NIGERIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Editor-in-Chief
Prof. S.O. Adebayo
Managing Editor
B.E. Nwankwo Ph.D

Effects of Perceived Similarity and Self-Concept on Social Dominance and Prosocial Behaviour among Some Undergraduates

Olukayode Ayooluwa AFOLABI
&
Lydia ADEMILUYI
Department of Pure & Applied Psychology,
Adekunle Ajasin University,
Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria
E-mail: afolabi95@yahoo.co.uk

Abstract

Social dominance and prosocial behavior has widely been studied by researchers in developed countries, yet there exist a wide knowledge gap needed to be filled on these variables in Nigeria especially among students of tertiary institutions. Hence, this study investigated the effects of perceived similarity and self-concept on social dominance and prosocial behavior among some undergraduates Using cross-sectional survey design with a purposive and accidental sampling technique, a total sample of 238 undergraduates consisting of 118 males (49.6%) and 120 females (50.4%) respondents with their ages ranging from 16 to 40 (M =1.95; SD=.78). Two hypotheses were formulated and tested with 2X2 ANOVA. The result confirmed a significant effect of self-concept on social dominance [F(1, 234) =9.30, P<.01], however, no significant effect was found for perceived similarity on social dominance [F (1, 234) =.205, P>.05]. Also, perceived similarity and self-concept did not have an interaction effect on social dominance [F(1, 234) =.08, P>.05]. In addition, perceived similarity [F(1, 234) =15.01, P< .01] and self-concept [F(1, 234) =534.53, P<.01] had significant main effects on prosocial behaviour. Also, there was an interaction effect of similarity and self-concept on prosocial behaviour [F (1, 234) =5.36, P<<.01]. The study therefore recommends that prosocial education should be embraced and taught in tertiary institutions as one of the courses. This will help students to form a positive attitude towards others thereby breeds oneness, progress and wellness in the society.
Keywords: Prosocial behavior, social dominance, perceived similarity, self-concept

Introduction

Social dominance refers to the induction of fear, through intimidation and coercion, to attain social rank. Dominance is exemplified by relationships based on coercion, such as that between a peer group, boss and employee, or bully and victim in campus. Dominant individuals create fear in subordinates by unpredictably and erratically taking or threatening (implicitly or explicitly) to withhold resources. In turn, subordinates submit by complying with dominants' demands, in order to safeguard other more valuable resources (e.g., their

physical welfare, children, or livelihoods). As a result, dominants can attain a great deal of social influence.

Some studies have illustrated that social dominance can shift in ways that reflect what is salient in the particular context. Thus, peoples' social dominance scores do not depend only on the extent to which they favor hierarchical group relations, in general, but also on the social category or issue that happens to be salient at the time (Guimond, Dambrun, Michinov & Duarte, 2003; Huang & Liu, 2005; Lehmiller & Schmitt, 2007). However, individuals can vary markedly in how they perceive hierarchal differences (Sidanius & Pratto, 2003). Additionally, those with a high social dominance orientation are likely to prefer unequal social roles among individuals in a hierarchical system (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). Conversely, those low on social dominance orientation prefer equality and have egalitarian viewpoints on how people should be treated (Sidanius & Pratto, 2003), though most researchers have framed their theoretical arguments concerning the impact of social dominance orientation in terms of high social dominance orientation (O'Brien & Dietz, 2011). Driskell, Goodwin, Salas, and O'Shea (2006) summarize how individuals high on social dominance approach group relations, and they state that these individuals "prefer intragroup relations to be unequal, hierarchical, and ordered along a superior-inferior dimension".

At first glance, social dominance appears to be a measure of outgroup prejudice or intergroup bias. However, those endorsing social dominance orientation do not necessarily favor their own group (Jost & Thompson, 2000), thus researchers recognize it as more than simple bias. Indeed, social dominance orientation is a rare instrument that seemingly captures an individual's foundational orientation toward social group relations–one predicting a wide range of secondary beliefs "including political conservatism, noblesse oblige, just world beliefs, nationalism, patriotism, militarism, internal attributions for poverty, sexism, rape myths, and the endorsement of the Protestant work ethic across a range of cultures" (Ho, Sidanius, Pratto, Levin, Thomsen, Kteily, & Sheehy-Skeffington, 2012).

Prosocial behavior on the other hand, is defined as a behavior of helping, comforting, sharing, and cooperating (Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005). Prosocial activities are any conducted or planned action to help other people without expecting anything in return (Afolabi, 2013). It is a voluntary behavior intended to benefit another and it consists of actions which benefit other people or society as a whole, such as helping, sharing, donating,

co-operating, and volunteering (Eisenberg, Fabes & Spinrad, 2006). It can also be referred to as a broad category of behaviours that includes any action that provides benefit to others like following rules in a game, being honest and cooperating with others in social situations. Based on this, Roche (2010) groups prosocial behaviors into ten distinct classes: physical assistance; physical service; giving and sharing; verbal assistance; verbal comfort; validation and positive assessment of others; attentive listening; empathy; solidarity; positive presence; and unity.

Considering the benefits of prosocial behavior, previous formulations of prosocial behavior have focused primarily on the costs to the giver and the benefits to the recipient, with little emphasis on the immediate benefits of prosocial acts for the giver. Yet emerging evidence suggests that acting with kindness yields many kinds of benefits for the giver. For example, research has documented that caring for others is linked to greater self-esteem and self-efficacy (Crocker, 2008). In another study, Dunn, Aknin & Norton (2008) investigated how spending money on oneself versus others affects happiness. Beyond serving as a reward for acts of kindness, gratitude also influences the default tendency toward prosocial action. It produces increased tendencies toward generosity, favors, sacrifices, and expressions of appreciation, which are critical to prosocial relations (Bartlett & DeSteno, 2006). More generally, there appear to be strong emotional benefits to acting prosocially and being prosocially inclined.

