; Mavroveli and Sánchez-Ruiz, 2011). Ogunboyede and Agokei (2016) also discovered that emotional intelligence acting alongside assertiveness positively influenced prosocial behavior. Therefore, there is empirical support for the association between emotional intelligence and prosocial behavior.

Among other variables known to relate with prosocial behavior is assertiveness, (Siddiqui, et al., (2021); Ogunboyede & Agokei (2016)). Assertiveness is a skill that involves speaking and acting with power while maintaining respect for others, instead of passively giving up power or aggressively demanding it (Wesley, et al., 2008). Assertive communication is appropriately direct, open and honest, clarifies one's needs to the other person. In conflict situations, one may choose to be passive or aggressive, but an assertive response is invariably the preferable one, and leads to win-win situations where both parties feel good about themselves (Bishop, 2010). Assertiveness encompasses multidimensional aspects of human expression, including behaviour, cognition and affect (Yong, 2010). Assertiveness is seen as the ability to express one's own thoughts and feelings, and defend one's own right to behave in certain ways without violating the rights of others (Alberti & Emmons, 1974; Galassi & Galassi, 1977). It is the expression of social boldness by which an individual claims right, and voices out true feelings in social settings in ways that would maximize reinforcement (Onyeizugbo, 2001, 2003). Assertiveness therefore implies ability to express one's thoughts and feelings with confidence, without having to resort to passive, aggressive, or manipulative behaviours. Its communication involves respect for the

boundaries of oneself and others which presumes an interest in the fulfillment of needs and wants through cooperation (Kalu et al, 2014; Gottman, 2000).

Statement of the Problem

Low prosocial behavior among the Nigerian Police is evidenced in seemingly high rate of cases of police brutality and nonchalant attitude among the Nigerian Police. The low prosocial behavior could be reason for likely poor psychosocial wellbeing among the Nigerian Police as well as seemingly high rate of crimes such as kidnapping and murder targeted against the Nigerian Police. Therefore, improving prosocial behavior among Nigerian Police will significantly improve their mental health, curb police brutality and ensure better protection of the citizens. Therefore, studying of variables that may influence their prosocial behavior becomes necessary. Afolabi, (2014) identified self-social dominance, self-concept, effects of mood, environment, residential mobility, spirituality, and narcissism as variables that influence prosocial behavior. Zahn-Waxler, et al., (1992) also noted that motivations for being prosocial is that through helping and volunteering, people can satisfy their own needs, learn about and express their values, understand their world, gain career-related experience, strengthen social competence and relationships. However, there is limited study on emotional intelligence and assertiveness as factors that influence prosocial behavior among Nigerian Police. Moreover, numerous studies (Marti-Vilar, et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2021; Charbonneau & Nicol, 2002; Akelaitis & Lisinskiene (2018); Siddiqui, et al., 2021) have been conducted on the variables of interest in different parts of the world and population yet few has been conducted among the Nigerian Police. In this light, this study sought to examine if emotional intelligence and assertiveness as factors that influence prosocial behavior among the Nigerian Police in order to provide answers to the following questions:

- Will emotional intelligence significantly influence prosocial behavior among Nigerian Police?
- Will assertiveness significantly influence prosocial behavior among Nigerian Police?

Purpose of the study

The aim of this study is therefore, to empirically examine emotional and assertiveness as factors that influence prosocial behavior among university students. However the following are specific objectives of the study:

- To determine whether emotional intelligence will significantly influence prosocial behavior among Nigerian Police.
- To examine whether assertiveness will significantly influence prosocial behavior among Nigerian Police.

A Brief Review of Related Literature

Emotional Intelligence and assertiveness as factors in prosocial behavior among Nigerian Police could be appreciated from Need to belong theory (Baumeister, 2012). Need to Belong Theory (Baumeister (2012) proposes that humans' minimum need for forming and maintaining social relationships drives human behaviour, emotion and cognition. The need to belong to groups makes people follow social norms and to act according to social standards, in order to feel accepted and integrated into the community. Several studies observed that excluded people are more likely to engage in aggressive, non-cooperative, and disruptive behaviours. For instance, excluded minorities result in less academic performance, more prone for violence and crime, and lack of engagement in prosocial activities (Baumeister, 2012). Therefore, the need to belong theory suggests that people are more likely to act

prosocially in order to feel included in the society.

