Nigerian Journal of Social Psychology, Volume 2, No. 2 (2019).
Published by the Nigerian Association of Social psychologists.

PERSONALITY VARIABLES AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE PREDICTING PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR: THE MODERATING ROLE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL STRAIN

Afolabi Olukayode Ayooluwa[1]
afolabi95@yahoo.co.uk
&
Olusa Abayomi Olubanjo[2]
bjyomsi@yahoo.com

[12]Department of Pure and Applied Psychology,
Adekunle Ajasin University,
Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria.

Abstract
The relevance of voluntary helping behaviour goes beyond social interactions within the society and social setting, but even into social interactions in the organizations; either towards fellow workers or towards members of the society. This study, thus investigate the impact of personality variables (core self-evaluation, emotional stability and work locus of control) and emotional intelligence on prosocial behaviours among security and safety personnel, considering the role of psychological strain. Adopting the cross sectional survey design, 247 personnel (Male-168; Female-79) were purposively selected from security and safety organizations. Their age ranges between 18 and 60 (M=38.56; SD=9.11) and they responded to standardized measures of core self-evaluation (α= .79), emotional stability (α= .63), work locus of control (α= .89), emotional intelligence (α= .79), psychological strain (α= .71) and prosocial behaviour (α= .84). The result indicated that psychological strain did not moderate the relationship between core self-evaluation and prosocial behaviour (β=-.11, p> .05). Also, the relationship between emotional stability and prosocial behaviour was not moderated by psychological strain (β= .00, p> .05). Work locus of control did not predict prosocial behaviour on its own (β= -.09, p> .05). However, the relationship between emotional intelligence and prosocial behaviour was significantly moderated by psychological strain (β= -.52, p< .01). The findings add to the knowledge of the relationship between emotional intelligence and prosocial behaviour with consideration of the moderating role of psychological strain. This will help prevent the eliciting of negative work behaviour from emotional intelligence, and improve positive utilization of such intelligence in building and managing positive work behaviours and selfless helping attitudes.
Keywords: Core self-evaluation, emotional stability, work locus of control, psychological strain, prosocial behaviour

Introduction

Building a positive perspective towards socialization and human existence is a vital strategy towards creating harmonious existence for the human race. This is justified with the view that social relationships are important for human survival (Piff, Stancato, Martinez, Kraus, & Keltner, 2012). In our present society, the negative perception developed towards others; probably resulting from stereotypical or past events (Afolabi, 2014a) could be a reason for poor attitude towards helping others. Individuals saddled with the responsibilities of security and safety finds themselves more prone to situations that required social helping behaviours and citizenship actions (Blakely, Andrews & Moorman, 2005; Collins & Gibbs, 2003; Arrigo, 2001).

Most research carried out on security and safety officers considered factors associated with increase in their organizational citizenship behaviours (Nalla, & Madan, 2012; Paoline, & Terrill, 2004; Pelfrey, 2004; Paoline, 2003) while there has been little concern for their pro social behavioural display, which is quite different. It is expected that individuals with high level of prosocial behaviours could be more effective and valued by the society when engaged with security or safety occupations. This is because such behavioural pattern will be of immense relevance to their work roles. The trending behavioural pattern whereby people show less commitment towards others (Mortelmans, Damen & Sinardet, 2008) instigate the need for more research on the factors associated with voluntarily helping or benefiting others. Either, it is towards individuals or groups, such research would enhance the occurrence of these (pro-social behaviour) vital aspects of human life, especially among officers in the security and safety occupations

Prosocial behavior is explained as a voluntary behavior comprising a broad spectrum of activities which benefit other people or society, like sharing, comforting, rescuing, and helping with the intention to benefit another (Afolabi, 2013). The willingness to help voluntarily varies within societies and among individuals. The present study therefore considered the implication of some less researched personality variables (like core self-evaluation, emotional stability and work locus of control), and emotional intelligence on the tendency of security and safety personnel exhibit pro social behaviours. While evaluating the implication of the above

mentioned, the role of psychological strain experienced by these personnel in the line of their duties were also considered.

Personality Variables and Prosocial Behaviour

Several literatures had considered the impact of personality factors on prosocial behaviours (Shah & Rizvi, 2016; Afolabi & Idowu 2014; Caprara, Alessandro, & Eisenberg, 2011; Caprara, Alessandri, di Giunta, Panerai,& Eisenberg, 2010). Most of these researches focused on the big five personality factors, depression and aggression personality attributes. Few studies had been carried out on some other and major personality variables, especially among samples within the security and safety sections where the relevance of helping behaviours are essential for optimum performance. The present study will be considering such personality variables as; core self-evaluation as a distinct construct, emotional stability and work locus of control on prosocial behaviour.

Core Self-evaluation and Prosocial Behaviour

Core self-evaluation is a cognitive appraisal that is fundamental and subjective in nature. It is defined as a subconscious bottom-line evaluation, representing the fundamental values of one's life (Packer's diary as cited in Ang, 2011).In a more recent description, it is viewed as fundamental self-evaluation of perceived value, effectiveness and individual skills (Judge, Erez, Bono & Thoresen, 2003).

Studies have indicated a link between components of core self-evaluation and core self-evaluation as a composite with prosocial behaviours (Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton, Exline, & Bushman, 2004; Laibe, Carlo & Roesch, 2004). Researches that had considered those identified personality traits categorized as components in core self-evaluation separately, found similarities in such traits with prosocial behaviours. For example, Afolabi (2014b) examined the relationship between self-esteem and prosocial behaviour within a study of 294 university undergraduates and found that individuals' with high self-esteem will display prosocial behaviour more than those with low esteem. In a similar trend, researches had indicated a positive relationship between prosocial behaviour and other personality traits as self-efficacy, emotional stability and

locus of control (Afolabi & Alade, 2015; Afolabi, 2013; De Caroli & Sagone, 2013; Jakob, Carina, Eric & Ann-Charlotte, 2012; Caprara, Alessandri & Eisenberg, 2011; Caprara *et al*., 2010; Alessandri, Caprara, Eisenberg & Steca, 2009; Caprara & Steca, 2007; Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder 2005), thus justifying the possibility of a positive relationship between core self-evaluation and prosocial behaviour.

