CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION: II

PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOUR IN RELATION TO FAMILY STRUCTURE, PARENTAL MORAL VALUE, AND VALUE PATTERN

The previous chapter was devoted to the dimension of the development of prosocial behaviour or to say to the dimension of the effect of age on prosocial behaviour of children. It was seen that prosocial behaviour steadily increased with age. Other factors subjected to test were the effect of family structure, parental moral value and parental value pattern on prosocial behaviour and its development. In the present chapter the focus of discussion will be the effect of family structure, parental moral value and parental value pattern on prosocial behaviour in particular and in context of the age of children. Hence, the discussion in this chapter has been divided into two sub-section i.e., first, effect of individual factors and second, interaction effect.

A. EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

As has already been discussed above that apart of age, three more factors were subjected to test pertaining to their effects on prosocial behaviour. These are: (i) family structure (ii) parental moral value, and (iii) parental value pattern.

I. PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOUR IN RELATION TO FAMILY STRUCTURE

In the present investigation sample was drawn from two family structures—nuclear and joint families. We had assumed that children in joint families would be more prosocial than children in nuclear families because the children in joint family structure are exposed to such an environment where they learn to share the responsibilities of others and own belongings, while the children in nuclear families are deprived of such environment rather find themselves always as the only owner of their belongings and
also deprived of idealistic models for pro-social behaviour which are common and of necessity in joint family structure.

In order to see whether there is any marked difference in pro-social behaviour of the children in nuclear and in joint family structures, difference in average pro-social scores was tested through F-ratio (Table 12). The mean pro-social scores of the children in nuclear and in joint families are 1.633 and 1.525 (Table 11, Figure 4).

The obtained F-ratio is 1.077, which is not significant at any acceptable level of confidence for 1 and 216 degrees of freedom which provides sound statistical ground to accept the null hypothesis in regard to difference in pro-social behaviour of children belonging to different family structures i.e., nuclear and joint. Though average pro-social scores of children in nuclear families is higher (M=1.633) than those in joint families (M=1.525), the difference of 0.108 is not evidenced as genuine statistically, that is, both the groups act almost similarly in situations wherein they are expected to share their rewards with the co-participants on the task.

An allied problem, here too, was whether the number of subjects in two types of family structures i.e., nuclear and joint differ in terms of being high pro-social and low pro-social. It is clear from Table 18, that out of 120 subjects in nuclear families, 51 are high pro-social and 69 are low pro-social. Similarly, out of 120 subjects in joint families 41 are high pro-social and 79 are low pro-social (Figure 5).

The obtained $X^2$ value for these differences in nuclear and joint families is 1.76 (Table 18) which is not significant at any acceptable level of confidence for 1 degree of freedom. Furthermore, four $X^2$ values were computed to check the significance of difference in nuclear and joint families of four parental groups, firstly, disregarding age factor, and then 12 $X^2$ values were also computed due considering three age-groups i.e., 4-5, 6-7 and 8-9 years in each of four parental moral value groups. Number of high and low pro-social subjects in each of sub-groups are exhibited in Figures 6 to 9 and in Figures 10 to 21, and obtained $X^2$ values for difference in nuclear and joint families are given in Table 18.
FIGURE 4: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE AVERAGE PROSOCIAL SCORES FOR THE SUBJECTS IN NUCLEAR & JOINT FAMILIES.

FIGURE 5: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN NUCLEAR & JOINT FAMILIES.
FIGURE 6: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN NUCLEAR & JOINT FAMILIES WITH BOTH PARENTS OF HIGH MORAL VALUE.

FIGURE 7: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN NUCLEAR & JOINT FAMILIES WITH FATHER HIGH & MOTHER LOW MORAL VALUE.
FIGURE 6. BARP DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH &
LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN NUCLEAR & JOINT
FAMILIES WITH MOTHER HIGH & FATHER LOW MORAL
VALUE.
FIGURE 10: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN NUCLEAR & JOINT FAMILIES WITH FATHER HIGH MOTHER LOW MORAL VALUE.

FIGURE 11: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN NUCLEAR & JOINT FAMILIES WITH BOTH PARENTS OF HIGH MORAL VALUE (6-7 YEARS).
FIGURE 12: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN NUCLEAR & JOINT FAMILIES WITH BOTH PARENTS OF HIGH MORAL VALUE (8 - 9 YEARS).

FIGURE 13: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN NUCLEAR & JOINT FAMILIES WITH FATHER HIGH-MOTHER LOW MORAL VALUE (4 - 5 YEARS).
Figure 14: Bar diagram showing the number of high & low prosocial subjects in nuclear & joint families with father high-mother low moral value (6-7 years).

Figure 15: Bar diagram showing the number of high & low prosocial subjects in nuclear & joint families with father high-mother low moral value (8-9 years).
FIGURE 16: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN NUCLEAR & JOINT FAMILIES WITH MOTHER HIGH-FATHER LOW MORAL VALUE (4 - 5 YEARS).

FIGURE 17: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN NUCLEAR & JOINT FAMILIES WITH MOTHER HIGH-FATHER LOW MORAL VALUE (6 - 7 YEARS).
Figure 18: Bar diagram showing the number of high & low prosocial subjects in nuclear & joint families with mother high-father low moral value (8-9 years).

Figure 19: Bar diagram showing the number of high & low prosocial subjects in nuclear & joint families with both parents of low moral value (4-5 years).
FIGURE 20: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN NUCLEAR & JOINT FAMILIES WITH BOTH PARENTS OF LOW MORAL VALUE (6-7 YEARS).