The Need to belong theory was designed to assess individual differences in “the strength of the desire for acceptance and belonging”, and is the most well-known and used measure of the construct. Leary et al. (2013) argued that individuals scoring high in the need to belong regularly worry about acceptance and belonging. As a result, these concerns of being accepted and belonging lead them to engage in behaviors that are considered prosocial. The need to belong theory by Baumeister (2012) posits that that people are more likely to act prosocially in order to feel included in the society. People who feel included to groups are more likely to perform behaviors supported by existing social norms in order to ensure continuous inclusion as opposed to excluded minorities who result to more prone for violence and crime, and lack of engagement in prosocial activities.

Scholars have indicated the influence of emotional intelligence and assertiveness on prosocial behavior (e.g. Siddiqui, et al., (2021); Marti-Vilar, et al., 2022). For instance, Charbonneau and Nicol (2002) investigated the influence of emotional intelligence and prosocial behaviors in adolescents. 134 adolescents were involved in a 6-wk. training camp run by the military. It was discovered that ratings of emotional intelligence significantly correlated with scores on prosocial behaviors. Abera (2021), in a study of emotional intelligence and prosocial behavior as predictors of academic achievement among university students showed that emotional intelligence predicted prosocial behavior of students, whereas emotional intelligence did not predict academic achievement. Ogunboyede and Agokei (2016) investigated prosocial behavior of in-school adolescent: the prosocial influence of self-esteem, peer influence and parental involvement, using 300 randomly selected in-school adolescents in

Ibadan metropolis. They discovered that the three predictors contributed significantly to the prediction of prosocial behavior with assertiveness being a factor in self-esteem. Afolabi (2014) in their study to determine if self-esteem and family relations predict prosocial behavior and social adjustment of fresh students employing 294 fresh students found that assertiveness acting through self-esteem and family relations independently predicted prosocial behavior. Thus, present study hypothesizes that:

- 1) Emotional intelligence will significantly influence prosocial behavior among Nigerian Police.
- 2) Assertiveness will significantly influence prosocial behavior among Nigerian Police.

Research design, Participants and procedure

Cross-sectional survey design was adopted for the study. A questionnaire was used to collect data relating to prosocial behavior, emotional intelligence, assertiveness and demographic characteristics from Nigerian Police officers drawn from three (3) Police Stations out of 15 police stations in Enugu metropolis. The complete set of the instruments were administered to 150 police officers who agreed to participate in the study. Out of the 138 copies of the questionnaire that were returned from the original 150 distributed, 16 copies were discarded because they were completed incorrectly, leaving 122 copies that were completed correctly and used for data analysis. The questionnaire contained no provision for participant names in order to ensure anonymity of participants. The sample, therefore, consisted of 122 (78 males and 44 females). Police officers from three police stations in Enugu state that were drawn using cluster and simple random sampling techniques (balloting) for selection of police stations and availability sampling technique for selection of participants. Participant's ages ranged from

21-60 years with a mean age of 36.8 and SD of 9.68.

Measures

Prosociality scale: Prosocial behavior was measured with Prosociality Scale developed by Caprara et.al, (2005). The items in the scale refer to the tendency involved in prosocial behaviour such as cooperation and helping behaviour towards others. The scale includes 16 items, and these items are direct scored. This questionnaire was scored by a five-point Likert scale such as (5) strongly agree, (4) agree, (3) undecided, (2) disagree, (1) strongly disagree. The overall score refers to an individual's participation in prosocial behaviour. The higher scores on this questionnaire indicate a high level of prosocial behaviour. In the research conducted by Abdullah et al., (2020) using a Nigerian sample, the scale was shown to be highly reliable using the alpha-Cronbach coefficients (0.933).

Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS): Emotional intelligence was assessed with Emotional Intelligence Scale developed by Wong and Law (2002). The scale is a self-report questionnaire that assesses emotional intelligence. The Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale was developed and validated by Wong & Law and is based on Davies (1998) four-dimensional definition of emotional intelligence. There are 16 items on the scales which assess emotional intelligence competences in four areas; Self-Emotional Appraisal, Others-Emotions Appraisal, Use of Emotion and Regulation of Emotion. All items are direct scored. Respondents circle one of the five numbered response categories ranging from; (5) strongly agree, (4) agree, (3) undecided, (2) disagree, (1) strongly disagree. The developers obtained a Cronbach alpha consistency of 0.92. Acosta-Prado and Zarate-Torres (2019) reported an internal consistency of .82 and test-retest reliability of 0.68 and 0.62 for its six subscales. Makama, et al., (2019)

revalidated the scale for Nigerian use, using 71 students from Nigerian university. The reliability analysis of the pilot study shows Cronbach's alpha ranging from .72 to .85. It also showed a reliability coefficient of the composite variables to be .85.

