

## **The Role of Almighty Prosocial behavior in De-Escalating Social Identity Crisis for National Development**

**Anazonwu, Charles Okey (PhD)**

**Nweke, Kingsley Onyibo**

Kingsleyonweke73@yahoo.com

**Dike-Aghanya, Adannia Amalachukwu**

dannia\_dyke@yahoo.com

&

**Ilona, Chinenye Frances**

francesilona@yahoo.com

### **Abstract**

*This study seeks to examine the role of almighty prosocial behavior and prosocial behavior in de-escalating national identity crisis for national development. Undergraduates comprising of 98male (53%) and female 85 (46.40%) age range 18 years to 31 years, with mean age 22.74 years and standard deviation 2.14 participated in the study. Two instruments were used for data collection, Global Identity Scale-10 (GIS-10) developed by Turken and Rudmin (2013) and revalidated by Nwafor, Obi-Nwosu, Atalor, and Okoye (2016) and almighty prosocial scale by (Anazonwu, 2016). The internal reliability of the Global identity scale in the present study was.76 Cronbach alpha, and that of the almighty prosocial measure was an experimental scale. The design of the study was within-group design and the statistics used for data management was paired t- test. Result showed that there was significant mean difference between almighty prosocial behavior and prosocial behavior at ( $t(182) = 15.49, p < .01$ ). Mean score for Almighty prosocial thesis was 28.00 and standard deviation 21.484, while mean score for prosocial behavior was 13.50 and standard deviation 15.34. It was concluded that almighty prosocial behavior may be a vibrant factor in de-escalating national identity crisis and achieving national development. Recommendations are that parents should inculcate almighty prosocial teachings in their children at home and government should implement almighty prosocial behavior in all aspects of governance.*

### **Introduction**

Hogg, Terry and White, (1995) argue that Social Identity (SI) is a concept set to explain group processes and inter group relations. A group is a collection of individuals who perceive themselves as members of some social identity (Ellemers & Haslam, 2011, Turner & Reynolds, 2011; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Social identity forms basis of our interaction with strangers because we increasingly continue to categorize ourselves in terms of such groups in order to feel

positive about groups we belong to and stereotype others on the basis of groups to which they belong (Lea, Spears and de Groof, 2011). Some of the groups we affiliate ourselves with include sex, religious, political parties and ethnic origins. These groups are part of our cognitive schemas that most often influence our thought and behavior. Groups help us form impression about people and manage information about the social world effectively well. Social identity theory (SIT) was proposed by Tajfel

and Turner (1986). According to the theory, each of us strives to enhance our self-esteem, which has two major components a personal identity and various collective social identities that are based on groups to which we belong. People can boost their self-esteem through their personal achievement or through affiliation with successful groups (Gagnon & Bourhis, 1996). Boosting self-esteem through the achievement of one's in-group is referred to as basking in reflected glory (BIRG). Self-esteem is a feeling that comes with an individual's evaluation of self worth.

The dark side of SIT is in-group favoritism and the tendency to belittling others to feel good about ourselves (Moghaddam, 2005; Mohammad, 2005). In-group favoritism is the tendency to treat in-group members more favorably than other out-group members. Negative side of the SIT (in-group) could be applied in the understanding of religions crisis, racial discrimination and ethnic conflicts (Kassin, Fein & Markus, 2008, PP. 150). Both personal and social identities are two ends of a continuum. As people think of themselves as individual they are in the personal end of the continuum. Likewise when people think of themselves as groups they operate at the social end of the continuum. The part of our identity that is salient at anytime determines the end we consider on the continuum.

Authors have defined social identity, as a person's definition of who he or she is, including personal attributes and attributes shared with others such as gender and race. (Baron & Byrne, 2005); perception of oneness with a group of persons (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) and self definition that guides

precisely how we conceptualize and evaluate ourselves (Deaux; 1993; Sherman, 1994). Therefore, as individuals pursue studies, careers, and other ambitions they find themselves in diverse groups. One could say that social identity is a perception of an individual's self with reference to the group in which he belongs.