FIGURE 21: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN NUCLEAR & JOINT FAMILIES WITH BOTH PARENTS OF LOW MORAL VALUE (8-9 YEARS).
All the obtained $X^2$ values are insignificant providing statistical ground to reject the experimental hypothesis as regards to the difference between children of nuclear and joint families in respect of their prosocial behaviour. That is, it can be concluded that there is no genuine difference in prosocial behaviour of children belonging to nuclear and joint families. The findings are neither in line with experimental hypothesis, nor with findings of Cohen (1973) and Kohlberg and Richman (1989). Though it was expected that children in joint families would excel those in nuclear families in regard to their prosocial behaviour, it is not found so. However, Cohen (1973) and Kohlberg and Richman (1989) found that children in nuclear families or small families have better opportunities to develop empathy and social competence for prosocial behaviour which is comprised of separate unique actions each of which is developed in a different manner. Due to increased job and social mobility in the modern time the structure of joint family mostly has restricted to small family i.e., a nuclear family plus grand-parents. Apart of it with increased demands for social competence in the modern time, both types of families find themselves exposed to rather similar life patterns and functions for its smooth and comfortable survival and for better adjustment. Moreover, because of increasing generation gap between grand-parents and grand children under the fast growing cultural changes, the interactions between the two have either been minimised, or most of the time remains undesirable, grand-parents are being left with the bitter feelings of disregarded and neglected, while at the same grand-children as being faced with the condition of strict discipline laid down by the grand-parents. These conditions lead the children of even joint families to interact most of the times with their parents only, a condition quite similar to the nuclear families, children being exposed to same models to observe for their prosocial behaviour by means of developing social competence, empathy for others and moral judgement capacity. These may be the reasons for ingenuine difference between the children of nuclear and joint families as regards to their prosocial behaviour in the present research. However, further research with a larger sample is recommended to throw more light on this aspect.
An important problem undertaken in the present investigation was the effect of parental moral value on prosocial behaviour of the children. It was hypothesized that children of parents both with high moral value would exhibit more prosocial behaviour than children of parents both with low moral value, and children of those parents one of whom is of high moral value and another is of low moral value would stand in between in this regard.

Average prosocial scores of the children in four parental moral value groups i.e., both parents of high moral value, father of high and mother of low moral value, mother of high and father of low moral value, and both parents of low moral value are given in Table 11. It is clear from the table that average prosocial scores of the children of mother high and father low moral value is the highest (M=1.767), while those of father high and mother low moral value is the lowest (M=1.350), the children of parents both of high moral value stand second (M=1.633) and the children of parents both of low moral value stand third (M=1.567) in this regard (Figure 22). The obtained data are certainly not in consonance with the hypothesis of the present research. The obtained differences among four parental moral value groups in regard to prosocial behaviour of the children was put to statistical test by computing an F-ratio (F=2.795, Table 12). The obtained F-ratio is significant at 0.05 level of confidence for 3 and 216 degrees of freedom. This significant F-ratio provides ample statistical ground to retain the research hypothesis of difference among the children of differential parental moral value as regards to their prosocial behaviour. A $X^2$ value was computed to see whether there exists any significant difference among children of different parental moral values in regard to the number of high prosocial and low prosocial children. It is evident from Table 20 that the number of high and low prosocial subjects in both high, father high-mother low, mother high-father low and both low moral value groups are 25, 35; 17, 43, 28, 32; and 22, 38, respectively (Figure 23). The obtained $X^2$ for these differences is 4.66, which is not significant at any acceptable level of confidence for 7 degrees of freedom.
FIGURE 22: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE AVERAGE PROSOCIAL SCORES OF CHILDREN FROM FOUR PARENTAL MORAL VALUE GROUPS

FIGURE 23: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF SUBJECTS IN HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL VALUE OF FOUR PARENTAL MORAL VALUE GROUPS
Furthermore, two $X^2$ values were computed to check the significance of differences as regards to the number of high and low prosocial subjects in four parental moral values of nuclear and joint families, firstly, disregarding age factor and then six $X^2$ values were computed considering age-groups. The number of high and low prosocial subjects in these sub-groups are given in Table 20 and exhibited in Figures (24-31). Three more $X^2$ values were computed for the same purpose for the subjects of three age-groups separately, disregarding family structures. The number of high and low prosocial subjects of four parental moral values in three age-groups is given in Table 20. All the obtained $X^2$ values (Table 20) are insignificant providing sufficient statistical ground to accept the null hypothesis as regards to difference in the number of high and low prosocial children with differential parental moral values.

In view of above findings, it was also thought necessary to investigate in deep by comparing any two of four parental moral value groups at a time. For the purpose, firstly, six CRs were computed (Table 19). Only two of the six comparisons, that is, between the children of parents both of high moral value ($M=1.633$) and father high-mother low ($M=1.350$) moral value and between the children of father high-mother low ($M=1.350$) and mother high-father low ($M=1.767$), are significant (CR=2.02, $P<.05$ and CR=3.02, $P<.01$, Table 19) for 118 degrees of freedom. Similarly, six $X^2$ values (Table 20) were computed for these comparisons on the basis of number of high and low prosocial subjects. Only one of the obtained $X^2$ values is significant at .05 level of confidence for 3 degrees of freedom, again providing ample ground to accept the null hypothesis in this regard.

It is clear from above findings that though there is genuine difference between children of different parental moral value groups in respect of their average prosocial scores, such difference is not observable in all comparisons and also in respect of number of high and low prosocial subjects in comparison groups. Significant CRs for comparisons between prosocial scores of children of mother high-father low moral value ($M=1.767$) and father high-mother low moral value ($M=1.350$) and between
FIGURE 24: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN FOUR PARENTAL MORAL VALUE GROUPS.

FIGURE 25: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN FOUR PARENTAL MORAL VALUE GROUPS (JOINT FAMILY).
Figure 26: Bar diagram showing the number of high & low prosocial subjects in four parental moral value groups (4-5 years-nuclear family).