Rathus Assertiveness Schedule: Assertiveness was measured with Rathus Assertiveness Schedule developed by (Rathus, 1973). The RAS is a standardized psychological assessment instrument developed by Rathus (1973). It is a 30- item inventory designed to assess assertive behaviour as a component of personality. and validated for use with Nigerian samples. It is a 30- item inventory designed to assess assertive behavior as a component of personality. The RAS requires participants to respond to items using ; (5) strongly agree, (4) agree, (3) undecided, (2) disagree, (1) strongly disagree. In terms of scoring, more than half of the items (1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 23, 24, 26, 30) are reverse scored, and a sum of the results of the direct and reverse scored items gives the client's overall score, which could range from +90 to -90. Previous research showed that RAS has high reliability (Del Grecoet, et al.,1986; Rathus, 1972, 1973), and high validity (Takashi, et al., 2003). Rathus (1973) reported a split-half reliability coefficient .77, and an eight-week interval test-retest coefficient .78, while Anumba (1995) using a Nigerian sample obtained a concurrent validity coefficient .25 by correlating RAS with Index of Peer Relations (IPR) (Hudson, et al., 1986).

Statistics

Analysis of data was done using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) IBM version 23 software. Regression analysis was used because the researcher intends to find out the level of interaction between each variable.

RESULT

Data obtained from participants were analyzed by computing the means, standard deviations

and correlations among the study variables (239, $p < .01$), and marital status ($r = -.201$, $p < .05$). Multiple regression was conducted to test the hypothesis. The variables were entered into the equation in models to test the extent to which they predicted prosocial behavior.

Table 1: Means, standard deviations, and correlations for demographic variables, emotional intelligence, and assertiveness on prosocial behavior

S/N	Variables	M	SD	1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8		
9	10	11				
1	Age	36.80	9.68			
2	Gender	1.36		.48	-.175	
3	Marital Status	1.70	.71	-.262**	-.024	
4	No. of children	1.07	1.37	.239**	-.061	-.201
5	Religious aff.	1.33	.64	-.033	-.092	-.332** .013
6	Ethnic Group	1.92	1.25	-.284**	-.047	.381**
7	Years of serv.	13.55	8.68	.092	-.072	-.200* -.105
8	Rank	2.98	1.22	-.104	-.055	-.047
9	EI	68.02	7.68	-.092	-.040	-.052
10	Assertive	121.26	13.41	-.006	-.026	.084
11	PB	66.34	6.59	.031	-.073	-.013
100		-.117	.022	-.060	.323**	.371**

Note: N=122, *= $p < .05$ (two tailed), **= $p < .01$ (two tailed), Age was coded in years, No. of children= Number of children; Religious aff.= Religious affiliation; Years of serv= Years of service; EI= Emotional intelligence; PB= Prosocial behavior; Gender was coded 1= male, 2= female; marital status was coded 1= married, 2= single, 3= divorced, 4= widowed; rank was coded 1= dsp, 2= acp, 3= sergeant, 4= cp; ethnic group was coded 1= igbo, 2= hausa, 3= Yoruba, 4= others; Religious affiliation was coded 1= Christian, 2= muslim, 3= traditional.

Result of the correlation table show that gender is significantly related to age ($r = -.175$, $p < .05$). Marital status is significantly related to gender ($r = -.262$, $p < .01$). Number of children is significantly related to age ($r =$

$r = .381$, $p < .01$), number of children ($r = -.171$, $p < .05$), and religious affiliation ($r = -.153$, $p < .05$). Years of service is significantly related to marital status ($r = -.241$, $p < .01$), number of children ($r = -.105$, $p < .05$), religious affiliation ($r = .374$, $p < .01$), and ethnic group ($r = .17$, $p < .05$). Rank is significantly related to age ($r = -.104$, $p < .05$), religious affiliation ($r = .214$, $p < .05$), ethnic group ($r = -.251$, $p < .01$), and years of service ($r = -.241$, $p < .01$). Assertiveness is significantly related to years of service ($r = .131$, $p < .05$), rank ($r = -.103$, $p < .05$), and emotional intelligence ($r = .413$, $p < .01$). Prosocial behavior is significantly related to religious affiliation ($r = -.100$, $p < .05$), ethnic group ($r = -.117$, $p < .05$), emotional intelligence ($r = .323$, $p < .01$), and assertiveness ($r = .371$, $p < .01$).