Jackson and Smith (1999) proposed four dimensions to social identity: perception of intergroup context, in-group attraction, interdependency of beliefs and depersonalization. Perception of intergroup context refers to aspect of relationship between one's in-group and other comparison groups by in-group members. In-group attraction refers to the affect (emotion) shared by members of in-group. Inter-dependency of belief emphasizes a common shared norm, culture, symbols and values by in-group members, which regulate their behavior as they pursue common goals. Depersonalization demonstrates perception of one's self as interchangeable member of a social category rather than a unique person. Application of depersonalization at a global scale may go a long way in breaching the crisis gap between ethnics and other groups individuals associate with.

Cosmopolitanism is an early idea resembling global identity (Appiah, 2006). According to Tajfel and Turner, (1986) individuals can form groups at any level. Social identity at the world level is referred to as global identity. Global citizen's initiative group defines global identity as someone who identifies with being part of an emerging world community and whose actions contribute to building this community values and practices. Global identity appears to be

the highest level of group identification individuals can form. Shinohara, (2004) defined global identity as the consciousness of an international society or community transcending national boundaries without necessarily neglecting importance of state, nation or domestic society. The fact that global implies universal seems to clear the ground for wider scope of citizenship identity. Furthermore, global identity endorses the perception of every individual irrespective of tribe culture, ethnic, norm or national origin as would member of his own in-group. Such perception is embossed in individuals affect and behavior. Global identity is endorsement of groups' norms, values, and behavior such as embracing diversity (Reysen & Katzarka-Miller, 2013).

### **Global identity**

The global citizen respects other groups' cultures and consciously aims at ways in which all would be united to reap the benefit of diversity. In global identity the sense of rigidity is grossly eliminated and tolerance is enhanced. One may define global identity as the perception and consciousness of existence of one form of social group (world) in which group membership exists without cultural or ethnic distinctiveness. This implies that there is the perception of oneness of purpose. Every member strives for the welfare of another and works toward protection of collective existence of the group. Global identity is supported as a dimension of SI in the works of Jackson & Smith, (1999). Depersonalization advocates for need to seek welfares of other individuals rather than self. Global identity transcends beyond national identity, we hypothesize that

individuals who operate on level of global identity consciousness may have less social identity crisis. Scholars found that motivational importance of social identity beyond group members influence vicarious reward and prosocial behavior (Hackel, Zaki & Van Bavel, 2017).

### **Prosocial behaviour**

From the existence of humankind, individuals had always dwelled in groups and communities. The tendency for members of society to rely on others for help had been historic as well. As a matter of fact, prosocial behavior became norm and component of belief systems of the diverse cultures due to communal style of living. Authors define prosocial behavior from different conceptualization; as positive emotions, and attitudes. Acting in ways that may benefit others, transcending actions that may provide meaning to life, voluntary behavior for others benefits, as form of altruistic behavior which is dependent on moral of the individual, and acts that are motivated solely by desire to help someone in need (Batson & Oleson, 1991; Eisenberg, 1986; Fehr & Fischbacher, 2003; knafo-Noam et al., 2015; Muhlberger, 2000; Tongeren, Green, Davis, Hooks & Hulsey, 2016).

Literature emphasize on three common concepts such as motives for helping without expectation of reward, morally motivated behavior and intention to benefit others rather than self. The condition of the prosocial behavior should be very voluntary in nature and aimed at immediate enhancement of well-being of the helped. One could say that prosocial behavior is morally motivated

behavior for the well-being of another person without expectation of immediate reward. Authors continue to substitute prosocial behavior for altruistic behavior and argue that prosociality must have fallen out from altruistic personality dispositions (Hilbig, Glockner & Zettler, 2014; De Yong, 2017). Yet, Social Psychologists seem not to have a unified conclusion on prosocial personality. It was proposed that six types of prosocial behavior existed among human settlements: altruistic, complaint, emotional, dire, public and anonymous prosocial behavior (see Carlo & Randall, 2002). Each of the six types of prosocial behavior explains conditions under which the prosocial behavior is manifested. These conditions include such that help may be given to someone who does not have any known means of rewarding (altruistic). Compliant refers to help given to someone who requested for assistance. Emotional prosocial behavior refers to help given to someone when the helper is emotionally aroused. Dire prosociality occurs among the fire workers, help given to people having emergency situation. Public refers to help rendered with motive to receive appreciation, respect and cooperation from others. Anonymous prosociality is situation in which the helper wishes to remain oblivious and unknown to even the helped. These conditions under which prosocial behavior may be displayed may have some aspects of personality traits. Importantly, one may ask why would a helper want to remain anonymous while another go public? Perhaps, it could be a reflection of innate disposition and manifestation of the intension of the helper.