On a contrary finding, it was noted that individuals with lower feelings of self-importance were more selfless in their relationships and helped more (Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton, Exline, & Bushman, 2004). Research on self-value had also revealed that self-transcendence values are positively related to prosocial behaviours, while self enhancement values correlated negatively with helping attitudes (Boer & Fischer, 2013; Caprara, Alessandri & Eisenberg, 2012), therefore, the evaluation of the individual self-areas is presumed to vary as regarding their helping attitude. It is generally presumed that prosociality would increase with less significant attention given to the self (Piff, Dietze, Feinberg, Stancato & keltner, 2015). The inconsistency with the self-component of core self-evaluation demands further empirical evidence on the relationship between prosocial behaviours and core self-evaluation. Especially in the less documented aspect of the work settings (personnel of the security and safety organizations).

Correlating self-concept with prosocial behaviour, Singh, Junnarkar and Sharma (2015) found that negative perception of the self-concept leads to lower prosocial behaviour. In line with the position of Nantel-Vivier, Pihl, Coté and Tremblay (2014), Singh *et al*. (2015) also noted that prosocial behaviour was negatively related with outcomes of stressor such as stress, anxiety and depression. Further findings on prosocial behaviour and job strain envisaged reduction in the pro social behaviour as a result of stressor. Since core self-evaluation is positively correlated with unrewarded organizational behaviours like citizenship behaviours (Rode, Judge, & Sun, 2012; Rich, LePine & Crawford, 2010) and negatively associated with counter-productive work behaviour (Ferris, 2011), stress (Lim & Tai, 2014; Judge, Ilies, & Zhang, 2012) and work related stress (Takeuchi, Bolino & Lin, 2015; Brunborg, 2008), it implies that individuals with positive core self-evaluation might find it difficult rendering help when experiencing exposed to psychological strain. It is therefore hypothesized that:

1. Psychological strain will moderate the relationship between core self-evaluation and prosocial behaviour among security and safety personnel

Emotional Stability and Prosocial Behaviour

Emotional stability is one of those factors associated with prosocial behaviour in the development of human socialization (Afolabi & Idowu, 2014; Watson, 2000), although, few studies had established this relationship with little or none among security and safety personnel. Individuals that are emotionally unstable are said to in need of constant help and lack the ability to dispose problems. Invariably, employees with stable emotions are expected to be more predisposed to render helping hands at work since emotionally stable individuals are empathetic (Chaturvedi & Chander, 2010) and can adjust with situation more conveniently while maintaining stable social interactions. Considering the features embedded in emotional stability (Abdul-wahed, 2016; Chaturvedi & Chander, 2010), and the negative implication of work related stressor on emotional stability (Kammeyer-Mueller, Judge & Scott, 2009) and prosocial behaviours (Raposa, Laws & Ansell, 2016), there is the possibility that exposure of employees to psychological strain could buffer the impact of emotional stability on employees' prosocial behaviours. This study thus hypothesizes that:

2. Psychological strain will moderate the relationship between emotional stability and prosocial behaviours among security and safety personnel

Work Locus of Control and Prosocial Behaviour

Locus of control in relation to work setting is the belief that an individual has the necessary behavioral skills and would receive determined reinforcements based on the possession of such skills (Lefcourt' s diary as cited in April, Dharani & Peters, 2012). Employees possess a fundamental desire to control or influence decisions made within the work settings probably by superiors, coworkers or subordinates, their relationship with others and the responsibilities allocated to them.

Organizational research had opined that internal locus of control relates positively with favourable and positive work outcomes (Hoepf, 2010; Ng, Sorensen & Eby, 2006). One of the previous findings revealed a weak relationship between internal locus of control and voluntary

helping behaviours (O'Brien, 2004). However, O'Brien (2004) found internal locus of control correlating positively with citizenship behaviours. Also, a varied report had been given for locus of control and citizenship behaviours with a range from negative correlation to positive (Facteau, Allen, Facteau, Bordas, & Tears, 2000). It was expressed that the correlations are positive when using self-reported data, but negative while using peer reports of citizenship behaviours (O'Brien, 2004). Still on the relationship between locus of control and voluntary helping behavious, Spector and Fox (2003) found no correlation between organizational citizenship behaviour and locus of control, while Afolabi and Alade (2014) reported similar findings between prosocial behaviour and locus of control. These equivocal findings had been partly attributed to rating sources, but it cannot be concluded because of the dearth nature of researches on the variables (O'Brien, 2004). Relating work locus of control to conservation of resource theory (Hobfoll, 2001), there is the tendency of personnel to attribute both internal and external factors based on their locus of control. This will invariably determine their helping behaviours. Conservation of resources theory explains employees' behaviour as a result of the perception the employee has about the availability or loss of their resources. Negative work behaviours as attributed to a situation whereby am employee feels the loss of resources without replenishment, thus, when personnel of security and safety organization feels the loss of resources, they may engage less in prosocial behaviours. Also, in the process of replenishing the loss resources just as employees with internality locus of control will view factors within themselves as relevant for gaining resources, so also will individuals with externality locus of control will view and belief in factors within their environment as relevant for gaining resources. Therefore, both facet of locus might not determine an employee's prosociality differently. For empirical justification of the above explained theoretical view, observed literatures outcome and the perceived negative influence of strain on prosocial behaviour, It is hypothesized that;

3. Psychological strain will moderate the relationship between work locus of control and prosocial behaviour among security and safety personnel