Figure 27: Bar diagram showing the number of high & low prosocial subjects in four parental moral value groups (6-7 years-nuclear family).
FIGURE 28: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN FOUR PARENTAL MORAL VALUE GROUPS (8-9 YEARS-NUCLEAR FAMILY).

FIGURE 29: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN FOUR PARENTAL MORAL VALUE GROUPS (4-5 YEARS-JOINT FAMILY).
FIGURE 30: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN FOUR PARENTAL MORAL VALUE GROUPS (6-7 YEARS-JOINT FAMILY).

FIGURE 31: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE NUMBER OF HIGH & LOW PROSOCIAL SUBJECTS IN FOUR PARENTAL MORAL VALUE GROUPS (8-9 YEARS-JOINT FAMILY).
prosocial scores of children of parents both with high moral value (M=1.633) and father high-mother low moral value (M=1.350) provide a sound basis to conclude that the children of father high-mother low moral value are certainly poorest in comparison to the children of mother high-father low moral value and children of parents both of high moral value. A keen observation of the findings also reveals that mother’s moral value plays more important role in the prosocial behaviour of her children than the moral value of father. Since, in the present research only female students had been selected as the sample, it becomes more relevant in this regard. The girls mostly identify themselves with their mothers and in the process of identification develop the moral value similar to their mothers which ultimately affect their prosocial behaviour. A girl of mother with high moral value will also be of high moral value and another girl of mother with low moral value will also be of low moral value. This identification process becomes subtler in the case when father is of opposite moral value level, that is, when mother is of high and father is of low moral value. In contrast condition with father, mother’s high morality attracts the daughter more and she being identifying herself with the mother accepts the morality level of mother only. The same process may be active while mother is of low moral value and father is of high moral value and the daughter accepts low morality level of mother in the identification process. And this may be the cause of the findings of present research, that is, highest prosocial scores of the girls of mother high and father low moral value group and lowest prosocial behaviour scores of the girls of mother low and father high moral value. Concluding, it can be said that mother’s role is of rather more importance than that of father as regards to prosocial behaviour of their daughters. The finding is in consonance with those of London (1970), Vlussen et al. (1970), Rosenhan (1970), Hoffman(1975) Eron and Huesmann (1984), Sparks et al. (1984) who found that the acquisition of prosocial behaviour depends on the extent to which at least one of the parent can serve as model for such behaviours. This is specially true in the case of same-sex parent’s altruistic values as observed in Hoffman (1975) study who found that the altruistic behaviour of fifth graders, measured by classmates’ ratings, was positively related to the same-sex parent’s altruistic values.
Another important problem considered in the present research was in relation to the effect of parental value pattern on prosocial behaviour of the children. It was expected that children of parents with high social or religious and low economic or political values would exhibit more prosocial behaviour as compared to children of parents with low religious or social values and high political or economic value. Children of parents with high theoretical or aesthetic value would stand in between in this regard depending whether they are of parents with low religious / social or with low economic / political value.

Total 30 groups were formed initially on the basis of high and low scores on either of six values i.e., theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political and religious, for example, high theoretical-low economic. Looking at the average prosocial scores (Table 14) of these thirty value groups, it was thought reasonable to reduce these thirty groups to two-high prosocial value group and low prosocial value groups with statistical supports in this regard (Tables 23, 24 and 25). Hence, further analyses to study the effect of value of parents were done on the merged scores of 15 value groups-high economic-low theoretical, high economic-low social, high aesthetic-low theoretical, high aesthetic-low economic, high aesthetic-low social, high aesthetic-low religious, high social-low theoretical, high political-low economic, high political-low aesthetic, high political-low social, high religious-low theoretical, high religious-low economic, high religious-low social, and high religious-low political, into 'High Prosocial Value Group' and similarly scores of other sub-groups-high theoretical-low economic, high theoretical-low aesthetic, high theoretical-low social, high theoretical-low political, high theoretical-low religious, high economic-low aesthetic, high economic-low political, high economic low religious, high aesthetic-low political, high social-low economic, high social-low aesthetic, high social-low political, high social-low religious, high political-low religious, high religious-low aesthetic, into 'Low Prosocial Value Group'. Average prosocial scores of all thirty value groups are exhibited in Figures 32 to 37. Average prosocial scores of high prosocial and low prosocial value groups are 1.844 and 1.387, respectively.
FIGURE 32: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE AVERAGE PROSOCIAL SCORES OF CHILDREN IN HIGH THEORETICAL AND LOW ECONOMIC, LOW AESTHETIC, LOW SOCIAL, LOW POLITICAL, LOW RELIGIOUS PARENTAL VALUE GROUPS.

FIGURE 33: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE AVERAGE PROSOCIAL SCORES OF CHILDREN IN HIGH ECONOMIC AND LOW THEORETICAL, LOW AESTHETIC, LOW SOCIAL, LOW POLITICAL, LOW RELIGIOUS PARENTAL VALUE GROUPS.
PARENTAL VALUE GROUPS

FIGURE 34: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE AVERAGE PROSOCIAL SCORES OF CHILDREN IN HIGH AESTHETIC AND LOW THEORETICAL, LOW ECONOMIC, LOW SOCIAL, LOW POLITICAL, LOW RELIGIOUS VALUE GROUPS.

FIGURE 35: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE AVERAGE PROSOCIAL SCORES OF CHILDREN IN HIGH SOCIAL AND LOW THEORETICAL, LOW ECONOMIC, LOW AESTHETIC, LOW POLITICAL, LOW RELIGIOUS VALUE GROUPS.
FIGURE 36: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE AVERAGE PROSOCIAL SCORES OF CHILDREN IN HIGH POLITICAL AND LOW THEORETICAL, LOW ECONOMIC, LOW AESTHETIC, LOW SOCIAL, LOW RELIGIOUS VALUE GROUPS.