A multitude of internal and external factors may exert effect on prosocial behavior and social dominance. Such variables like perceived similarity and self concept will however be investigated in this study.

Perceived similarity refers to belief of an interpersonal situation in which two individuals share attributes. It is believed that relationship partners are supposed to be similar to one another (Morry, 2005). Davis and Rusbult, (2001) propose that similarity would continue to lead to attraction in existing relationships because (i) similarity provides continuous reinforcement throughout the relationship, and (ii) dissimilarity should eventually be extinguished due to the lack of reinforcement. Similarity plays an important role in predicting affiliation and liking (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). People who share well-established relationships such as couples, friends, mentor and mentee, coworkers and members of informal organizations also tend to be more similar to each other than other randomly selected members of the same population.

In addition, McGlothlin and Killen (2005) examined the impact of intergroup contact on perceived similarity between members of the in-group and out-group and perceptions of cross-group friendships and found that intergroup contact influenced perceptions of similarity in first and fourth grade children. According to attraction-similarity hypothesis, aspects of a relationship are what is leading to perception of similarities (Morry, 2005). Based on this assumption, perceptions of similarity will be intensified during the course of relationships. Similarities among friends may therefore, come from three different sources; interpersonal influence, selective attraction and effects of shared environment. This is particularly true for on-going relationships when a person is motivated to perceive more similarities with friends or significant others as part of their self or relationship-serving bias (Morry, 2005). Individuals tend to associate with those who hold similar beliefs and attitudes (Corcoran, Crusius, & Mussweiler, 2011). However, as noted by Buunk & Gibbons, (2007) that not only do individuals compare themselves to other individuals within their in-group, they also compare themselves to members of out-groups.

Self-concept refers to an individual's cognition and feelings about the self (Stone & May, 2002). Self-concept is the combination of self-appraisals, verbal and motor behaviors directed at the self and cultivation of various images of the self (Henry, 2001). It is is a complex network of interactive self-perceptions that a person holds about his beliefs to the adoption of certain behaviors and to have some personal attributes with cultural value. It can therefore be classified as a cognitive science that organizes abstract and concrete views about you and controls the processing of information of the self-belonging. Self-concept relates to individual beliefs and estimates about characteristics, roles, skills and his relationships (Wigfield, Lutz & Wagner, 2005).

Statement of the Problem

A critical step in the process of preferentially helping those who are prosocially inclined is to identify who is likely to be prosocial. Although, the motivations for being prosocial has been explained by Zahn-Waxler, Radke-Yarrow, Wagne and Chapman (1992) who show in their work that through helping and volunteering, young people can satisfy their own needs, learn about and express their values, understand their world, gain career-related experience, and strengthen social competence and relationships. However, there are limited researches on prosocial behavior among undergraduate students in Nigeria, especially some important variables that could influence prosocial behavior among them which include, self

esteem, self concept, effects of mood, environment, residential mobility, spirituality, narcissism, etc. as recommended by Afolabi, (2014). Where literature exists, most of the researches on prosocial behavior have been done in the United States and Europe, to date. Research suggests that there are both internal and external factors in the development of prosocial tendencies, also called the prosocial personality (Eisenberg, 2000) and these two sources can either reinforce or challenge one another.

Social dominance orientation is one of the widely studied constructs in social psychology literature with its high predictive and explanatory power on many other concepts. Social dominance is a rare instrument that seemingly captures an individual's foundational orientation toward social group relations, one predicting a wide range of secondary beliefs "including political conservatism, noblesse oblige, just world beliefs, nationalism, patriotism, militarism, internal attributions for poverty, sexism, rape myths, and the endorsement of the Protestant work ethic across a range of cultures" (Ho, Sidanius, Pratto, Levin, Thomsen, Kteily & Sheehy-Skeffington, 2012). Although according to Sidanius, Pratto, van Laar and Levin (2004), social dominance orientation was found to be significantly related to many other concepts such as dominancy and some personality traits yet there is wide knowledge gap that needs to be filled in terms of likely variables that could influence social dominance among students of tertiary institutions, especially in Nigeria. Hence, the present study seek to examine the extent to which perceived similarity and self concept influences social dominance and prosocial behavior among a sample of Nigerian undergraduates.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of perceived similarity and self concept on social dominance and prosocial behavior among undergraduate students of Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko Ondo state. Based on the research topic above, the specific purposes are:

1. To examine the extent to which perceived similarity affect social dominance behavior among undergraduates
2. To examine the extent to which perceived similarity affect prosocial behavior among undergraduates
3. To examine the extent to which self concept affect social dominance behavior among undergraduates

4. To examine the extent to which self concept affect prosocial behavior among undergraduates

Perceived Similarity and Social Dominance

Klepper, Sleebos, van de Bunt and Agneessens (2009) examined whether social categorization and peer control amplifies the social influence process among friends. Using a stochastic actor based model for network dynamics, with three-wave dataset of first year Royal Netherlands Naval College officer students on friendship formation and military discipline. Results showed that students adjust their own military discipline to that of their friends. However, result also revealed that there was no support for the idea that individuals adjust their discipline more to friends who are of the same military specialty, and neither more to friends who exert peer control.