Table 2: Showing the prediction of 'prosocial behavior' from control variables, emotional intelligence and assertiveness.

	R ² Δ T	R B	R ² Beta (β)	
Model 1	.220 ^a		.048	-
.019				
Age		-.038*	-.056	-
.536				
Gender		-1.44	-.105	-
1.11				
Marital status		-.034	-.004*	-
.034				

No. of children			
.147	-.069*	-.014	-
Religious aff.			
1.37*	-1.57	-.152	-
Ethnic group			
-.964	-.183*	-1.70	
Years serv			of
	.052	.068	
	.632		
Rank			
.656*	-.369*	-.068	-
Model 2			
EI	.386 ^b	.149*	
	.081	.280*	
	.327	3.65	
Model 3			
Assertiveness	.455 ^c	.207*	
	.136	.134	
	.273*	2.85	

Note. N= 122, * = p< .05 (two tailed), ** = p<.01 (two tailed). No. of children= number of children; Religious aff. = religious affiliation; Years of serv = years of service; EI = Emotional intelligence.

Regression result in table 2 above indicated that of all the control variables, gender predicted prosocial behavior ($\beta = -.105$, $t = -1.11$, $p < .05$). Religious affiliation predicted prosocial

behavior ($\beta = -.152$, $t = -1.37$, $p < .05$). Ethnic group also predicted prosocial behavior ($\beta = .183$, $t = -1.70$, $p < .05$). But jointly, the control variables accounted for a less than 1% non-significant variance as a predictor of prosocial behavior ($R^2\Delta = -.019$, $p < .05$). Emotional intelligence entered in model two of the equation did significantly predict prosocial behavior ($\beta = .327$, $t = 3.65$, $p < .05$). It accounted for less than one significant variance as a predictor of prosocial behavior ($R^2\Delta = .081$, $p < .05$). Assertiveness was entered in model three of the equation. Regression results show that it significantly predicted prosocial behavior ($\beta = .273$, $t = 2.85$, $p < .05$). However, it accounted for a non-significant variance as a predictor of prosocial behavior ($R^2\Delta = .136$, $p < .05$). Assertiveness and Emotional intelligence were entered in Model four. They both accounted for a non-significant variance as a predictor of prosocial behavior ($R^2\Delta = .159$, $p < .05$).

Summary of Findings

- In the correlation result prosocial behavior was only significantly related to religious affiliation, ethnic group, emotional intelligence and assertiveness but not significantly related to gender, marital status, number of children, years of service and rank.
- Of all the control variables, only gender, religious affiliation and ethnic group significantly predicted prosocial behavior.
- Emotional intelligence significantly influenced prosocial behavior.
- Assertiveness significantly influenced prosocial behavior.

Discussion

The first hypothesis tested in the study which stated emotional intelligence will significantly influence prosocial behavior among the

Nigerian police was accepted. This finding implies that an officer who has a good understanding of their emotions as well as observe other's emotions would have a predisposition to engage in prosocial behavior. Hence, emotional intelligence is a variable that plays a role in encouraging prosocial behavior. This finding is consistent with the findings of Marti-Vilar, Trejos-Gil and Bentacur-Arias (2022) who discovered that emotional intelligence is the best predictor of prosocial behavior. It is also consistent with findings of Afolabi (2013) who discovered a significant positive relationship between emotional intelligence and prosocial behavior.

The second hypothesis stated that Assertiveness will significantly influence prosocial behavior was thereby accepted. This indicates that an officer who refuses to be taken advantage of as well as assertively starts conversations with new acquaintances or strangers would have a higher chance of engaging prosocial behavior. This finding is consistent with Siddiqui, et al., (2021), findings that there is a positive correlation between assertiveness and prosocial behavior. Similarly, Afolabi (2014) in a study discovered that assertiveness acting through self-esteem and family relations independently predicted prosocial behavior.