Emotional Intelligence and Prosocial Behaviour

Emotional intelligence has experience wide range of research with prosocial behaviour (Afolabi, 2013; Cote, De Celles, Mc Carthy, Van Kleef & Hideg, 2011; Lopes, Salovey, Cote, Beers,& Petty, 2005), but not exactly among personnel of security and safety occupations. Some of these findings were of the view that individuals measuring high on emotional intelligence engaged less in critics, act less aggressive, more cooperative and were more helpful to others (Brackett, Rivers, Shiffman, Lerner & Salovey, 2006; Lopes, Salovey, Cote, Beers & Petty, 2005; Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Izard, Fine, Schultz, Mostow, Ackerman & Youngstrom, 2001). The security and safety jobs are such that require high level of cooperation, with effective control on aggressive tendencies in the face of tensed situations. Personnel with high level of emotional intelligence would be at an advantage to efficiently manage his or her behaviours and show higher tendency towards helping others (both co-workers and significant others in the work situations).

Strain and human reaction to its presence in his environment still remain a major focus of research (Sudhamayi, 2013; Jones & Kidman, 2001). Empirical literatures that had investigated the relationship between psychological strain and emotional intelligence, observed negative relationship between both construct such that emotional intelligence increases with decreased level of strain (Sudhamayi, 2013; Gohm, Corser & Dalsky, 2005; Nina Oginska & Bulik 2005; Nikolaou & Tsaousis, 2002). When individuals are faced with imbalance in constraints demand and supportive resources, the psychological straining experience could hamper the extent at which emotional intelligence would stimulate prosociality. Capitalizing on the trend of literatures on these concepts, it is proposed that:

4. Psychological strain will moderate the relationship between emotional intelligence and prosocial behaviour

Method

Adopting a cross sectional survey research design, questionnaires were used to source information from personnel security and safety organizations. The study was purposively carried out in three major settings, which are the Nigeria Police Force (NPF), the Federal Road Safety

Corps (FRSC) and the security and safety sections of a State University, all within Ondo State, Nigeria.

Participants

Two hundred and seventy personnel from selected security and safety organizations in Ondo State were recruited for the research purpose using convenience sampling method. The nature of the job roles of these selected work forces in conjunction with the poor perception of organizations towards staff/ employees' participation in research study initiated the need for utilizing those that were easily accessible during the period of the research. From the distributed 270 questionnaires, 252 were retrieved while 247 were found valid for the research purpose. This was 91.5% response rate. The sample comprised of 168 male and 79 female personnel whose age ranged between 18 and 60 (M=38.56; SD=9.11). Other personal characteristics show that 64.4% of the respondents were Christians, while 35.6% were Muslims. The academic qualification indicated that 24% were educated to the secondary school level, 27.2% had either National Diploma (ND) or NigeriaCertificate in Education (NCE), 45.9% has either a First Degree or Higher National diploma (HND), while 2.9% had a Master Degree. Their marital status was such that 18.6% were single, while 81.4% were married. Their job level indicated that 33.2% were junior, 42.5% were intermediate, while 19.4% were senior personnel.

Measure

The instrument used to obtain the research data was a structured questionnaire with standardized constructs measuring the study variables. These scales were preceded by a section meant to elicit information on the respondents' personal and biosocial data. These include, age, gender, religion, marital status, academic qualification, working experience and job level.

Core Self-evaluation: This was measured using 12-items core self-evaluation scale (CSES) developed by Judge, Erez, Bono & Thoresen (2003). The scale was rated on a Likert rater ranging from 1-Strongly Disagree to 5- Strongly Agree. Sample item is; "I determine what will happen in my life". Judge obtained coefficient alpha reliability estimates of .80 and above for the

construct and conducting test-retest reliability, .81 was found. In the present study, a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of .79 was found. High scores from the mean and above imply adequate core self-evaluation and vice versa.

Emotional Stability: To measure emotional stability, 10-item emotional stability scale from the personality inventory by Patel (1976) was adopted. The scale was rated on a Yes and No format. Sample item is; "I make a good impression upon my relatives or friends". Reliability value of .63 alpha co-efficient was found in the present study, and this indicated that the measure was reliable for use in the cultural and organizational context of the study. The mean score was the basis for interpreting the scale such that scores from the mean and above implied adequate or average emotional stability.

Work Locus of Control: This was measured using Spector (1988) Work Locus of Control Scale (WLCS) containing 16 items. The scale was designed measure generalized control beliefs in the workplace.Using the original response choice, the items were rated on a 6 point Likert format ranging between 1-Disagree Strongly and 6-Agree Strongly. Sample item include; "A job is what you make of it". It is a domain specific locus of control scale which had a good correlation of about .50 to .55 with general locus of control. Spector obtained a reliability coefficient alpha of .86 for the scale. Internal consistency (coefficient alpha)ranges from .80 to .85 in the English language version and Bond and Bunce (2003) reported a test-retest reliability for a year as .57, while Moyle (1995) found .60. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .89 was found in the present study. High scores on the scale represent externality, while low scores represent internal work locus of control

Emotional Intelligence: Afolabi's (2017) 40-item measure of emotional intelligence was utilized. The scale was rated on a 5 point Likert format ranging from 1-Strongly Disagree to 5- Strongly Agree. The measure has 7 dimensions; interpersonal skill, empathy, stress tolerance, optimism, assertiveness, problem solving and flexibility. Sample item within the scale is "I can complain without making it an issue". Reliability coefficient ranging between .69 and .80 was obtained for the dimensions of the scale and .77 for the overall measure. A Cronbach's alpha coefficient of

.79 was obtained in the present study. The scale was interpreted such that scores from the mean and above implied high emotional intelligence.