FIGURE 37: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE AVERAGE PROSOCIAL SCORES OF CHILDREN IN HIGH RELIGIOUS AND LOW THEORETICAL, LOW ECONOMIC, LOW AESTHETIC, LOW SOCIAL, LOW POLITICAL VALUE GROUPS.
and have been shown in Figure 38. The obtained F-ratio for the difference is 82.06 which is highly significant at .01 level of confidence for 1 and 444 degrees of freedom.

The significant F-ratio provides sufficient statistical ground to conclude that there exists genuine difference between high prosocial and low prosocial value groups as regards to prosocial behaviour of the children and to reject the null hypothesis in this regard.

Though, the results of the present investigation are not in consonance with the hypothesis, however, a systematic trend has been observed as regards to the relationship between different value groups and prosocial behaviour of their children. It was hypothesized that children of high theoretical, low economic, high aesthetic, high social, low political and high religious parents would be more prosocial than those of low theoretical, high economic, low aesthetic, low social, high political and low religious. However, perusal of Table 21 reveals that our hypothesis stands true in the case of economic, aesthetic and religious values while it does not stand true in the cases of theoretical, social, and political values wherein the findings are just reverse of the hypothesis.

Similar results have been observed on the basis of non-parametric analyses. It is clear from Table 28 that out of total 225 subjects in high prosocial value group, 143 children were high prosocial and 82 were low prosocial. And out of 225 subjects in low prosocial value group only 88 were high prosocial and 137 were low prosocial (Figure 39). The obtained $X^2$ value for the difference is 26.92 which is significant at .01 level of confidence for df 1. Further, three more $X^2$ values were calculated for the difference in the number of high prosocial and low prosocial subjects separately in three age-groups i.e., 4-5 years, 6-7 years and 8-9 years. The number of high and low prosocial subjects in high and low prosocial value groups of three age-groups are exhibited in Figure 40. The obtained $X^2$ values for these differences are .02, 24.22 and 19.64, respectively for comparisons between high and low prosocial parental value groups in three age-groups i.e., 4-5 years, 6-7 years and 8-9 years. All the obtained $X^2$
values are significant at .01 level of confidence for 1 degree of freedom except for the age-group 4-5 years which is not significant at any acceptable level of confidence.

All these findings clearly indicate that there is genuine difference between the children of high and low prosocial parental value patterns as regards to their prosocial behaviour. That is, the children of parents with high prosocial value are definitely more prosocial than the children of parents with low prosocial value.

As has already been discussed earlier and also clear from Table 21 that children of parents with high economic-low theoretical, high economic-low social, high aesthetic-low theoretical, high aesthetic-low economic, high aesthetic-low social, high aesthetic-low religious, high social-low theoretical, high political-low theoretical, high political-low economic, high political-low aesthetic, high political-low social, high religious-low theoretical, high religious-low economic, high religious-low social, high religious-low political are definitely high on prosocial behaviour. And similarly, children of parents with high theoretical-low economic, high theoretical-low aesthetic, high theoretical-low social, high theoretical-low political, high theoretical-low religious, high economic-low aesthetic, high economic-low political, high economic-low religious, high aesthetic-low political, high social-low economic, high social-low aesthetic, high social-low political, high social-low religious, high political-low religious, high political-low aesthetic, high political-low social, high religious-low political are definitely low in respect of their prosocial behaviour. A keen observation of the Tables 21 and 22, throw sufficient light on the relative role of high and low parental values-theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political and religious-in prosocial behaviour of their children. That is, children of parents with low theoretical, low economic, high aesthetic, low social, high political and high religious show comparatively higher prosocial behaviour than children of parents with high theoretical, high economic, low aesthetic, high social, low political and low religious. Hence, it can be said that both dominance (high score) of a value as well as low insistence (low scores) on a particular value by parents exert considerable effect on prosocial behaviour of their children.
The person high on theoretical value is primarily concerned with the discovery of truth. Such a person is characterised by a rational, critical and empirical approach to life because of his high intellectual ability. His critical attitude and rational approach towards life and behavioural aspects tend him to be less sensitive in situations when he is expected to help without its return in future. Therefore, such person is reluctant to act prosocially as empathy which is an essential element for prosocial behaviour, lacks in this person in contrast to those who are low on this value. A person who is low on theoretical value views the life and behavioural aspects uncritically leading high empathy in the situation wherein another person requires his help. This empathy leads the person, low on theoretical value, to act altruistically and observing such parents always involved in helping others prone their children too to adopt such behaviour patterns and this may be the reason for high prosocial scores of the children of parents who are low on theoretical value.

The person high on economic value places highest value on whatever useful or pragmatic. He or she is thoroughly 'practical' and confirms closely to the stereotype of the successful business person. Such a person is keenly interested in making money and regards un-applied knowledge as wasteful. All these characteristics prone a person to insist on profit of his any act even in social situations which demand persons concerned in the interaction to act prosocially. That is the reason of low prosocial behaviour of persons who are high on economic value. Moreover, in spite of his competence, empathy is lacking in such persons as they view themselves as losers so as profit is concerned after the help is rendered out by them, wherein expectation of return is not desirable or not possible. Instead, a person who is low on economic value hardly cares for his profit and tends to be helpful even though the altruistic act may cost him more than the return. Low insistence on economic aspects or to say profit, also tends a person to be empathetic for the needed person and to perform prosocial act providing thereby an ideal model for their children to act similarly by developing high level of empathy.