In addition, Amodio and Showers (2005) investigated the association between perceived similarity and liking for a romantic partner in college students' relationships. Eighty four (84) individuals participated in three laboratory sessions. The result indicated that high perceived similarity appeared to buffer couples against destructive accommodation responses. Also, destructive responses were associated with ended status only when perceived similarity was low. The following year, Duller, LePoire, Aune and Eloy (2006) studied social perceptions as mediators of the effect of speech rate similarity on compliance. 257 participated in the study and the findings indicated that speech rate similarity enhanced social attractiveness, and faster speech rates increased speaker competence and dominance. Social attractiveness had a main effect on compliance, suggesting a direct effect on attraction.

Snellman and Ekehammar (2005), in their own investigation examined ethnic hierarchies, prejudice, and social dominance. They sampled 150 non-psychology students from six ethnic target group both Swedish and immigrant men and women. The results disclosed that irrespective of gender and ethnic origin, the various subgroups of participants ranked and formed similar hierarchies of the six ethnic target groups, and people inclination to ethnic ranking showed significant correlations with their ethnic prejudice as well as social dominance orientation.

In addition, Levin (2008) investigated perceived group status differences and the effects of gender, ethnicity, and religion on social dominance orientation. Data were collected in Israel, Northern Ireland, and the United States. The study outcome showed that social dominance between ethnic and religious groups were found to be greater when the status gap

between the groups was perceived to be larger. The perceived group status on social dominance and the degree to which these effects vary depending on whether the salient group distinction and it is based on gender, ethnicity or religion.

Perceived Similarity and Prosocial Behaviour

Van-Vugt (2003) examined kinship cues as the basis for prosocial behavior in groups. The study summarized a range of cues that serve as kin-recognition heuristics, and focus especially on the cue of similarity. The evidence revealed that similarity promotes a wide range of prosocial feelings and behavior. In other words, kin-selection promote prosocial behavior not toward the family, per se, but rather toward individuals who are psychologically familiar.

The same way, Park and Schaller (2005) studied to know if attitude similarity serves as a heuristic cue signaling kinship, which may motivate kin-recognition responses (e.g., prosocial behavior) even to unrelated individuals. Forty-five students (29 women and 16 men) from the University of British Columbia participated in exchange for extra credit in undergraduate psychology courses. Results revealed that, the activation of kinship cognitions was correlated with perceivers' willingness to help similar others. Additional results showed that, relative to targets with dissimilar attitudes, attitudinally similar targets were automatically linked to kinship cognitions.

Also, Maner and Gailliot (2006) in their own study found that prosocial motivations for helping depend on relationship context. Empathic concern appeared to partially mediate effects of relationship context on willingness to help. Moreover, while controlling for egoistic motivators; empathic concern was linked to participants' willingness to help a kin-member but not a stranger.

Following this, Pagotto (2010) examined the interplay of empathy, oneness and perceived similarity in mediating the effects of perspective taking on prosocial responses in Italy. Participants were 151 young women who accepted to participate in the research on a voluntary basis. The results indicated that focusing on feelings and focusing on similarities between oneself and the target, compared to an objective attention focus, resulted in greater arousal of emotional responding to the target's plight, eliciting higher levels of empathic concern, feelings of injustice and personal sadness. The results also provide further evidence of the role of emotional responses to the other's plight, and in particular of empathic concern,

in predicting prosocial responses. Additionally, they are consistent with the idea that perceptions of self-other closeness and oneness are amplified by emotional reactions.

The same way, Hawkins and Nosek in (2012) studied to understand when In-groups Aren't "In": Perceived Political Belief Similarity Moderates Religious In-group Favoritism. In two focal experiments and two replications, they find evidence that perceived belief similarity moderates ingroup favoritism. Results also revealed that compared to non-religious people, Christians favored religious charities, but within Christians, conservative Christians favored religious charities more than liberal Christians did.

In another study by Connick-Keefer (2016), he examined the impact of intergroup similarity on prosocial behaviour. The sample was 122 participants from Canada, United States, and the Europe, Asia, South American and African countries. Results showed that intergroup similarity does have an impact on prosocial behaviour. Furthermore, civic engagement moderated the effect of intergroup similarity on Facebook support as well as prosocial intent. Also, conservatives moderated the relationship between intergroup similarity and prosocial actions. Lastly, individuals were more willing to provide aid to in-group and similar out-group members than to dissimilar out-group members.

The most recent is the work of Fiedler, Hellmann and Dorrough (2018), which investigated cross-national in-group favoritism in prosocial behavior: evidence from Latin and North America. The study made use of 915 participants from four Latin American nations (Chile, Peru, Colombia, & Venezuela) and the USA. The results revealed strong evidence for national in-group favoritism for the overall sample, but also significant differences among national subsamples. The magnitude of in-group favoritism increases with social distance toward the out-group.

Self Concept and Prosocial Behaviour

Gupta and Thapliyal (2015) carried out a study of prosocial behaviour and self-concept of adolescents in Delhi. Sample comprised of 100 students both male and female from classes 7th, 8th and 9th classes. The findings revealed that overall self-concept of adolescents was found to be average and favourable and there was no significant difference found between self-concept of male and female adolescents. The result also revealed that there was significant relationship found between prosocial behaviour and self-concept of adolescents.

Žukauskien and Malinauskien (2009) investigates the relationship between youth prosocial orientation, and personality traits and personal values in a sample of Lithuanian adolescents, in order to assess differences in personality and personal values between those adolescents who are engaged in community and school life and those who are not. 490 students participated in the study. Findings revealed that adolescents who engaged more in community and school life were found higher levels of basic personal values, with the exception of hedonism. Results are discussed with regard to the role that personality traits and personal values may play in fostering the prosocial orientation of adolescents.