Psychological Strain: The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) developed by Cohen (1983) was used to assess psychological strain. The scale was rated on 5 point Likert rater ranging from 0- Never to 4- Very Often. Sample item include; "In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?" Cohen (1983) indicated a reliability alpha of .78 and obtained a strong validity by correlating it with other measures of stress (Job Responsibilities Scale, life events scales).In the present research, a reliability coefficient to .71 was obtained for the measure. Scores above the mean imply high level of psychological strain, while scores below imply low psychological strain.

Prosocial Behaviour: Prosocial behaviour was measured with 12-item scale developed by Afolabi (2013) and it was scored on a 5-point Likert format with response options ranging from 1- Strongly Disagree to 5- Strongly Agree. Sample item in the scale include; "I enjoy helping others". Afolabi obtained a coefficient alpha of.81, test - re-test reliability of .77 and a split half reliability of .72 for the scale. The present research found an alpha coefficient of .84 for the construct. Score from the mean and above indicate high level of prosociality, while scores below the mean imply low prosocial behaviour.

Procedure

The Human Resource Managers of each of the selected organizations were approached and oriented on the purpose of the research. Each of them then promised to discuss the purpose and importance of the research with their management. The researchers were then given a date to come back for the feedback. Four of the organizations declined to approve the use of their employees for the research for some reasons not disclosed. The organizations that agreed to take part insisted that the researchers sign an undertaking that the anonymity of their organizations and the participants will be guaranteed. The lead researchers gladly sign the undertaking on behalf of the authors. After the establishment of a convincing anonymity and formality in expected participants' information, the research instruments were distributed to the personnel in

each of the organizations who were willing to participate in the research study during the period. An agreed time frame was reached for the retrieval of the questionnaire and all data were obtained within a period of two weeks.

Ethical Considerations

None of the organizations has a formal ethics/research committee. Researchers only need to write to inform the Personnel Manager of the organizations on the purpose and benefit of the research. The manager in turn presents it to the management who either approve or disapprove. If approved, the lead researcher is made to sign an undertaking not to mention the name of the organization in the final report/publication. Participation was voluntary and anonymity was ensured.

Data Analysis

Correlation analysis was utilized to test the extent and direction of relationship among the study variables. This was carried out with both Pearson Product Moment Correlation and Spearman Brown Rank Order Correlation depending on the measurement scale of the variables involved. Four sets of Regression modelwere conducted to test the moderating role of psychological strain in the relationship between personality variable and emotional intelligence with prosocial behaviour.

Results

Table 1: Correlation Matrix Showing the Relationships among Study Variable

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	1
1. Prosocial Behaviour	(.84)	**.20****	**.18****	**-.09**	**.41*****	**-.21****	**.20****	*-.08*	*-.11*	*-.03*	*-.20*$^{++}$	**.**
2. Core Self-evaluation		(.79)	**.40*****	**-.13***	**.23*****	**-.33*****	**.01**	*-.01*	*-.13*$^{+}$	*.09*	*.08*	-
3. Emotional Stability			(.63)	**-.01**	**.44*****	**-.38*****	**.06**	*-.14*$^{+}$	*-.19*$^{++}$	*.09*	*.08*	-
4. Work Locus of control				(.89)	**-.16***	**.05**	**-.01**	*.00*	*.12*	*.09*	*-.01*	
5. Emotional Intelligence					(.79)	**-.29*****	**.14***	*-.10*	*-.14*$^{+}$	*.06*	*.10*	
6. Psychological Strain						(.71)	**.00**	*.04*	*.14*$^{+}$	*-.12*	*-.16*$^{+}$	-
7. Age							1	*.02*	*.02*	*.40*$^{+++}$	*.18*$^{++}$	**.79**
8. Gender								*1*	*.09*	*-.01*	*-.16*$^{+}$	
9. Religion									*1*	*.10*	*-.01*	
10. Marital Status										*1*	*.27*$^{+++}$	*.39*
11. Academic Qualification											*1*	
12. Work Experience												
13. Job Level												
Mean	44.34	36.81	7.17	56.18	137.57	18.91	38.56	-	-	-	-	14.
SD	7.48	4.38	1.74	3.99	17.75	3.68	9.11	-	-	-	-	8.

Note: ***/+++ $p < .001$, ****/++ $p < .01$, ***/+ $p < .05$, N=247, Gender: Male-1, Female-2; Religion: Christianity-1, Islam-2; Marital Status: Single-1, Married-2; Academic Qualification: O'level-1, NCE/ ND-2, HND/ First Degree-3, Master Degree-4, Above Master Degree-5; Job Level: Junior-1, Intermediate-2, Senior-3.*

Results of PPMC is presented in **Bold** form, while Spearman is presented in *Italics*, Cronbach's Alphas of the scales were presented in bracket within the diagonals

Table 1 indicated that prosocial behaviour was significantly and positively related to core self-evaluation [r(245)= .20, p < .01] and emotional stability [r(245)= .18, p < .01], but indicated a weak negative relationship with work locus of control [r(245)= -.09, p > .05]. The relationship between emotional intelligence and prosocial behaviour was positive [r(245)= .41, p < .001], such that prosocial behaviour increases with increase in emotional intelligence. A negative significant relationship was realized between psychological strain and prosocial behaviour [r(245) = -.21, p < .01], such that prosocial behaviour decreases with increase in psychological strain.

The results in Table 1 also indicated that personality variables – core self-evaluation [r(245) = -.33, p < .001] and emotional stability [r(245) = -.38, p < .001] were significantly and negatively correlated with psychological strain, except for work locus of control [r(245)= .05, p

> .01] that was not significant. Emotional intelligence had a significant negative relationship with psychological strain [r(245)= -.29, p < .001]. It was also observed that emotional intelligence was significantly related with personality variable such that positive relationship were observed with core self-evaluation [r(245)= .23, p < .001] and emotional stability[r(245)= .44, p < .00], while work locus of control indicated a negative relationship [r(245)= -.16, p < .05].