The person who is high on aesthetic value places importance to form and harmony. He judges each single experience from the standpoint
of grace, symmetry, or fitness and perceives life as a procession of events, with each individual impression enjoyed for its own sake. His keen interest is in the artistic episodes of life. These characteristics tend the person to view all the life situations as natural occurrences and are considered beautiful, inspite of unpleasant looking, and to be sensitive to all behavioural interactions especially when he perceives some one requiring help and becomes easily ready to render help. A greater sensitivity towards life, social perspectives and cultural norms lead such person to be high moralistic and high empathetic, inclining him to be more altruistic in comparison to the person who is low on aesthetic value and has poor sensitivity for life matter leading him to act selfishly rather than prosocially. These may be the reasons for high prosocial behaviour of the children of parents high on aesthetic value as they too develop high sensitivity for socio-cultural norms of prosocial behaviour.

According to Allport (1961) the highest value of the social type is love of people. Such a person is likely to view the theoretical, economic, and aesthetic attitudes as cold and inhuman, regarding love as the only suitable form of human relationship. In its purest form the social attitude is altruistic and closely related to the religious value. However, the findings of the present research indicate just a reverse pattern i.e., the children of parents with high social value exhibited low prosocial behaviour while the children of parents with low social value exhibited high prosocial behaviour. It can be reasoned that in the present modern time, the purest form of social attitude may not be feasible. Rather it can be said that a person who is high on social value may prefer to interact and get acquainted with people, follows the socio-cultural norms and may have a tendency to get his recognition in his society. He may have a strong desire for social approval and reward or appreciation, and with this goal in his mind, he may be maintaining his entire interaction with other people. He may help others only in those situations wherein he feels that his act will attract high social appreciation but where this is lacking especially in respect to prosocial behaviour his motivation to help also lacks. That is, in the condition of non-reward, one may not expect from the person high on social value to have any desire to help a needy person whereas a person low on social value who is not involved in social interaction much may help a needy person just
out of his urge to help him and not for approval or appreciation from the
society for his prosocial behaviour. Frequent and wilful helping interaction
of low social value parents provide an opportunity and ideal model for their
children too to adopt high prosocial behaviour patterns. The finding of the
present research is not in consonance with that of Seigal (1978) who
observed positive relation between social skills and prosocial behaviour.

The dominant interest of the political person is power. Vocational
activities of this type of person are not necessarily confined to the realm of
politics, since leaders in any field generally place a high value on power and
influence. Thus, clear individual differences in the power value do exist. At
the same time, expression of this motive overrides all others in that political
types yearn for personal power, influence and renown above all else. The
findings of the present research indicate that children of parents high on
political value exhibit more prosocial behaviour than those children whose
parents are of low political value. It may be possible that the children of
parents with high political value observe their parents always ready to help
others. The desire of getting reward whether in the form of respect, power,
appreciation by mass or even other physical reward is not observable to the
kids. Furthermore, they are not even so matured to understand any
transaction as a resultant of helping others i.e., better prospects for winning
next election, or getting more power through mass support. And, consequently,
observing parents as helping models, the children too learn
to act prosocially. In contrast to this, the children of parents low on political
value are deprived of such helping models in the family and lack the
opportunities to render the help wherein no external reward is observable.

The person high on religious value is mainly concerned with
understanding the world as a unified whole. There are, however, different
modes of expressing this desire to understand. For instance, some religious
persons are 'immanent mystics' who find meaning in the affirmation and
active participation in life, while others are 'transcendental mystics' striving
to unite themselves with a higher reality by withdrawing from life (e.g.,
monks). Regardless of the particular type of expression, the religious
person seeks unity and higher meaning in the cosmos. Franco (1978) found
that the subjects who valued religious beliefs were high altruistic. It can be
reasoned that a person high on religious value finds meaning of his life in serving the needy persons around him because of his high sensitivity and empathy towards them. Probably, acting out prosocially brings a feeling of self-satisfaction, a desired opportunity to serve humanity, a creation of the God in the persons who value religiosity high and such person motivate their children too to act in the similar manner, that is, helping the people without expecting any external reward in return. And this may be the reason of high prosocial behaviour of the children of parents who are high on religious value in comparison to those children whose parents are low on religious value and interacting with the people in selfish manner most of the time.

It may also be of interest and vital importance to ascertain comparative importance of six values of parents in relation to prosocial behaviour of their children. For the purpose, plus (+) and minus (-) weightages were assigned to each high and low value group on the basis of data obtained in the present investigation. The procedure of assigning weightages has already been described in the previous chapter and given in Tables 21 & 22. Looking at the weightages in both high and low prosocial value groups it is clear that all the value groups who were assigned double plus (+ +) weightages are in high prosocial value group and all who were assigned double minus (- -) weightages are in low prosocial value group. Further analysis of groups assigned with one plus and one minus (+ -) weightages provides us the basis to study comparative importance of value groups in prosocial behaviour. These are discussed below:

I. Theoretical vs. Economic Value: It is clear from the Table 21, that average prosocial score of high economic-low theoretical value group (- +) is 1.80 while that of high theoretical-low economic value groups (- +) is 1.40 (Figure 41). The earlier group is high prosocial value group while the latter group is low prosocial value group. It is evident that there is one value in each group, which has plus weightage and at the same time counterpart of it is in another group. Hence, inspite of having a negative value (high economic) high economic-low theoretical group is high prosocial because of positive value (low theoretical) while at the same time high theoretical-low economic
Figure 38: Bar diagram showing the average prosocial scores of children in high & low prosocial parental value groups.

Figure 39: Bar diagram showing the number of high & low prosocial groups in each parental value group.
Figure 40: Bar diagram showing the number of high & low prosocial subjects in two parental value groups.

Figure 41: Bar diagram showing the average prosocial scores of children of high economic - low theoretical and high theoretical low economic parental value groups.
group having a positive value (low economic) but with a negative value (high theoretical) is low prosocial. Therefore, it can be concluded that being of high or low economic value is of lesser importance in regard to prosocial behaviour as effect of theoretical value is dominating the effect of economic value. Moreover, the difference in both the groups is significant at .05 level of confidence for 28 degrees of freedom (t=2.10, Table 25).