Implications of the study

The present study verified emotional intelligence as a factor that influence prosocial behavior among Nigerian Police. Hence, how police officers interpret emotions and act on it can foster their prosocial behavior. This study determined the relationship between emotional intelligence and prosocial behavior by adopting prosocial behavior as being able to help others, volunteer activities to help others and feeling what others feel. Therefore, police officers who understand peoples' emotions and interpret

emotions accordingly would practice prosocial behavior. Hence, the importance of Emotional Intelligence classes or trainings to police officers in Nigeria in order to decrease the rate of police brutality and increase goodness and kindness in the police force.

The findings equally showed that an officer who refuses to be taken advantage of as well as starts conversations assertively with new acquaintances or strangers would engage in prosocial behavior. Therefore, officers who know their rights and speak up both to civilians and their superiors would engage in prosocial behavior. Hence, the need for officers to take assertiveness training in order to improve their prosocial behavior.

Limitations of the study

One of the limitations of the study is the relatively small sample size and the fact that the study was limited only to police officers in police stations in Enugu metropolis.

Furthermore, self-report measures were used to assess prosocial behaviour, emotional intelligence and assertiveness and there is usually an issue of social desirability biases with such measures.

Moreover, the design of the study was cross-sectional survey and this could limit the result from being generalized as survey focuses on perception which could change depending on existing situation of the individual.

Directions for Future Research

Further studies in this area can use longitudinal approach which could reduce the challenges of survey design.

Future studies can also apply qualitative means such as interview and focus group discussion alongside self-report quantitative measures in

order to elicit quality data to address the objectives of the study better.

Summary/conclusion

This study investigates emotional intelligence and assertiveness as factors that influence prosocial behavior among the Nigerian Police. One hundred and twenty-two (122) participants participated in the study. Findings indicate that both variables are factors that influence prosocial behavior. Prosocial behavior among Nigerian Police remained paramount as it will contribute to curbing the excesses of the Nigerian police thereby reducing police brutality. Hence, emotional intelligence and assertiveness courses/trainings need to be undertaken by Nigerian police officers.

References

- Abdullah, A. A., Hamsan, H. H., & Ma'rof, A. A. (2020). How do Personality Factors Associate with Prosocial Behavior? The Mediating Role of Empathy. *International journal of academic research in business and social sciences*, 10(16), 206–219
- Acosta-prado, César .J., Zarate-torres, & Arturo .R. (2019). Validation of the Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale for Chilean managers. *Suma psicol*, 26 (2), 110-118. ISSN 0121-4381
- Afolabi . A. (2013). Roles of Personality Types, Emotional Intelligence and Gender Differences on Prosocial Behavior. *Psychological thought* 6(1), 124–135
- Afolabi. A. (2014). Psychosocial predictors of prosocial behavior among a sample of Nigerian undergraduates. *European Scientific Journal ESJ*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2014.v10n2p%p>
- Akelaitis & Lisinskiene (2018). Social Emotional Skills and Prosocial Behaviour among 15-16-Year-Old Adolescents *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 7(1), 21-28
- Alberti, R. E., & Emmons, M. L. (1974). *Your perfect right: a guide to assertive behavior*. 2d ed. San Luis Obispo, Ca.: Impact.
- Anowor, O. F. & Ogbe, E. E. (2019). Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) Approach to the Challenges of Electricity Power Generation in Nigeria, *Sumerianz Journal of Economics and Finance*, 2(3), 26–36.
- Ayooluwa & Olubanjo (2019). Personality variables and emotional intelligence predicting pro-social behaviour: the moderating role of psychological strain. *Nigerian Journal of Social Psychology*, 2 (2), 1-4
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (2012). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497–529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.21.2.77>
- Carlo, G. (2014). Prosocial behavior: past, present, and future. Prosocial behavior: A multidimensional approach
- Charbonneau, D., & Nicol, A. A. M. (2002). Emotional intelligence and prosocial behaviors in adolescents. *Psychological*