Afolabi (2014) investigated on the relationship between self-esteem and family relations of a sample of Nigerian undergraduates as indicated by their prosocial behaviour and social adjustment. He made use of 294 fresh students who have spent at least 30 weeks in the university as participants from both Ambrose Alli and Adekunle Ajasin universities in Nigeria. Results revealed that self-esteem and family relations independently predicted prosocial behaviour. The result also revealed that self-esteem and family relations had a jointly prediction on prosocial behavior.

Liu, Huang, Du and Wu (2014) studied the relation among self-concept, inter-personal relation and internet altruistic behavior in China. The study sampled 177 in-school undergraduate students. The results showed that the total scores of self-concept have no significant correlation with the total scores of internet altruistic behavior. However, internet altruistic behavior has a significant correlation with inter-personal relation.

Bryan, Master and Walton (2014) examined on how invoking the self to increase helping in young children. A number of 149 children of age between 3 to 6 years participated in the experimental study. The outcome revealed that children are motivated to pursue a positive identity which otherwise leveraged to encourage prosocial behavior

Falanga, Caroli and Sagone (2012) examined the relationship between self-efficacy and self-concepts in university students. A total sample of 76 Italian students at university of Catania took part in the research. Results showed that the students reached on averages in emphatic and self-efficacy and express a very similar representation of self-concepts. In addition, the more the students perceived themselves efficient at understanding the feelings and emotion of the others and cultivating good relations, the more they expressed a positive representation of actual and social self.

Self Concept and Social Dominance

Jonkmann, Trautwein and Ludtke (2009) investigated socially dominant adolescents: the moderating role of classroom context and behavioral heterogeneity. Data from 5,468 seventh grade students in 266 classrooms. The results confirmed the hypothesis that there was a relationship between social dominance, achievement, peer acceptance and rejection, self-concept, and deviance.

Snellman (2007) examined some aspects of ethnic and gender-based prejudice and discrimination in hierarchical situations in Sweden. Both immigrant and ethnic Swedes were asked to report their social distance to a number of ethnic groups represented in their geographical area. The results showed that hierarchies exist in Swedish environments and that they are connected with both ethnic prejudice and participants' tendency to promote and support hierarchies, as expressed in their scores on social dominance orientation.

Levin and Sidanius (2003) examined social dominance and social identity in the United States and Israel. Participants of the study were students from both America and Israel universities. Result showed that for all high and low status groups, stronger ingroup identification was associated with more positive in-group affect, and for nearly all groups, higher social dominance was associated with more negative in-group effect toward the low-status group. Levin (2008) investigated on perceived group status differences and the effects of gender, ethnicity and religion on social dominance orientation. Data were collected in Israel, Northern Ireland, and the United States. The study outcome showed that social dominance between ethnic and religious groups were found to be greater when the status gap between the groups was perceived to be larger. The perceived group status on social dominance, and the degree to which these effects vary depending on whether the salient group distinction is based on gender, ethnicity or religion.

Weisfeld, Block and Block (2012) examined possible determinants of social dominance among adolescent girls. Participants were 50 upper-middle class girls of age 15 to 18 years old were ranked by 200 classmates of each sex on various traits reputed to be social prerogatives or bodily expressions of dominance status. Results confirmed that intelligence and dominance emerged as separate factors in each sex's perception of the girls.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested in this study:

1. Perceived similarity and self-concept would have significant main and interaction effect on social dominance among a sample of Nigerian undergraduates

2. Perceived similarity and self-concept would have significant main and interaction effect on prosocial behavior among a sample of Nigerian undergraduates.

METHOD

Design

A cross-sectional survey was adopted in this study. This is because data on all variables under investigation were collected simultaneously with single questionnaire. The dependent variables are social dominance and prosocial behavior. The independent variables are perceived similarity and self-concept.

Setting

The focus of the study was centered on undergraduates of Adekunle Ajasin University Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State. The choice of this school for the study is primarily because the university environment is suitable for the achievement of the research objectives, and the fact that the researchers are members of the University community.

Participants

Based on the characteristics of the population and the objective of the study, purposive and convenience sampling techniques were utilized to select a total of two hundred and thirty eight (238) students (male=118 and female= 120) from the six Faculties of the university, namely; Faculty of Social and Management Sciences, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Arts, Faculty of Agriculture and Faculty of Sciences. The participants were made up of 100 level=26 (10.6%), 200 level=59 (24.8%), 300 level=68 (28.6%), 400 level=74 (31.1%) and 500 level=11 (4.6%). The participants' age as at the time of data collection ranged between 16–35 years (mean =1.95; SD =.78). Furthermore, their family type vary; monogamous=182 (76.5%) and polygamous=56 (23.5%).

Instruments

Data were gathered through a questionnaire which comprised five sections (A-E). Section A was used to gather socio-demographic information, which includes age, gender, family type and academic level.

Prosocial behavior was measured using Prosocial Behavior (PSB) Scale developed by Afolabi, (2004). It consisted 12 Items. The instrument is rated on 5-point Likert scale (1= Strongly Disagree 2= Disagree 3= Neutral 4= Agree 5= Strongly Agree). Sample item on the scale include: "I enjoy helping others" and "helping others can put you in trouble". The Cronbach Alpha obtained in the present study is .83. High score would indicate that the individual is much concern with helping and reaching out to others in time of needs while low score indicates that the individual is less concerned about others.