However, Dunfield and Kuhlmeier (2013) proposed three different types of situations under which helpers are compelled to render help: Instrumental need, Emotional distress and material desire. Instrumental need arises when the intended helper is unable to complete a goal directed behavior, warranting a need for the helper to make such provision that will enable the helped accomplish the goal directed behavior. Emotional distress refers to the condition when the helped experiences an unpleasant affective state and the helper come along with compassionate help especially in times of accident or death of loved ones. Material desire is the help rendered to another when he or she is unable to acquire a desired resource; this could be giving food stuffs to the poor and less privileged. The six types of prosocial behavior and the three dimensions of prosocial behavior have some similarities, in the sense that (De Yong, 2017; Hilbig, et al., 2014) addressed altruistic and emotional while (Dunfield and Kuhlmeier, 2013) focused on instrumental need, emotional distress and material). Therefore, the two works focused on the immediate need of the helped as the goal of prosocial behavior. However, the difference between the two theories is public and anonymous. Public and anonymous emphasizes the aspect of prosocial behavior that is focused on the intension of the helper.

### **Literature review**

Greitemeyer (2011) found that prosocial behavior decreases antisocial outcomes (especially exposure to media with prosocial contents) and increases thoughts, empathy and helping behavior and reduces aggressive

related cognition and affects. More recently, studies confirm that prosocial behavior have been implicated in socio-economic status (khanna, Sharma, Chauhan & Pragyendu, 2017) important in development of positive adolescence outcomes, tendency to donate labor in delivery of public services, facilitation of social interaction and positive affects (Gregg, Gout, Ratcliffe, Smith, & Windmeiser, 2018; Law, 2012; Telle & Pfister, 2015). Scholars reported that consequences of prosocial behavior may manifest in poor development in adolescents, neuroticism, disinhibition, impulsivity and antisocial behavior (Goma-i-Freixanet, 1995), antisocial children perceive peers prosocial motives as personal rather than moral (Wardle, Hunter & Warder, 2011). Out-groups perception of in-group prosocial behavior fosters social injustice and discrimination (Moghaddam, 2005, Mohammed, 2005). This could be explained by in-group favoritism (favorable treatment of members of one's in-group members) and unfavorable treatment of other out-group members. It seems that earlier theories of prosocial behavior have not been able to stem the tide of injustice in unfavorable treatment of out-group members. This failure calls for a new theory of prosocial behavior the Almighty prosocial theory (Anazonwu, 2017).

Almighty Prosocial Theses (APT) states that when religious/ spiritual people are reminded to perform Positive Prosocial Behavior (PPB) prayer that has relevance to Overwhelming Problem (OP) their desire to have the overwhelming problem (OP) solved will motivate them to perform the prayer. Frequently reminding them of PPB prayer

that highlights varieties of OP and supported with material rewards (prestigious honors, recognitions, and monetary awards) and social support for its performance is envisaged to produce frequent PPB prayer will produce persistent PPB capable of changing negative prosocial behavior (prosocial behavior in favor of in-group members alone).

Recently, violence and killing in different parts of nation calls for concern toward peace and security of human kind. Basically, various theories of prosociality have been in existence and the increase in violence and insecurity continues unabated. Global world index (2016) reported of increase in violence in human world within the past decades. This shows that prosociality theories on which pursuit of world peace were established may not have been very effective in curbing crisis. The need to seek a new theory of prosocial behavior remains apparent. Moghaddam, (2005) argues that perception of in-group favoritism fosters social injustice and discrimination, which may give rise to retaliations and cycles of violence. In-group favoritism is one of the major tenets of the theory of social identity. In-group favoritism could be used to explain benefits members of family, cult, associations and other social groups' shear which enhances group cohesion. In-group favoritism refers to help given to an individual by virtue of being a member of one's in-group. It becomes quite glaring that it is on this premise of in-group favoritism that earlier theories of prosociality dwells. Until now, the theories have not been able to come up with a promising solution to world peace. The need to pursue a new model that may give answer to lasting peace in a



nation beclouded with historic crisis is absolutely pertinent. The answer that may de-escalate these crises may perhaps lay on Almighty Prosocial Theses (APT) and global identity model. It is assumed based on theoretical evidence that globalized individuals may report less Social Identity crisis. We hypothesize that there will be significant mean difference within participants in almighty prosocial and prosocial conditions.