I. Economic vs. Social Value: Average prosocial scores (M=1.87) of a high economic-low social value group (- +) is more than that of high social-low economic value(- +) group (M=1.40), making the former group high prosocial and the latter low prosocial value group (Figure 42). It is clear that despite of having a negative value (high economic) former group is more prosocial because of having a positive value (low social) while at the same time latter group is low prosocial despite of having a positive value (low economic) just because of having a negative value (high social). Hence, it can be concluded that weightages either plus (+) or minus (-) in social value is more influential in respect of prosocial behaviour than plus (+) or minus (-) weightages on economic value. That is social value of parents plays more important role as compared to economic value in children's prosocial behaviour. The difference between the two groups in respect of their average prosocial behaviour is significant at .05 level of confidence for 28 degrees of freedom (t=2.14, Table 25) which provides ample ground to reject the null hypothesis as regards to the difference between the two groups.

II. Aesthetic vs. Religious Value: Average prosocial scores of high aesthetic – low religious (+ -) parental value group(M=1.87) is more than that of high religious-low aesthetic (M=1.20). These data have been pictorially presented in Fig. 43. It is clear that high aesthetic-low religious group is high prosocial group while high religious-low aesthetic group is low prosocial group. It is also clear that former group has a positive value (high aesthetic) and a negative value (low religious) and similarly, latter group has a positive value (high
religious) and a negative value (low aesthetic). Inspite of having a negative value i.e. low religious, the former group is the high prosocial group because of positive value i.e., high aesthetic. Similarly, inspite of having a positive values i.e., high religious, the latter group is the low prosocial group because of negative value i.e., low aesthetic. It means, aesthetic value of parents play more important role than religious value in respect of prosocial behaviour of their children. Moreover, the difference between the two groups (t=3.53) is significant at .01 level of confidence (Table 25) for 28 degrees of freedom indicating thereby a genuine difference between the two groups in respect of their prosocial behaviour.

IV. Theoretical vs. Social Value: Average prosocial scores of high social-low theoretical value group is 1.73 and that of high theoretical-low social value group is 1.47 (Table 21, Figure 44). The former group has been classified as high prosocial value group and the latter group has been classified as low prosocial value group. It is clear that inspite of having a negative value i.e., high social, the former group had shown high prosocial behaviour because of positive value i.e., low theoretical. It is also clear that inspite of a positive value i.e., 'low social' the latter group is low prosaically because of negative value i.e., high theoretical. It can be reasoned that theoretical value of parents is dominating the effect of social value as regards the prosocial behaviour of their children as just because of high or low theoretical parents, their children are showing low or high prosocial behaviour inspite of the presence of low social (positive value) or high social (negative value) of their parents. Hence, it can be said that theoretical value of parents exerts more effect on prosocial behaviour of their children in comparison to social value of parents. The difference in prosocial behaviour of the two groups, however, is not found significant (t=1.23, Table 25), indicating thereby no any genuine difference between the two groups. Therefore, it can be concluded that though theoretical value of parents seems to be playing more important role in their children's prosocial behaviour in comparison to social value, the two parental values are not found to
exert considerable differential effect on prosocial behaviour of their children.

V. Aesthetic vs. Political Value: A perusal of Table 21 clears that average prosocial scores of high political-low aesthetic (+ -) parental value group is 2.07 and of high aesthetic-low political (+ -) parental value group is 1.47 (Figure 45). High political-low aesthetic parental value group has been classified as high prosocial value group inspite of a negative value i.e., low aesthetic. High prosocial behaviour of high political-low aesthetic parental value group must be because of high political value of the parents. Similarly, high aesthetic-low political parental value group has been classified as low prosocial value group inspite of a positive parental value i.e., high aesthetic, and here in this case low prosocial behaviour of the children can be attributed to their parent’s low political value. It is reasonable to conclude that political value of parents play more important role as regards to prosocial behaviour of their children as compared to aesthetic value of parents. The Computing a CR has tested significance of difference between the two groups has been tested by computing a t (t=2.06, Table 13) which is significant at .05 level of confidence for 28 degrees of freedom which also provides ample statistical ground in respect of the genuine difference between the two groups in regard to their prosocial behaviour.

VI. Political vs. Religious Value: Average prosocial scores of high religious-low political parental value group (high prosocial) is 2.07 and of high political-low religious parental value group (low-prosocial) is 1.47. (Table 21). High religious and high political values are found positive values and low religious and low political values are found negative values in respect of prosocial behaviour. The difference between the two groups is checked by computing a t which (t=2.40, Table 22) is significant at .05 level of confidence for df 28. It is evident that the two groups differ truly in respect of their prosocial behaviour. Furthermore, it is evident that inspite of having a negative value i.e., low political, high religious-low political parental value group is high prosocial and inspite of having a positive value i.e., high
FIGURE 42: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE AVERAGE PROSOCIAL SCORES OF CHILDREN OF HIGH ECONOMIC - LOW SOCIAL AND HIGH SOCIAL - LOW ECONOMIC PARENTAL VALUE GROUPS.

FIGURE 43: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE AVERAGE PROSOCIAL SCORES OF CHILDREN OF HIGH AESTHETIC - LOW RELIGIOUS AND HIGH RELIGIOUS - LOW AESTHETIC PARENTAL VALUE GROUPS.
PARENTAL VALUE GROUPS

FIGURE 44: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE AVERAGE PROSOCIAL SCORES OF CHILDREN OF HIGH SOCIAL - LOW THEORETICAL AND HIGH THEORETICAL - LOW SOCIAL PARENTAL VALUE GROUPS.