From the results of the correlation analysis, there is possibility that multicollinearity would affect the variables if regressed together since they lack orthogonality. Most of the regressors are highly linearly related and in such cases, the inferences from such regression model could be misleading. In addition, the VIF observed from the outcome and tolerance test indicated the presents of multicollinearity, therefore, those variables that lacked orthogonality were regressed separately to control for the implication to certain extent. Four different set of regression models were conducted to test the study's hypotheses and the findings were summarized in Table 2.

Table 2:

Regression Analysis showing the Moderating role of Psychological Strain on Prosocial Behaviour

Model	Predictors	β	t	R	R^2	ΔR^2	df	F	Δ F
1	Core Self-evaluation	.20	3.19**	.20	.04	-	1, 245	10.17**	-
2	Psychological Strain	-.21	-3.43**	.21	.05	-	1, 245	11.760**	-
3	Core Self-evaluation* Psychological Strain	-.11	-1.77	.11	.01	-	2, 244	3.14	-
1	Emotional Stability	.18	2.79**	.18	.03	-	1, 245	7.79**	-
2	Psychological Strain	-.21	-3.43**	.21	.05	-	1, 245	11.760**	-
3	Emotional Stability * Psychological Strain	-.00	-.04	.00	.00	-	2, 244	.00	-
1	Work Locus of Control	-.09	-1.49	.09	.01	-	1, 245	2.207	-
2	Work Locus of Control Psychological Strain	-.09 -.21	-1.36 -3.34**	.23	.05	.04	2, 244	6.83**	11.35**
3	Work Locus of Control * Psychological Strain	-.22	-3.48**	.22	.05	-	2, 244	12.14**	-
1	Emotional Intelligence	.41	6.93**	.41	.16	-	1, 245	47.97**	-
2	Psychological Strain	-.21	-3.43**	.21	.05	-	1, 245	11.760**	-
3	Emotional Intelligence * Psychological Strain	-.52	-4.95**	.43	.19	-	2, 244	18.59**	-

Note: ** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$

In the first set of the analysis, the moderation role of psychological strain in the relationship between core self-evaluation and prosocial behaviour was examined. Core self-evaluation predicted prosocial behaviour ($\beta = .20$, $p < .01$). This was such that increase in core self-evaluation leads to increase in prosocaility among security and safety personnel with 4% observed variance in prosocial behaviour that could be attributed to core self-evaluation. It was noted that psychological strain predicted prosocial behaviour in a negative form, such that prosocial behaviour would increase with decrease in psychological strain experience by security and safety personnel($\beta = -.21$, $p < .01$). Although, both variables (core self-evaluation and psychological strain) predicted prosocial behaviours, the interaction of the variables on prosocial behaviour was not significant ($\beta = -.11$, $p < .01$). This implied that psychological strain does not moderate the relationship between core self-evaluation and prosocial behaviour. The result negates hypothesis 1 and it was rejected.

The second set of the analysis shows the moderating role of psychological strain in the relationship between emotional stability and prosocial behaviour. The result indicated that emotional stability significantly predicted prosocial behaviour ($\beta = .18$, $p < .01$) with a contributing variance of 3%. The prediction was in such form that prosocial behaviour increases with increase in increase in emotional stability. Since the predictors and moderating variables were entered separately as a way of controlling for the effect of multicollinearity, the dependent factor was regressed separately on psychological strain. The result indicated that psychological strain predicted prosocial behaviour in a negative form, with prosocial behaviour increasing with decrease in psychological strain experience by security and safety personnel($\beta = -.21$, $p < .01$). The interacting influence of emotional stability and psychological strain on prosocial behaviour was not significant ($\beta = .00$, $p < .01$). This means that psychological strain did not moderate the relationship between emotional stability and prosocial behaviour. This negates hypothesis 2.

Testing hypothesis 3, the moderating role of psychological strain was considered in the relationship between work locus of control and prosocial behaviour. From the result in Table 1, it was observed that both variables in this set of analysis were orthogonal, thus, the variables could be modeled into the regression analysis serially. In the first step of the set, work locus of control was entered and it was observed that it did not predict prosocial behaviour ($\beta = -.09$, $p > .05$). When psychological strain was introduced to the model, work locus of control was still not significantly predicting prosocial behaviou ($\beta = -.09$, $p > .05$). The differences observed at this stage were not much and the VIF value was 1.00. This value was within the normal range and thus not explaining the present of multicollinearity. It was noted that psychological strain predicted prosocial behaviour ($\beta = -.21$, $p < .01$). The VIF was also within range (1.00) and indicating the absence of multicollinearity. With the addition of psychological strain, a significant variance of 5% was observed in prosocial behaviour and the change of 4% could be attributed to the added variable (psychological strain). Testing the interating influence of work locus of control and psychological strain separately, it was indicated that the variables had an interacting influence on prosocial behavior ($\beta = -.22$, $p < .01$). This could be attributed to the significant contribution of psychological strain. Since work locus of control did not independently predict prosocial behaviour, it could be summated that psychological strain does

not significantly moderate the relationship between work locus of control and prosocial behaviour. The result did not confirm hypothesis 3.

The last set of regression analysis confirmed the fourth hypothesis and it was indicated that when personnel's emotional intelligence increases, their prosocial behaviour also increases ($\beta = .41$, $p < .01$). Emotional intelligence contributed a significant variance of 16% to the total variance observed in prosocial behaviour. The relationship between psychological strain and prosocial behaviour was such that prosocial behaviour increases with significant decrease in personnel's psychological strain ($\beta = -.21$, $p < .01$). The interaction influence of emotionl intelligence and psychological strain on prosocial behaviour was significant with a contributing variance of 19% jointly ($\beta = -.52$, $p < .01$). Since the three processes were significantly met, it could be summated that psychological strain moderated the relationship between emotional intelligence and prosocial behaviour. It was in such form that psychological strain buffers the impact of emotional intelligence on prosocial behaviour and reducing its positive influence on prosociality.