### **Method**

Two hundred and five questionnaires were distributed and One hundred and eighty-three properly filled questionnaires were used for data analysis comprising (male 98, females 85) undergraduate students age range 18 to 31 years, with mean age 22.74 years and standard deviation 2.14 years. Participants were 400level students from the department of Sociology. Multistage sampling method was adopted. Simple random sampling was utilized to select the faculty of choice among other faculties in the University. Another simple random sampling was used to select department of study (Sociology). After the selection of department of study, accidental random sampling was used to select participants for the study. Participants who declared interest in the study were given opportunity to participate. The study adopted a within-group participant design and statistics applied was paired t- test. Instruments used were Global Identity scale (GIS-10) developed by Turken and Rudmin (2003) and revalidated by Nwafor, Obi-Nwosu, Atalor and Okoye (2016). GIS- 10 is a scale that measures individual identity on a global scale; it contains 10 items that

measures two main domains (openness to culture and non-nationalism). Items are on a six-point Likert response option 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= slightly disagree, 4= disagree, 5= slightly agree and 6= strongly agree. Nwafor, et al., (2016) reported an alpha reliability coefficient of .84. Similarly, alpha coefficient in the present study was .76. Almighty prosocial behavior and prosocial behavior materials were used in the study. Since the almighty prosocial measure was an experimental material it may not require report of internal consistency.

### **Result**

Results show that there is significant mean difference between almighty prosocial behavior and prosocial behavior on global identity at  $t(182) = 15.49, P < .000$ . However, it was observed that mean score for almighty prosocial behavior was 21.48, while the mean score for prosociality was 15.34.

### **Conclusion**

It was concluded that almighty prosocial behavior has higher mean score than prosocial behavior. The implication is that those who practice almighty prosocial behavior may have less identity crisis than those who practice prosocial behavior alone. It is recommended that parents may start to inculcate the practice in raising their children and wards to imbibe the culture early in life. The government may enshrine this practice in law to make give it the necessary force it deserves and most importantly practice it at all levels of governance. Hopefully we may achieve a more peaceful world.

## REFERENCE

- Appiah, A. (2006). Cosmopolitanism: ethics in a world of strangers, In W.W. Norton and Ardoine Nicole M. (2009). Sense of place and Environmental Behavior at an Eco-regional scale. Unpublished dissertation. Yale University, School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, New Haven, CT.
- Ashforth, B. E & Mael, F. (1989). Social Identity and the organization. *Academy Management Review*, 14, (1), 20-39.
- Baron, R. A, Brancome, N. R. & Bryne, D. (2009). *Social psychology* 12<sup>th</sup> (Ed) Pearson International Edition.
- Baron, R.A. & Donn, B (2005). *Social Psychology Tenth* (ed). Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd, Licenses of Pearson Education in South Asia.
- Batson, C.D, & Oleson, K.C.(1991).Current status of the empathy- altruism hypothesis. In M.S. Clark (Ed.) *Prosocial behavior* (pp.62-85). Newbury Park CA: Sage.
- Batson, C.D, Duncan, B.D, Ackerman, P. Buckley, T., & Birch, K.(1981). Is empathic emotion a source of altruistic motivation? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 290- 302.
- Carlo, G. & Randall, A. (2002). The development of measure of prosocial behavior in late adolescents. *Journal of youth and adolescents*, (31), (1): 31-44.
- Deaux, K., Reid, A., Mizrahi, K, S. & Ethier, K.A. (1995). Parameters of Social identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68, 280-291.
- Dunfield, K.A. & Kuhlmeier, V.A.(2013). Classifying prosocial Behavior: Children's Responses to instrumental Need, Emotional Distress and Material Desire. *Child Development*, 1-11.
- Ellemer, N. S., & Haslam, S.A. (2011). "Social identity theory "In Handbook of theories of Social, psychology, eds p. Large, A. van Kruglanski and T. Higgins (London: Sage), 379-398.
- Ellemers, N., Van Rijswijk, W., Roofs, M., & Simons, C. (1997). Bias in inter-group perceptions: Balancing group identity with social reality. *Personality and social psychology Bulletin*, 23, 186-198.
- Featherstone, M. (2003). "Localism, Globalism and Cultural Identity. Identities: Race, Class, Gender, and Nationality.
- Global Peace Index (2016) in peace, inclusive societies and psychology, in Nigerian Psychological Association (NPA) 2017.