- Reports*, 90(2), 361–370. <https://doi.org/10.2466/PRO.90.2.361-370>
- El-Khodary, B., & Samara, M. (2019). The mediating role of trait emotional intelligence, prosocial behaviour, parental support and parental psychological control on the relationship between war trauma, and PTSD and depression. *J. Res. Pers.* 81, 246–256. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2019.06.004
- Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T. L., & Eggum, N. D. (2010). Emotion-related self-regulation and its relation to children's maladjustment. *Annual review of clinical psychology*, 6, 495–525. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.121208.131208>
- Fensterheim, H., & Baer, J. (2010). *Don't say yes when you want to say no: How assertiveness training can change your life*. David McKay.
- Galassi M. D. & Galassi J. P. (1977). *Assert Yourself -- How to be Your Own Person*. New York: Human Sciences Press.
- Kalu, I. E., Agbarakwe, H. U., Anowor, O. F. (2014). "National Housing Policies and the Realisation of Improved Housing for All in Nigeria: An Alternative Approach", *Asian Development Policy Review*, 2 (3), 47-60.
- Kou, Y., Fu, Y., & Zhang, Q. (2007). The prosocial behaviors endorsed by adolescents: a focus group study. *Sociol. Study*, 154–173.
- Marc, A. B., John, D. M., & Rebecca, M. W. (2004). Emotional intelligence and its relation to everyday behaviour. *Pers. Indiv. Differ.* 36, 1387–1402. doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00236-8
- Martí-Vilar, M., Serrano-Pastor, L., & Sala, F. G. (2019). Emotional, cultural and cognitive variables of prosocial behaviour. *Curr. Psychol. J. Diverse Perspect. Diverse Psychol.* (1)38, 912–919. doi: 10.1007/s12144-019-0168-9
- Mayer, J.D. & Salovey, P. & Caruso, D. (2000). *Models of emotional intelligence*. In R.J. Sternberg (Eds.). *Handbook of Intelligence*, 396-420. Cambridge University Press.
- Mavroveli, S., & Sánchez-Ruiz, M. J. (2011). Trait emotional intelligence influences on academic achievement and school behaviour. *Br. J. Educ. Psychol.* 81, 112–134. doi: 10.1348/2044-8279.002009
- McDonald, K. L., Wang, J., Menzer, M. M., Rubin, K. H., & Booth-LaForce, C. (2011). Prosocial behavior moderates the effects of aggression on young adolescents' friendships. *International Journal of Developmental Science*, 5(1-2), 127-137. DOI: 10.3233/DEV-2011-10066
- McMahon, S. D., Todd, N. R., Martinez, A., Coker, C., Sheu, C. F., Washburn, J., & Shah, S. (2013). Aggressive and prosocial behavior: Community violence, cognitive, and behavioral predictors among urban African American youth. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 51(3-4), 407-421. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-012-9560-4>
- Ogunboyede, M. O., & Agokei, R. C. (2015). Prosocial Behaviour of In-School Adolescents: The Perceived Influence of Self-Esteem, Peer Influence and Parental Involvement. *Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 13(2), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.9734/BJESBS/2016/19995>

Onodugo, V. A., Anowor, O. F., Ukwueni, N. O., Ibiam, F. O. (2014). Bank Credit and Private Sector Investment: Evidence from Nigeria. *International Journal of Management Science*. 3(2), 82-92.

Onyeizugbo, E. U. (2001). Assertiveness: An essential ingredient in marital adjustment. *Nigerian Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(1), 143–149.

Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: multilevel perspectives. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 56, 365–392. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070141

Rathus, S. (1973). A 30-item schedule for assessing assertive behavior. *Behavior Therapy*, 4 (3), 398-406. ISSN 0005-7894

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1989). Emotional Intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9, 185-211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG>

Vorbach, A. M., & Foster, S. (2002). The relationship between emotional competence and social competence among early adolescents. *Diss. Abstr. Int. Sect. B Sci. Eng.* 9, 1578.

Wang, H., Wu, S. & Wei, W. (2021). Emotional intelligence and prosocial behavior in college students: A moderation mediation analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*

Wong, K.S. & Law (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 243-274

Yuan, M., Li, W., & Kou, Y. (2019). How dose social class affect individual's prosocial behavior? mechanism and related factors. *J. Beijing Norm. Univ. (Soc. Sci.)* 2019, 37–46.

Zahn-Waxler, C., Radke-Yarrow, M., Wagner, E. & Chapman, M. (1992). Development of concern for others. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 126-136

Appendix I

Measurement Items

(Participant's demographic information)

Instruction: Please give the needed information about yourself by ticking the appropriate box or filling the blank space.