Discussion and Conclusion

The study examined the moderating role of psychological strain in the relationship between personality variables, emotional intelligence and prosocial behaviour. The correlation analysis indicated that prosocial behaviour relates negatively with psychological strain. This is consistence with previous researches (Nantel-Vivier*etal*., 2014) that explain the implication of stressors as antecedents of anti-social behaviours (Singh *et al*., 2015; Ferris, 2011; Lim & Tai, 2014; Judge *et al*., 2012), while less strain situations elicit increase in prosocial behaviours (Rode *et al*., 2012; Rich *et al*, 2010). It was also observed that prosocial behaviour was positively associated with personality variables like core self-evaluation and emotional stability, but not with locus of control. Core self-evaluation, which is a cognitive appraisal of one's self could stimulate helping attitude since those that sees themselves as effective, skillful with value (Judge *et al*., 2012) will want to utilized such perceived capabilities in helping others. Emotional stability and locus of control had been described as components of core self-evaluation, but

testing them differently revealed that emotional stability was positively related to prosocial behaviour, while work locus of control was not. Although, work locus of control revealed a negative relationship which implied that internality correlated more with prosociality, the relationship was weak and not significant. This was justified earlier in O'Brien's (2004) review and confirmed the report from Afolabi and Alade (2015) research. The positive correlation of emotional stability with prosocial behaviour was in line with Chaturvedi and Chander's (2010) conclusion that emotionally stable individuals are empathetic and can adjust with situation more conveniently while maintaining and building stable social interactions. In agreement with previous researches (Afolabi, 2013; Brackett, Mayer & Warner, 2004; Brackett & Mayer, 2003) emotional intelligence correlated strongly with prosocial behaviour.

Contrary to the formulated hypotheses 1, 2 and 3, psychological strain did not moderate the relationship between personality variables (core self-evaluation, emotional stability and work locus of control) and prosocial behaviour. Even though the variables were related changes in prosocial behaviours were not determine by personality variables, thus difficult to attribute these changes to experience of psychological strain. Core self-evaluation did predicted prosocial behaviours such that pro social behaviour increases based on increased self-evaluation, but the impact of this personality trait on voluntary helping behaviour was not determined by experience of strain that are psychological. It was envisaged that behavioural responses from personality types will be conditioned to changes in environmental factors even though personality theories had explain the indifference in personality determine less of changes in environmental conditions. This constant nature of personality seems to dominate the findings of this research.

The weak impact of work locus of control in relationship with the variables understudy could be explained from the perspectives of conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 2001). Employees that attribute events to themselves will seek internal ways to regain loss energy just like those that attribute events to external forces will seek external strategy to cope with situation, thus there will be no differences in the work locus of control of personnel, but rather in their capabilities to cope. From a different point of view, there is the tendency that people with internality work locus of control could engage in voluntary helping behaviour to suit their internal desire (O'Brien, 2004), while also those with externality work locus of control could

actually attribute or attach an external value or belief with providing voluntary helping behaviours to others. For example, someone that believes that somehow, he will be blessed with greatness in some way if he renders uncompensated help to others. This justify why work locus of control, just like previous findings on locus of control (Afolabi & Alade, 2015; Spector & Fox, 2003) did not significantly predict personnel's prosocial behaviours.

Confirming hypothesis 4, the findings form the regression analysis indicated that psychological strain moderated the relationship between emotional intelligence and prosocial behaviour such that the impact of emotional intelligence on prosocial behaviour was buffer by psychological strain. As expected and opined by previous researches, emotional intelligence increases prosocial behaviours, but strain had also been identified as a negative stimulator of helping behaviours, thus the present of psychological strain would hinder the free helping attitude that should be displayed by emotionally intelligent individuals. Emotional intelligence is characterized by the ability of an individual to adapt (Afolabi, 2017), therefore in the face of accumulated stressor resulting to strain, such individual could engage in energy saving behaviours to replenish loss energy and avoid further loss (Hobfoll, 2001) by restraining from helping behaviours.

Conclusively, the research had empirically broadened the scope of understanding in the relationship between personality variables (core self-evaluation, emotional stability and work locus of control) and prosocial behaviour with emphasis on the role of psychological strain. In addition, it has also added to the knowledge of the relationship between emotional intelligence and prosocial behaviour with consideration of the moderating role of psychological strain. Theoretically, the role of emotional intelligence in the process of conservation of resources was further established, while limiting the possibility of work locus of control determining the replenishment of resources. Organization management, specifically the security and safety organizations should take cognizance of psychological strain while building on employees' emotional intelligence with the purpose of increasing prosociality within the work force. Modalities should be put in place to curtail strain. This will help prevent the generation of negative work behaviour from emotional intelligence, but rather positive utilization of such intelligence in building and managing positive work behaviours and selfless helping attitudes.

Considering the limited sample size and location, there is the need to replicate the findings among a larger sample size cutting across the various cultural and geographical locations in Nigeria. This will increase the strength of generalizing such research outcomes. In addition, cross sectional research design is limited in the aspect of causal effect conclusion. If possible, a much more empirical study could be carried out on the prosocial behaviours of security and safety personnel in relation to emotional intelligence in the face of psychological strain.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

Abdul-wahed, P. A. (2016). A study of emotional stability among children. *Scholarly Research Journal for Humanity Science and English Language*, 3(15), 3623-3627

Afolabi, O. A. (2013). Roles of personality types, emotional intelligence and gender differences on prosocial behavior. *Psychological Thought*, 6 (1), 124-139.