- Hackle, L. M., Zaki, J. & Van Bavel, J. J. (2017). Social Identity shapes social evaluation: Evidence from Prosocial behavior and vicarious reward. *Social cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 12, (8): 1219-1228
- Hogg, M.A, Terry, D.J. & White, K. M.(1995), A Tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58.(4) : 255-269.
- Hur, Y. M., & McGue, M., E Iacono, W. G. (1998). The structure of self-concept in female preadolescent twins: A behavioral genetic Approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1069-1077.
- Jackson, Y.W., & Smith, E. R. (1999) .Conceptualizing Social identity: A new frame work and evidence for the Impact of different dimensions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 120-135
- Kassin, S., Fein, S., & Markus, A. R. (2008). Social Psychology International (ed). www. Cengage. Cm |global.
- Lea, M, Spears, R, &de Groot, D. (2001). Knowing me knowing you. Anonymity effects. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 526,-537.
- Lockley, A., Borgida, E., Brekke, N. & Hepburn, C. (1980). *Sex Stereotypes and Social Judgment Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 821-831.
- Meyer, D.G, (2010). Social Psychology 10<sup>th</sup> (Ed). McGraw-Hill International edition.
- Moghaddam, F.M. (2005). The staircase to terrorism: a psychological exploration. *American psychologists*, 60, 161-169.
- Mohammad, A.Y.(2005). Roots of terrorism in the Middle East. Internal pressures and international constraints. In Tore Bjorgo (Ed) Roots causes of terrorism myths, reality and ways fawns. Chapter 8, P. 114 (3) Routledge, Taylor and Francis group: London. Retrieved from: [http:// books. Google.cm.ng| book](http://books.Google.cm.ng|book) ?
- Mullen, B., Brown, R., & Smith, C. (1992). In-group bias as a function of salience, relevance, and status: An integration. *European journal of social psychology*, 22, 103-122.
- Nwafor, C. E., Obi-Nwosu, H. Atalor, A. & Okoye, C. A. C. (2016). Toward Globalization: Construct Validation of Global identity scale in Nigerian sample. *Psychology and society*, Vol. 8 (1), 85-99.
- Ouakes, P. J,&Reynolds, K .Y. (1997).Asking the accuracy Question: is measurement the answer? In R. Spears, P.J, Qakes, N,