FIGURE 45: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE AVERAGE PROSOCIAL SCORES OF CHILDREN OF HIGH POLITICAL - LOW AESTHETIC AND HIGH AESTHETIC - LOW POLITICAL PARENTAL VALUE GROUPS.
political, high political-low religious parental value group is low prosocial. These can be, thus, attributed to the presence of positive parental value i.e., high religious in the former group and to the presence of negative value i.e., low religious in the latter group. Hence, it can be concluded that religious value of parents exert more effect on prosocial behaviour of their children than political value. Comparative prosocial scores are exhibited in Figure 46.

3. INTERACTION EFFECT

So far we have been discussing the effect of a single factor (Age, Family Structure, Moral Value, and Value Pattern of Parents) on prosocial behaviour. We can also study the joint effect of any two on more factors at a time. Thus, it may be interesting to see, for example, whether a child in a specific family structure and of the parents of a particular moral value drawn from one age-group would differ in his prosocial behaviour from another child in another family structure and of the parents of different moral value drawn from another age-group. In general, when a number of individuals or items are grouped according to several factors of classification and these factors are not independent, there is said to be interaction between them. The interaction is a measure of the extent to which the effect upon the dependent variable of changing the level of one factor depends on the level of others. Thus, with two treatments, say N and P each of two levels (0 and 1), the effect of the four treatment combinations can be written as n₀p₀, n₀p₁, n₁p₀ and n₁p₁. If the treatments are independent, the effect of varying N from n₀ to n₁ would be the same with p₀ as with p₁. The extent to which this is not so is a measure of interaction.

The combined effect of various factors on prosocial behaviour of children would be discussed in the remainder of this chapter.
I. INTERACTION EFFECT OF AGE AND FAMILY STRUCTURE ON PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOUR OF CHILDREN

The first among the interaction problems is whether there is any difference between children of nuclear and joint family structures as they advance in age in regard to their prosocial behaviour.

It was expected that oldest children (8-9 years) in joint families would be the best and the youngest children in nuclear families would be the poorest as regards to their prosocial behaviour. The other groups would remain in between the two extreme groups. In other words, children in joint families would exhibit more prosocial behaviour with advance in age; that is, there would exist a genuine interaction effect of age and family structure on prosocial behaviour of children.

A three-way analysis of variance was computed to study individual and interaction effects of three variables (age, family structure, and moral value of parents) on prosocial behaviour of children, wherein one of the first order interactions was between three age-groups and two family structures which yielded an F-ratio of 1.154 (Table 12). The obtained interaction F-ratio is not significant at any acceptable level of confidence for 2 and 216 degrees of freedom. The non-significant F-ratio clearly indicates that both the factors-age and family structure-are independent as regards to their effect on prosocial behaviour of children. It is clear from Table 29 that average prosocial scores of children in nuclear families and of children in joint families are 1.45, 1.35, 1.60 and 1.60, 1.85, 1.625, respectively for three age groups i.e., 4-5 years, 6-7 years, and 8-9 years. These data reveal that prosocial scores of children in nuclear and joint families do not differ much because of advances in age i.e., the obtained average difference between prosocial scores of children in nuclear and joint families (Figure 47) do not vary genuinely for 4-5 years age (Average difference=0.10), for 6-7 years (Average difference=0.00) and for 8-9 years (Average difference=0.225). The same data also reveal that the average difference between children of 4-5 & 6-7 years, 4-5 & 8-9 years and between 6-7 & 8-9 years age-groups in nuclear family structure are 0.15, 0.40 and 0.25, while that in joint family structure are 0.21, 0.275 and 0.025
FIGURE 46: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE AVERAGE PROSOCIAL SCORES OF CHILDREN OF HIGH RELIGIOUS - LOW POLITICAL AND HIGH POLITICAL - LOW RELIGIOUS PARENTAL VALUE GROUPS.

FIGURE 47: BAR DIAGRAM SHOWING THE AVERAGE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CHILDREN OF SOLitary AND JOINT FAMILIES FOR THREE AGE GROUPS.
(Figure 48), respectively, and these differences are found statistically insignificant in the present study.

This interaction effect between age and family structure on prosocial behaviour of children has also been studied by computing a $X^2$ (Table 30) for differences among various sub-groups based on three age-groups and two family structures i.e., in respect of number of high and low prosocial subjects. The obtained $X^2$ value ($X^2=2.36$) is also not significant at any acceptable level of confidence for 2 degrees of freedom. These provide sufficient statistical ground to conclude that children of nuclear and joint family structures do not differ significantly being high or low prosocial, as they advance in age.

Hence, it can be concluded that children of nuclear and joint families remain same throughout the ages considered in the present investigation i.e., from 4-9 years, in respect of their prosocial behaviour, that is, the obtained difference between the subjects of joint and nuclear families in one age-group is nearly the same in other age-groups also as regards to their prosocial behaviour, because of which the interaction effect has been found negligible. We have seen above that prosocial behaviour increases as age advances, however, no significant difference has been observed between the children of joint and nuclear families in regard to their prosocial behaviour. The insignificant interaction between age and family structure signifies that prosocial behaviour development is not affected by the family structure to which the child belongs. There is no evidence that with increase in age the children of joint families show more prosocial behaviour as compared to those of nuclear families or vice-versa., hence, our hypothesis does not stand the experimental test.