Social dominance was measured using Social Dominance Behavior Scale by Ho, Sidanius, Pratto, Levin, Thomsen, Kteily, & Sheehy-Skeffington (2012). It consisted of 16 Items. The instrument is rated on 7-point Likert scale (1= Strongly Oppose 2= Somewhat Oppose 3= Slightly Oppose 4= Neutral 5= Slightly Favor 6= Somewhat Favor 7= Strongly Favor). Sample item on the scale include: "It is unjust to try to make group equal" and "No one group should dominate in society". The Cronbach Alpha obtained in the present study is .74. High score indicate high level of social dominance behavior while low score indicates low social dominance.

Perceived similarity was measured using Perceived Similarity Scale developed by Madia and Lutz, (2004). It consisted of 14 items. The instrument is rated on 5-point Likert scale (1= Not at all true 2= Somewhat not true 3= True 4= True most of the time 5= Very true). Sample item on the scale include: "My protégé would look up to me" and "My protégé would be similar to myself". The Cronbach Alpha obtained in the present study is .84. High score indicates awareness of similarity among persons or group, while low score indicates vice versa.

Self-concept was measured using Self Concept Scale developed by Robson (1989). It consists of 30 items. The instrument is rated on 8-point Likert scale (0= Strongly Disagree 1= Somewhat Disagree 2= Slightly Disagree 3= Disagree 4= Slightly Agree 5= Somewhat Agree 6=Agree 7= Strongly Agree). Sample item on the scale include: (1) "I have control over my own life." and "I am not embarrassed to let people know my opinions". The Cronbach Alpha obtained in the present study is .78. High score indicate higher levels of self-concept while low score indicate low level of self-concept.

Procedure

The Researchers sought permission from class governors of some selected departments to make her intention of coming known to the class; the purpose of the study was explained to the participants. Questions about the study and why their participation is needed were entertained and convincing responses were given which gave the researcher the opportunity to administer the questionnaires. In addition, the respondents were informed that there is no right or wrong answers, and as such should try to be as honest as possible in their responses. They were also given assurance of confidentiality and anonymity of their identities and responses. Each questionnaire was given to the participants who were willing to participate in the study. Also, the researcher went further to administer the questionnaire to some of the passerby students at some strategic locations within the university environment in order to meet up with the study's sample expectation. However out of the 250 copies of the questionnaires that were administered, only 238 were retrieved and found usable for the analysis. Both the administering and the gathering of data was accomplished within two weeks.

Data Analysis

To determine the relationship among the study variables, Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) analysis was used. The two hypotheses were tested using 2×2 Analysis of Variance.

RESULTS

Test of Relationships among Variables of Study

Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) analysis was conducted to test the relationship among the variables of the study. The results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Correlation Matrix Showing the Mean, Standard Deviation and the Relationship among the Study Variables

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Age	1.95	.78	1							
2. Academic Level	2.94	1.09	.31**	1						
3. Gender	1.50	.50	-.10	.09	1					
4. Family Type	1.24	.43	.04	.10	.06	1				
5. Perceived Similarity	49.18	9.88	-.03	.19**	.02	-.06	1			
6. Self-Concept	131.76	24.06	-.01	.18**	.07	-.08	.42**	1		
7. Social Dominance	58.42	12.08	.07	-.16*	-.11	.01	-.10	-20**	1	
8. Prosocial Behaviour	46.55	8.60	-.08	.09	.12	-.08	.45**	.50**	-23**	1

** p $<$ 0.01, * p $<$ 0.05, N=238

Results in Table 1 indicates that age had no significant relationship with social dominance [r (238) = .07, $p<$. 01]. Also, age had no significant relationship with prososocial behavior [r (238) = -.08, $p<$. 01]. This implies that age differences among students had no contribution on social dominance experience neither on prosocial behavior among the sample. Furthermore, the results revealed that Academic Level had significant inverse relationship with social dominance [r (238) = -.16, $p<$.01], in such that social dominance tend to reduce as students move from one level to higher level academically.

In a contrary, the results further revealed that Academic Level had no significant relationship social dominance [r (238) =.09, p>.01]. This implies that prosocial behavior among undergraduate is not determined by academic level. Also, gender had no significant relationship with social dominance [r (238) =-.11, p>.01], and prosocial [r (238) =.12, p>.01]. This implies that social dominance or prosocial behavior among undergraduate are not connected with whether one is male or female. Furthermore, family type had no significant relationship with social dominance [r (238) =.01, p>.01], and prosocial [r (238) = -.08,

p>.01]. This implies that the family background of student, be it monogamous or polygamous had nothing to do with dominance or helping behavior (prosocial behavior). Also, perceived similarity had no significant influence on social dominance [r (238) =.-10, p>.01]. This implies that perceived similarity had no connection with social dominance =.-10, p>.01].

However, perceived similarity had a significant positive relationship with prosocial behavior [r (238) =.45, p>.01]. This implies that people are willing to help firstly; those they are familiar with. Furthermore, Self-concept had a significant inverse relationship with social dominance [r (238) =.-20, p>.01]. This implies that high self-concept will lead to less social dominance, likewise low self-concept will results to high level of social dominance. Also, self-concept had a significant positive relationship with prosocial behavior [r (238) =.50, p>.01]. This implies that there is a strong connection between self-concept and prosocial behavior.