Afolabi, O. A. (2014a). Psychosocial predictors of prosocial behaviour among a sample of Nigerian undergraduates. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(2), 142-166

Afolabi, O. A. (2014b). Do self-esteem and family relations predict prosocial behaviour and social adjustment of fresh students? *Higher Education of Social Science*, 7(1), 26-34. DOI: 10.3968/5127

Afolabi, O. A. (2017). Indigenous emotional intelligence scale: Development and validation. *Psychological Thought*, 10(1), 138–154, doi:10.5964/psyct.v10i1.184

Afolabi, O. A. & Alade, M. O. (2015). Self-efficacy and locus of control as predictors of prosocial behaviour and organizational commitment among a sample of Nigerian nurses. *Nigerian Journal of Psychology*, 20(1), 214-227

Afolabi, O. A. & Idowu, E. O. (2014). Influence of gender, spiritual involvement/belief and emotional stability on prosocial behavior among some Nigerian drivers. *Canadian Social Science*, 10(1), 121-127. DOI:10.3968/j.css.1923669720141001.3919

Alessandri, G., Caprara, G. V., Eisenberg, N., & Steca, P. (2009). Reciprocal relations among self-efficacy beliefs and prosociality across time. *Journal of Personality*, 77, 1229-1259.

Ang, H. B. (2011). Core self-evaluations as a moderator of the stressor-strain-satisfaction relationships among farm managers in New Zealand. *Unpublished Master thesis*, University of Auckland. New Zealand. http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz

April, K. A., Dharani, B. & Peters, K. (2012). Impact of locus of control expectancy on level of well-being. *Review of European Studies*, 4(2), 1-4. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/res.v4n2p124

Arrigo, B. A. (2001). Critical criminology, existential humanism, and social justice: Exploring the contours of conceptual integration. *Critical Criminology, 10*(2), 83-95. doi:10.1023/A:1013147816858

Blakely, G. L., Andrews, M. C. & Moorman, R. H. (2005). The moderating effects of equity sensitivity on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational 125 citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 20*(2), 259-273. doi:10.1007/s10869-005-8263-3

Boer, D. & Fischer, R. (2013). How and when do personal values guide our attitudes and sociality? Explaining cross-cultural variability in attitude-value linkages. *Psychological Bulletin,* 139(5), 1113-1147. doi: 10.1037/a0031347.

Bond, F. W., & Bunce, D. (2003). The role of acceptance and job control in mental health, job satisfaction, and work performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 1057-1067.

Brackett, M. A., & Mayer, J. D. (2003). Convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity of competing measures of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(9), 1147-1158.

Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S., Shiffman, S., Lerner, N. & Salovey, P. (2006). Relating emotional abilities to social functioning: A comparison of self-report and performance measures of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 780–795

Brunborg, G. S. (2008). Core self-evaluations: A predictor variable for job stress. *European Psychologist.* 13, 96–102. doi:10.1027/1016-9040.13.2.96

Campbell, W. K., Bonacci, A. M., Shelton, J., Exline, J. J. & Bushman, B. J. (2004). Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-report measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 83,* 29-45.

Caprara, G. V. & Steca, P. (2007). Prosocial agency: The contribution of values and self-efficacy beliefs to prosocial behavior across ages. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology,* 26, 218–239.

Caprara, G. V., Alessandri, G. & Eisenberg, N. (2011). Prosociality: The Contribution of traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0025626.

Caprara, G. V., Alessandri, G., & Eisenberg, N. (2012). Prosociality: The contribution of traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*, 1289-1303.

Caprara, G. V., Alessandri, G., di Giunta, L., Panerai, L. & Eisenberg, N. (2010). The contribution of agreeableness and self-efficacy beliefs to prosociality. *European Journal of Personality*, 24, 36 - 55.

Chaturvedi, M. & Chander, R. (2010). Development of emotional stability scale. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal*, 19(1), 37-40. DOI: 10.4103/0972-6748.77634

Cohen, S., Kamarck, T. & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24*, 385-396.

Collins, P. A. & Gibbs, A. C. C. (2003). Stress in police officers: A study of the origins, prevalence and severity of stress-related symptoms within a county police force. *Occupational Medicine (Oxford, England), 53*(4), 256-264. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqg061

Cote, S., DeCelles, K. A., McCarthy, J. M., Van Kleef, G. A. & Hideg, I. (2011). The Jekyll and hyde of emotional intelligence: Emotion-regulation knowledge facilitates both prosocial and interpersonally deviant behavior. *Psychological Science* 22(8) 1073–1080. DOI: 10.1177/0956797611416251

De Caroli, E. M. & Sagone, E. (2013). Self-efficacy and prosocial tendencies in Italian adolescents. *Journal* of *Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 92(6), 239-245.

Facteau, J. D., Allen, T. D., Facteau, C. L., Bordas, R. M. &Tears, R. S. (2000). *Structured interviewing for OCBs: Construct validity, faking, and the effects of question type.* Paper presented at the 15th Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans, LA.

Ferris, D. L. (2011). Approach or avoidance (or both?): integrating core self- evaluations within an approach/ avoidance framework. *Personality Psychology*, 64, 137–161. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01204.x

Gohm, C. L., Corser, G. C. & Dalsky, D. J. (2005). Emotional intelligence under stress: Useful, unnecessary, or irrelevant? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39, 1017–1028.

Hobfoll, S. E. & Shirom, A. (2001). Conservation of resources theory. In R. Golembiewski (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Behavior,* 57-80. New York, NY: Dekker.

Hoepf, M. R. (2010). Domain-specific core self-evaluations and stressors as predictors of strains. *Unpublished Master thesis*, Wright State University

Izard, C., Fine, S., Schultz, D., Mostow, A., Ackerman, B. & Youngstrom, E. (2001). Emotion knowledge as a predictor of social behaviour and academic competence in children at risk. *Psychological Science,* 12(1), 18-23

Jakob, E., Carina, L., Eric, M. H. & Ann-Charlotte, A. W. (2012). *Who cares about others? Empathic self-efficacy as an antecedent of prosocial behaviour.* Malardalen: Malardalen University Press.