- Ellemers, & S. A. Haslam (Eds). The Social Psychology of stereo typing and group life (pp.51\_71) Oxford: Blackwell.
- Pettigrew, T.F., Jackson, J.S. Brika, J. B. Lemarnie, G., Meertens, R.W., Wagner, U.” Zick, A. (1998). Out-group prejudice in western European.*Review of social psychology*, 8,241-273.
- Pogge, T. W. (1992). Cosmopolitanism and sovereignty. *Ethics*. 103: 48-75.
- Schimmel J. ,Simon, L. , Greenberg, J. , Pyszczynski, T., Solomon , S. , & Waxmonsky, J. (1999). Stereotypes and terror management: Evidence that mortality salience enhances stereotypic thinking and preferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 905-926.
- Shinohara, H. (2004). Evolution in Global identity: The league of Nations and the United Nations. In UNU Global Seminar.
- Solomon, S., Greenberg, J. &Pyszczynski, J. (2000). Period and prejudice: fear of death and social behavior. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9, 200-203.
- Sussman, N.M. (2000). The dynamic nature of cultural identity throughout cultural transition: Why home is not so sweet. *Personality and social psychology Review*, Vol, 4, 355-373.
- Tajfel, A., & Turner, J.C.(1986). The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup behavior. In.S. Worchel &W.G Austin (eds.) The social psychology of intergroup relations (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Pp. 7-24). Monterey, (A: Brooks-cole).
- Tajfel, H, &Turner, J.C. (1985). The Social identification theory of intergroup Behavior. Ins. Worchel & W.G. (Eds), psychology of intergroup relations (2<sup>nd</sup> ed, pp. 7-24).Chicago:Nelson\_Hall.
- Tajfel, H. S.&Turner, J.C. (1979) An Integrative theory of Intergroup conflict” in the Social Psychology Turner intergroup Relation, eds W.G. Austin and S. Worehel (Monterey, C.A: Brooks-cole), 33- 48
- Tesser A., Millar, M., & More, J. (1988) some affective consequences of social comparism and reflection processes: The pain and pleasure of being close. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 49-61.
- Turner, J.C. S.& Reynolds, K. J. (2011). “Self-Categorization theory, in Handbook of theories in Social Psychology, eds P.A, M.Van Large, A.W. Kruglanski and E.T. Higgins ( W.K, Sage Publications), 399-417.
- Zhuojun, W. & Hualing, H. (2014). National identity in the era of Globalization: Crisis and Reconciliation. *Journal of Social Science in China*, Volume 35, PP. 139-154.



Section A

**GIS-10**

**Gender ----- age----- state-----level-----Religion-----**

**Directions:** Please indicate the degree to which the statement applies to you by marking one of the choices depending on the extent you agree or disagree with each statement. There is no right or wrong answers.

- 6 = Totally Agree (TA)  
5 = Agree (A)  
4 = Slightly Agree (SA)  
3 = Slightly Disagree (SD)  
2 = Disagree (DA)  
1 = Totally Disagree (TD)

		TD	DA	SD	SA	A	TA
1. I consider myself more as a citizen of the world than a citizen of some nation		1	2	3	4	5	
6							
2. I could live in other cultures than my own	1	2	3	4	5	6	
3. I identify with a world community	1	2	3	4	5	6	
4. I enjoy learning about different cultures	1	2	3	4	5	6	
5. I like listening to music from different cultures	1	2	3	4	5	6	
6. My own culture is the best in the whole world	1	2	3	4	5	6	
7. One should first care for his/her nation, then others		1	2	3	4	5	
6							
8. I feel intense pride when I think about my country		1	2	3	4	5	
6							
9. I feel most connected to members of my own country		1	2	3	4	5	
6							
10. My country is one of the best in the world	1	2	3	4	5	6	

**SECTION B**

Please answer questions 1 and 2 below by writing the percent (any number from 0 to 100; for e.g., 63%) in the spaces provided. Assumed you won ten million Naira (N10, 000, 000) in a lottery:

1. What percent (%) of the money would you give to less (unlucky) people in need of help? Write the percent here: ..... %.

**In the alternative,**

2. What percent (%) of the money would you give to less privileged people (unlucky) people in need of help in order to please God to prevent you from experiencing fatal accidents, incurable diseases and early death? Write the percent here:.....%. Thanks for answering the two questions.

## APPENDIX

### Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
GENDER	183	1.00	2.00	1.4645	.50011
AGE	183	18.00	31.00	22.7432	2.14441
STATE	183	1.00	13.00	2.1366	2.21084
LEVEL	183	1.00	4.00	3.7486	.47136
Valid N (listwise)	183				

### Statistics

	GENDE R	AGE	STATE	LEVEL	RELIGIO N
N Valid	183	183	183	183	183
Missing	0	0	0	0	0

### GENDER

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Male	98	53.6	53.6	53.6
Female	85	46.4	46.4	100.0
Total	183	100.0	100.0	

### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.761	10



### Paired Samples Statistics

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 ALMIGHTYPROSOCIALITY	28.0055	183	21.48460	1.58819
PROSOCIALITY	13.5082	183	15.34256	1.13415

### Paired Samples Correlations

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 ALMIGHTYPROSOCIALITY & PROSOCIALITY	183	.814	.000

### Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	ALMIGHTYPROSOCIALITY – PROSOCIALITY	14.49727	12.66295	.93607	12.65032	16.34422	15.487	182	.000