Table 2: Summary of 2✕ 2 ANOVA Showing the Effect of Perceived Similarity and Self Concept on Social Dominance

Source	SS	Df	MS	F	P
Perceived Similarity	28.993	1	28.993	.205	> .05
Self-Concept	1314.381	1	1314.381	9.302	< .01
Perceived Similarity * Self-Concept	11.281	1	11.281	.080	> .05
Error	33062.895	234	141.294		
Total	34601.819	237			

The result in table 2 above showed that perceived similarity had no significant effect on social dominance [F (1, 234) =.205, P>.05]. This implies that perceived similarity did not exert effect on social dominance. However, self-concept had a significant effect on social dominance [F(1, 234) =9.30, P<.01]. This implies that student's level of self-concept is associated with social dominance. Finally, result from table 4.2 showed that perceived similarity and self-concept had main interaction effect on social dominance [F(1, 234) =.08,

P>.05]. This implies that there was no significant interaction effect of perceived similarity and self-concept on social dominance. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was partially confirmed.

Table 3: Summary of 2✕ 2 ANOVA Showing the Effect of Perceived Similarity and Self Concept on Prosocial Behaviour

Source	SS	Df	MS	F	P
Perceived Similarity	2369.483	1	2369.483	15.009	< .01
Self-Concept	84389.460	1	84389.460	534.530	< .01
Perceived Similarity * Self-Concept	846.829	1	846.829	5.364	< .05
Error	36942.969	234	157.876		
Total	137177.866	237			

The result in table 3 above showed that perceived similarity had significant effect on prosocial behavior [F(1, 234) =15.01, P<.01]. This implies that perceived similarity is associated with prosocial behaviors. Furthermore, result revealed that self-concept had a significant effect on prosocial behavior [F(1, 234) =534.53, P<.01]. This implies that students 'self-concept is strongly associated with prosocial behavior. Finally, result also revealed that perceived similarity and self-concept had main interaction effect on prosocial behavior [F (1, 234) =5.36, P<.01]. This implies that the combination of perceived similarity and self-concept is associated with prosocial behavior. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was confirmed.

Discussion

This study examined the effect of perceived similarity and self-concept on social dominance and prosocial behavior among the undergraduates of Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria.

Hypothesis one (1) which stated that perceived similarity and self-concept would have main and interaction effects on social dominance among undergraduates was partially confirmed. The result indicated that there was no main effect of perceived similarity on social dominance among university undergraduates. This implied that there is less social dominance

orientation among groups that shares common ties. The result supported the findings of Morrison and Ybarra (2009) which showed that high in-group identification was associated with high social dominance orientation. It also supported Klepper et al. (2009)'s findings that even military students adjust their own military discipline to that of their friends.

The study however, indicated that self-concept has a significant main effect on social dominance among university undergraduates. The result supported the findings of MacDougall, Vandermeer and Norman, (2017) that there was a significant effect of self-concept on social dominance. Likewise is the findings of Graham (2015) which revealed that leader self-efficacy moderated social dominance orientation. This implied that undergraduates with low self-concept have the tendency to experience high level of social dominance.

Perceived similarity and self-concept had no significant interaction effect on social dominance. This implied that social dominance had no association with similarity and self-concept. The result contradicts the findings of Klepper, Sleebos, van de Bunt and Agneessens, (2009). that students adjust their own military discipline to that of their friends, but revealed that there was no support for the idea that individuals adjust their discipline more to friends who are of the same military specialty, and neither more to friends who exert peer control.

Hypothesis two (2) which stated that perceived similarity and self-concept would have main and interaction effect on prosocial behavior among undergraduate was confirmed. The result indicated that perceived similarity has a main effect on social dominance among university undergraduates. The result did not support the findings of Connick-Keefer, (2016), which showed that intergroup similarity does have an impact on prosocial behavior. Likewise, individuals were more willing to provide aid to in-group and similar outgroup members than to dissimilar outgroup members. The result also, is in line with Van-Vugt, (2003) findings, that similarity promotes a wide range of prosocial feelings and behavior. In other words, kin-selection promotes prosocial behavior not toward the family, per se, but rather toward individuals who are psychologically familiar. Also is the findings of Hawkins and Nosek, (2012) revealed that compared to non-religious people, Christians favored religious charities, but within Christians, conservative Christians favored religious charities more than liberal Christians did.

The study indicated that self-concept had a significant main effect on prosocial behavior among university undergraduates. This implies that self-concept (value, beliefs and uniqueness) contributed to the degree of prosocial behaviour. This result supported the findings of Gupta and Thapliyal (2015), that there was significant relationship found between prosocial behaviour and self-concept of adolescents. Furthermore, the result supported the findings of Ingles, Gonzalez, Fernandez, Torregroza & Esteban (2012) which showed there was a significant prediction between self-concept dimensions and prosocial behaviour. However, the result negated the findings of Liu, Huang, Du, and Wu, (2014) that the total scores of self-concept have no significant correlation with the total scores of internet altruistic behavior. However, internet altruistic behavior has a significant correlation with inter-personal relation.

Finally, perceived similarity and self-concept had a significant interaction effect on prosocial behavior among university undergraduates. This implies that interaction of perceived similarity and self-concept was associated with prosocial behavior. However, the result fully supported the findings of Afolabi, (2014), that self-esteem and family relations independently predicted prosocial behaviour.

Conclusion

The present study investigated the effect of perceived similarity and self-concept on social dominance and prosocial behavior among undergraduates of Adekunle Ajasin University Ondo State. The results of the analysis showed that perceived similarity had no significant effect on social dominance. However, perceived similarity had a significant effect on prosocial behavior. Self-concept had a significant effect on social dominance and prosocial behavior independently. Both perceived similarity and self-concept had interaction effect on prosocial behavior, but had no significant effect on social dominance.