Jones, F. I., & Kidman, G. (2001). Approaches to studying stress. In F. I. Jones and J. Bright (Eds), *Stress: Myth, theory and research*. Harlow, UK: Prentice Hall.

Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E. & Thoresen, C. J. (2003). The core self-evaluations scale (CSES): Development of a measure. *Personnel Psychology*, *56,* 303–331.

Judge, T. A., Ilies, R. & Zhang, Z. (2012). Genetic influences on core self-evaluations, job satisfaction, and workstress: A behavioral genetics mediated model. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes.* 117, 208–220. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.08.005

Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., Judge, T. A. & Scott, B. A. (2009). The role of core self-evaluations in the coping process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 177–195.

Laibe, D. J., Carlo, G., & Roesch, S. C. (2004). Pathways to self-esteem in late adolescence: The role of parent and peer attachment, empathy and social behaviours. *Journal of Adolescents*, 27(6), 703-716

Lim, S. & Tai, K. (2014). Family incivility and job performance: A moderated mediation model of psychological distress and core self-evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 99, 351–359. doi:10.1037/a0034486

Lopes, P. N., Salovey, P., Cote, S., Beers, M. & Petty, R. E. (2005). Emotion regulation abilities and the quality of social interaction. *Emotion,* 5, 113-118

Mortelmans, D., Damen, S. & Sinardet, D. (2008). Lief, liever, liefdadig? Over het liefdadigheidsgehalte van de Vlaming. *PSW-paper 2005/8.* Sociale Wetenschappen. Antwerpen.

Moyle, P. (1995). The role of negative affectivity in the stress process: tests of alternative models. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 647-668.

Nalla, M. K. & Madan, M. (2012). Determinants of citizens' perceptions of police–community cooperation in India: Implications for community policing. *Asian Journal of Criminology, 7*(4), 277-294. doi:10.1007/s11417-011-9110-2

Nantel-Vivier, A., Pihl, R. O., Coté, S., & Tremblay, R. E. (2014). Developmental association of prosocial behaviour with aggression, anxiety and depression from infancy to pre adolescence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 55, 1135–1144. doi: 10.1111/jcpp.12235

Ng, T., Sorenen, K., & Eby, L. (2006). Locus of control at work: a meta-analysis. *Journal Organizational Behavior,* 27(8), 1057-1087.

Nikolaou, I. & Tsaousis, I. (2002). Emotional Intelligence in the Workplace: Exploring its Effects on Occupational Stress and Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis,* 10(4), 327-342.

O'Brien, K. E. (2004). Self-Determination Theory and locus of control as antecedents of voluntary workplace behaviors. An unpublished Master thesis. University of South Florida.*Graduate Theses and Dissertations.* http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/1182

Oginska-Bulik, N. (2005). Emotional intelligence in the workplace: Exploring its effects on occupational stress and health outcomes in human service workers. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health,* 18(2), 167-175.

Paoline, E. A. (2003). Taking stock: Toward a richer understanding of police culture. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 31*(3), 199-214. doi:10.1016/S0047-2352(03)00002-3

Paoline, E. A. I. & Terrill, W. (2004). Women police officers and the use of coercion. *Women and Criminal Justice [H.W.Wilson - SSA], 15*(3/4), 97.

Patel, A. S. (1976). Personality Inventory. Retrieved from http://shodh.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/76476/12/12_appendix.pdf

Pelfrey, W. V. Jr. (2004). The inchoate nature of community policing: Differences between community policing and traditional police officers. *Justice Quaarterly,* 21(3), 579-601

Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A. & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behaviour: multilevel perspectives. *Annual Reviews of Psychology,* 56, 365-392

Piff, P. K., Dietze, P., Feinberg, M., Stancato, D. M. & Keltner, D. (2015). Awe, the small self, and prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 108(6), 883-899 doi:10.1037/pspi0000018.

Piff, P. K., Stancato, D. M., Martinez, A. G., Kraus, M. W. & Keltner, D. (2012). Class, chaos and the construction of community. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103,* 949-962.

Raposa, E. B., Laws, H. B. & Ansell, E. B. (2016). Prosocial behavior mitigates the negative effects of stress in everyday life. *Clinical Psychology of Science*, 4(4), 691–698. doi:10.1177/2167702615611073.

Rich, B. L., LePine, J. A. & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academic Management Journal*, 53, 617–635. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2010.51468988

Rode, J. C., Judge, T. A. & Sun, J. M. (2012). Incremental validity of core self-evaluations in the presence of other self-concept traits: An investigation of applied psychology criteria in the United States and China. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies,* 19, 326–340. doi:10.1177/1548051812442964

Shah, A. M., & Rizvi, T. (2016). Prosocial behavior and big five-factor model of personality: A theoretical review. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 4(1), 161-170 DIP: 18.01.117/20160401

Singh, K., Junnarkar, M. & Sharma, S. (2015). Anxiety, stress, depression, and psychosocial functioning of Indian adolescents. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 57(4), 367–374. doi: 10.4103/0019-5545.171841

Spector, P. E. & Fox, S. (2003). Emotional experience at work: Assessing emotions with the job-related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS). *Paper presented at the meeting of the Southern Management Association*, Clearwater Beach, FL., November, 12-15

Spector, P. E. (1988). Development of the work locus of control scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology,* 61, 335-340.

Sudhamayi, P. (2013). Emotional intelligence and personal strain among high school teachers: a correlational study. *International Journal of Advancements in Research & Technology*, 2(11), 232-237

Takeuchi, R., Bolino, M. C. & Lin, C. (2015). Too many motives? The interactive effects of multiple motives on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 100, 1239–1248. doi:10.1037/apl0000001

Watson, D. (2000). *Mood and temperament.* New York: Guilford Press.