Age: _____

Gender: Male () Female ()

Marital Status: Married () Single ()

Divorced () Separated () Widow/Widower ()

Number of children if any: _____

Religious affiliation: Christian () Muslim () Traditional ()

Ethnic Group: Igbo () Hausa () Yoruba () others specify: _____

Years of service: _____

Rank: _____

PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR SCALE

Instruction: Please read each statement carefully and answer with care. Indicate your response to the items as previously stated above. Please do not skip any item.

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	UN	D	SD
1	I am pleased to help my friends/colleagues in their activities	5	4	3	2	1
2	I share the things that I have with my friends					

3	I try to help others					
4	I am available for volunteer activities to help those who are in need					
5	I am emphatic with those who are in need					
6	I help immediately those who are in need					
7	I do what I can to help others avoid getting into trouble					
8	I intensely feel what others feel					
9	I am willing to make my knowledge and abilities available to others					
10	I try to console those who are sad					
11	I easily lend money or other things					
12	I easily put myself in the shoes of those who are in discomfort					
13	I try to be close to and take care of those who are in need					
14	I easily share with friends any good opportunity that comes to me					
15	I spend time with those friends who feel lonely					
16	I immediately sense my friends' discomfort even when it is not directly communicated to me					

Emotional Intelligence Scale

Instruction: Read each statement carefully and answer the questions truthfully. There are no correct/incorrect responses. Indicate your response to the items below using the response options as follows:

5= Strongly Agree (SA), 4= Agree (A), 3= Undecided (UN), 2=Disagree (D), 1= Strongly Disagree (SD)

Please do not skip any item. Answer each one by ticking the appropriate response option.

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	UN	D	SD
1	I have a good sense of why I have certain feelings most of the time	5	4	3	2	1
2	I have a good understanding of my emotions					
3	I really understand what I feel					
4	I always know whether or not I am happy					
5	I always know my friends' emotions from their behavior					
6	I am a good observer of others' emotions					
7	I am sensitive to the feelings and emotions of others					
8	I have good understanding of the emotions of people around me					
9	I always set goals for myself and try my best to achieve them					
10	I always tell myself I am a competent person					
11	I am a self motivated person					
12	I always encourage myself to try my best					
13	I am able to control my temper and handle difficulties rationally					
14	I am capable of controlling my emotions					
15	I can always calm down quickly when I am angry					
16	I have good control of my emotions					

Assertiveness Scale

Instruction: Read each statement carefully and answer the questions with care. Indicate your response to the items as specified above.

Please do not skip any item.

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	UN	D	SD
1	Most people seem to be more aggressive and assertive than I am	5	4	3	2	1
2	I have hesitated to make or accept dates because of shyness					
3	When the food served at a restaurant is not done to my satisfaction, I complain about it to the waiter or waitress					
4	I am careful to avoid hurting other people's feelings, even when I feel that I have been injured					
5	If a salesperson has gone to considerable trouble to show me merchandise that is not quite suitable, I have a difficult time saying "No"					
6	When I am asked to do something, I insist upon knowing why					
7	There are times when I look for a good, vigorous argument					
8	I strive to get ahead as well as most people in my position					
9	To be honest, people often take advantage of me					
10	I enjoy starting conversations with new					

	acquaintances or strangers					
11	I often don't know what to say to people I find attractive					
12	I will hesitate to make phone calls to business establishments and institution					
13	I would rather apply for a job or for admission to a college by writing letters than by going through with personal interviews					
14	I find it embarrassing to return merchandise					
15	If a close and respected relative were annoying me, I would smother my feelings rather than express my annoyance					
16	I have avoided asking questions for fear of sounding stupid					
17	During an argument, I am sometimes afraid that I will get so upset that I will shake all over					
18	If a famed and respected lecturer makes a comment which I think is incorrect, I will have the audience hear my point of view					
19	I avoid arguing over prices with clerks and salespersons					
20	When I have done something important or worthwhile, I manage to let					

	others know about it					
21	I am open and frank about my feelings					
22	If someone has been spreading false and bad stories about me, I see him or her as soon as possible and "have a talk" about it					
23	I often have a hard time saying "No"					
24	I tend to bottle up my emotions rather than make a scene					
25	I complain about poor service in a restaurant and elsewhere					
26	When I am given a compliment, I sometimes just don't know what to say					
27	If a couple near me in a theater or at a lecture were conversing rather loudly, I would ask them to be quiet or to take their conversation elsewhere					
28	Anyone attempting to push ahead of me in a line is in for a good battle					
29	I am quick to express an opinion					
30	There are times when I just can't say anything					