Recommendations

Prosocial behavior is seen as universal antidote to eliminate antisocial behaviors such as; hatred, violence, dominance, ethnic rivalry and all forms of antisocial issues. On this note, the study recommend that;

- Prosocial education should be embraced and taught in tertiary institutions as one of the courses. This will help students form a positive attitude towards others thereby breeds oneness, progress and wellness in the society.

- Another way to promote prosocial behavior among undergraduates is through "recognition" and "reward". If students are being punished, suspended and rusticated, for antisocial behaviors in tertiary institutions, the management should as well make periodical public recognition of any outstanding behaviors worthy of emulation. Such behaviors that contributes to the wellbeing of others and promote peace in the university environment. With a token reward would not only pass a message to other fellow students but will motivate others to emulate such prosocial behavior.

References

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

Afolabi, O. A. (2014). Psychosocial predictors of prosocial behaviour among a sample of Nigerian undergraduates. *European Scientific Journal 10 (2),* 241-266. https://eujournal.org/index.php/esj/article/view/2593

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

Amodio, D. M., & Showers, C. J. (2005). 'Similarity breeds liking' revisited: The moderating role of commitment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22* (6), 817- 836.   http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407505058701

Bartlett, M.Y. & DeSteno, D. (2006). Gratitude and prosocial behavior: helping when it costs you. *Psychological Science, 17(4), 319–25*

Bekkers, R. H. F. P. (2004). *Giving and Volunteering in the Netherlands: Sociological and Psychological Perspectives*. An unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Utrecht. Retrieved   online   on   July   29,   2019   from https://www.rug.nl/research/portal/files/2973374/bekkersrhfp-uu-diss.pdf

Bryan, C., Master, A., & Walton, G. (2014). "Helping" versus "being a helper": invoking the self to increase helping in young children. *Child Development, 85,* 1836-1842

Buunk, A.P. & Gibbons, F.X. (2007). Social comparison: The end of a theory and the emergence of a field. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes* 102, 3-21.

Connick-Keefer, S.J.A. (2016). *The impact of intergroup similarity on prosocial behaviour*. An unpublished Master of Arts in Psychology (M.A.) dissertation, Faculty of Graduate Studies Laurentian University Sudbury, Ontario

Corcoran, K., Crusius, J. & Mussweiler, T. (2011). Social Comparison: Motives, Standards, and Mechanisms. *In Theories in Social Psychology (pp. 119-139).* Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell**.**

Crocker, J. (2008). From egosystem to ecosystem: Implications for relationships, learning, and well-being. In *Transcending Self-Interest: Psychological Explorations of the*

Quiet Ego, H.A Wayment. & J.J. Bauer (Eds) pp. 63–72. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Danner, D.D, Snowdon D.A, Friesen, W.V. (2001). Positive emotions in early Life and longevity: Findings from the Nun study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,   80 (5), 804-813

Davis, J. L. & Rusbult, C. E. (2001). Attitude alignment in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 65-84.

Duller, D., LePoire, B., Aune, K. & Eloy, S. (2006). Social perceptions as mediators of the effect of speech rate similarity on compliance. *Human Communication Research, 19 (2), 286- 311*

Dunn E.W, Aknin L.B. & Norton, M.I. (2008). Spending money on others promotes happiness. *Science 319, 1687–88.*

Eisenberg, N. (2000). Emotion, regulation, and moral development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 51, 665-697.*

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial Development. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 646-718). Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Falanga, R., Caroli, M. E. & Sagone, E. (2012). Relationship between Sel-Efficacy and Self-Concepts in University Students. *International Journal of Developmental and Educational Psychology.* 2 (1), 227-234

Fiedler, S. Hellmann, D. M. & Dorrough, A. R. (2018). Cross-national in-group favoritism in prosocial behavior: Evidence from Latin and North America. *Judgement and Decision Making, 13 (1), 42-60*

Graham, K. A. (2015). *Do Leaders' Hierarchical Perceptions Matter? A social dominance theory perspective of empowering leadership, abusive supervision and team performance.* An unpublished doctoral thesis. Drexel University.

Guimond, S., Dambrun, M., Michinov, N. & Duarte, S. (2003). Does social dominance generate prejudice? Integrating individual and contextual determinants of intergroup cognitions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 697–721.

Gupta, D & Thapliyal, G. (2015). A study of prosocial behaviour and self concept of adolescents. I-*manager's Journal of Educational Psychology, 9 (1), 38-45.*

Harker L, Keltner D. (2001). Expressions of positive emotion in women's college year book pictures and their relationship to personality and life outcomes across adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 80(1), 112–24.

Hawkins, C. B. & Nosek B. A. (2012). When in-groups aren't "in": Perceived political belief similarity moderates religious in-group favoritism. *PLoS ONE 7(12): e50945.doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0050945*

Henry, W. P. (2001). Defining the self in an interpersonal context. In J. C. Muran (Ed.), *Self-relations in the psychotherapy process*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Levin, S., Thomsen, L., Kteily, N. & Sheehy-Skeffington, J. (2012). Social dominance orientation: Revisiting the structure and function of a variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*, 583-606. http://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211432765

Huang, L. L. & Liu, J. H. (2005). Personality and social structural implications of the situational priming of social dominance orientation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38, 267–276.

Ingles, C. J., Gonzalez, A. E., Fernandez, J. G., Torregroza, M. S. & Esteban, C. R. (2012). Prosocial behaviour and self concept of Spanish students of compulsory secondary education. *Revista de Psicodidactica. 17(1), 136-156*

Jonkmann, K., Trautwein, U. & Ludtke, O. (2009). Social dominance in adolescence: The moderating role of classroom context and behavioral heterogeneity. *Child Development*, 80 (2), 338-55. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01264.x.

Jost, J. T., & Thompson, E. P. (2000). Group-based dominance and opposition to equality as independent predictors of self-esteem, ethnocentrism, and social policy attitudes among African Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36, 209–232.

Klepper, M., Sleebos, E., van de Bunt, G., & Agneessens, F. (2009). Similarity in friendship networks: Selection or influence? The effect of constraining contexts and non-visible individual attributes. *Social Networks,* doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2009.06.003

Lehmiller, J. J., & Schmitt, M. T. (2007). Group domination and inequality in context: Evidence for the unstable meanings of social dominance and authoritarianism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 704–724.

Levin, S. & Sidanius, J. (2003). Social dominance and social identity in the united states and israel: ingroup favoritism or outgroup derogation? *Political Psychology. 20: 99-126* **https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895X.00138**

Levin, S, (2008). Perceived group status differences and the effects of gender, ethnicity, and religion on social dominance orientation *Political Psychology,* 25(1), 31-48

Liu, H. Huang, X. Du, B., & Wu, P. (2014). Correlation study on undergraduate' internet altruistic behavior, self concept and inter-personal relation. *Advances in Applied Sociology, 4, 128-133.*

MacDougall, A. G. Vandermeer M. R. and Norman, R. M. (2017). Determinants of self esteem in early psychosis: The role of perceived social dominance. *Psychiatry Research. 258, 583-586.*

Madia, B. P., & Lutz, C. J. (2004). Perceived similarity, expectation-reality discrepancies, and   mentors' expressed intention to remain in big brothers/big sisters programs. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34*(3), 598-623. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02562.x

Maner, J., & Gailliot, M. T. (2006). Altruism and Egoism: Prosocial motivations for helping depend on relationship context. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37(2), 347-358

McGlothlin, H., & Killen, M. (2005). Children's perceptions of intergroup and intragroup similarity and the role of social experience. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 26*(6), 680-698. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2005.08.008

McGlothlin, H., Lillen, M., & Edmonds, C. (2006). European-American children's intergroup attitudes about peer relationships. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology,*
23(2), 227-250.

McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 27, 415–444.

Morrison, K. R., & Ybarra, O. (2009).Symbolic Threat and Social Dominance among Liberals and Conservatives: SDO Reflect Conformity to Political Values. *European Journal of Social Psychology.* 39(6), 1039-1052

Morry, M. M. (2005). Relationship satisfaction as a predictor of similarity ratings: A test of the attraction-similarity hypothesis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*, 561-584.

O'Brien, J., & Dietz, J. (2011). Maintaining but also changing hierarchies: What social dominance theory has to say. In Pearce, J. L. (Ed.*), Status in Management and Organizations:* 55-84. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pagotto, L. (2010). *The interplay of empathy, oneness and perceived similarity in mediating the effects of perspective taking on prosocial responses*. An unpublished doctoral thesis. Università degli Studi di Padova

Park, J. H., & Schaller, M. (2005). Does attitude similarity serve as a heuristic cue for kinship? Evidence of an implicit cognitive association. *Evolution and Human Behavior,* 26, 158 – 170

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

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 741-763.

Robson, P.J. (1989). Development of a new self-report questionnaire to measure self-esteem. *Psychological Medicine*, 19, 513–518

Roche, O. R. (2010). Prosocialidad nuevos desafios: métodosy pautas para la optimización creativa del entorno. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Ciudad Nueva.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (2003). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of inequality: A reply to Schmitt, Branscombe, & Kappen and Wilson & Liu. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42*(2), 207-213. **http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/014466603322127193**

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., van Laar, C., & Levin, S. (2004). Social dominance theory: its agenda and method. *Political Psychology, 25*(6), 845-880. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00401.x

Smith, E. E., & Medin, D. L. (1981). *Categories and concepts.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Snellman, A. (2007). Social hierarchies, prejudice, and discrimination. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. *Digital Comprehensive Summaries of Uppsala Disertations from Faculty of Social Sciences. 32. 54 pp. Uppsala.*

Snellman, A., & Ekehammar, B. (2005). Ethnic Hierachies, Prejudice, and Social Dominance *Orientation. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 15, 83-94*

Stone, C. A., & May, A. L. (2002). The accuracy of academic self-evaluations in adolescents with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35, 370- 384.

Van Vugt, M, (2003). *Kinship cues as the basis for prosocial behavior in groups.* Presentation at social dilemma Conference, Goteborg, Sweden.

Waugh. C.E., & Fredrickson, B.L. (2006). Nice to know you: positive emotions, self-other overlap, and complex understanding in the formation of a new relationship. *Journal of Positive Psycholology*, 1(2), 93–106.

Weisfeld, G. E., Block, S. A., & Block, S. A. (2012). Possible determinants of social dominance among adolescent girls. *Journal of Genetic Psychology. Research and Theory on Human Development.* 144(1), 115-129

Wigfield, A., & Wagner, A. L. (2005). Competence and motivation during adolescence. In A. Elliott & C.Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 222–239). New York: Guilford Press.

Zahn-Waxler, C., Radke-Yarrow, M., Wagner, E., & Chapman, M. (1992). Development of concern for others. *Developmental Psychology, 28*(1), 126-136. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.28.1.126.

Žukauskien, R. & Malinauskien, O. (2009). The effect of personality traits and personal values on adolescent prosocial orientation. *Social Work Research Journal*, 8 (2), 97-107. Retrieved online on August 24, 2019 from https://www3.mruni.eu/ojs/social-work/article/view/1264.