2. INTERACTION EFFECT OF AGE AND PARENTAL MORAL VALUE ON PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOUR OF CHILDREN

Second interaction problem of the present study is whether the children of parents with high moral value would exhibit comparatively more prosocial behaviour with increase in age than those of parents with low moral value. It was hypothesized that there would exist an interaction
A three-way analysis of variance was computed to study individual and interaction effects of three variables i.e., age, family structure and parental moral value, on prosocial behaviour of children. One of first order interaction was between age and parental moral value groups, which yielded an F-ratio of 0.992 (Table 12). The obtained interaction F-ratio is not significant at any acceptable level of confidence for 6 and 216 degrees of freedom which provides ample statistical ground to reject the experimental hypothesis retaining the null hypothesis of no difference in this regard. It is clear from Table 31 that average prosocial scores of children of parents both of high moral value are 1.25, 1.95 and 1.70, of father high and mother low moral value are 1.25, 1.20 and 1.60, of mother high and father low moral value are 1.60, 1.75 and 1.95, and of parents both of low moral value are 1.50, 1.50 and 1.70, respectively for children of three age-groups i.e. 4-5 years, 6-7 years and 8-9 years. These data reveal that prosocial behaviour of children of differential parental moral value groups do not differ much because of advances in age i.e., the obtained differences (Figure 49) among four parental moral value groups do not vary considerably for 4-5 years age (Average differences 0.00, 0.35, 0.25, 0.35, 0.25 and 0.10, respectively for comparisons between BH vs. FH-ML, BH vs. MH-FL, BH vs. BL, FH-ML vs. MH-FL, FH-ML vs. BL and MH-FL vs. BL), for 6-7 years (Average differences 0.75, 0.20, 0.45, 0.55, 0.30 and 0.25) and for 8-9 years (Average differences 0.10, 0.25, 0.00, 0.35, 0.10 and 0.25). The same data also reveal that the difference between children of 4-5 years and 6-7 years; 4-5 years and 8-9 years, and 6-7 years and 8-9 years in respect of their average prosocial scores are 0.70, 0.45 and 0.25, respectively for both parents of high moral value; 0.05, 0.35, 0.40, respectively for father high-mother low moral value; 0.15, 0.35, 0.20 respectively for mother high-father low moral value; and 0, 0.20 and 0.20, respectively, for both parents of low moral value (Figure 50). All these differences are found statistically insignificant in the present investigation.
Figure 48: Bar diagram showing the average difference between 4-5 yrs. & 6-7 yrs., 4-5 yrs. & 8-9 yrs. and between 6-7 yrs. & 8-9 yrs. in nuclear and joint family structures.
Figure 51: Bar diagram showing the average difference among prosocial scores of four parental moral value groups in nuclear and joint families.
This interaction effect between age and parental moral value on prosocial behaviour of the children has also been studied by computing a $X^2$ for differences among various subgroups based on three age-groups and four parental moral value groups, i.e., in respect of number of high and low prosocial subjects. The obtained $X^2$ value is 4.41 (Table 32) which is not significant at any acceptable level of confidence for 15 degrees of freedom. This finding provide ample statistical ground to conclude that children of four parental moral value groups do not differ genuinely being high and low prosocial as they advance in age.

Hence, it can be concluded that age of children and moral value of parents does not exert any joint effect on prosocial behaviour of the children. In other words, the differences among the subjects of four parental moral value groups in one age-group are nearly same in other age-groups also because of which interaction effect is found negligible. It has been observed in the present research that children of higher age-group show more prosocial behaviour in comparison to those of lower age-group. In respect of parental moral value, it has been found that children of mother high and father low moral value are highest, and children of father high and mother low moral value are lowest in respect of their prosocial scores, while children of parents both with high moral value and of parents both with low moral value stand second and third in this regard. However, in respect of joint effect of these two variables, no true effect is observed. That is, though both the factors exert their genuine effect on prosocial behaviour of children independently, there is no evidence of their combined effect. In other words, with advances in age, there is no any genuine differential change in prosocial behaviour of children of different parental moral values.

3. INTERACTION EFFECT OF FAMILY STRUCTURE AND PARENTAL MORAL VALUE ON PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOUR OF CHILDREN

Another problem pertaining to interaction effect is of family structure and parental moral value on prosocial behaviour of children. It was assumed that prosocial behaviour of children in nuclear and joint families would vary according to parental moral value. More specifically, the children of parents both with high moral value in joint families would be the
best and the children of parents both with low moral value in nuclear families would be the poorest as regards to their prosocial behaviour, while the children of parents both with high moral value in nuclear families and the children of mother with high moral value and father with low moral value in joint families would stand second position, the children of mother with high moral value and father with low moral value in nuclear families and the children of father with high moral value and mother with low moral value in joint families would occupy third position, the children of parents both with low moral value in joint families and the children of father with high and mother with low moral value in nuclear families would take fourth position as regards to their prosocial behaviour.

An interaction F-ratio was calculated to study the joint effect of family structure and parental moral value on prosocial behaviour of children in a three-way analysis of variance including age as the third factor. The obtained interaction F-ratio ($F=0.195$, Table 12) is not significant at any acceptable level of confidence for 3 and 216 degrees of freedom, providing thereby a sound statistical ground to accept the null hypothesis and refuting the experimental hypothesis in this regard. The obtained average difference between prosocial scores of children in nuclear and joint families (Figure 51) do not vary genuinely for parents both of high moral value group (Average difference=0), for father high mother and low moral value group (Average difference=0.166), for mother high and father low moral value group (Average difference=0.200) and for parents both of low moral value group (Average difference=0.067). The same data also reveal that average difference between prosocial scores for children of BH & FH-ML, BH & MH-FL, BH & BL, FH-ML & MH-FL, FH-ML & BL, and MH-FL & BL moral value groups in nuclear family structure are 0.200, 0.234, 0.033, 0.434, 0.167, 0.287, while those in joint family structure are 0.366, 0.034, 0.100, 0.400, 0.266, 0.134 (Figure 52) and these differences are not found considerable in the present research.

This interaction effect between family structure and parental moral value on prosocial behaviour of children has also been studied by computing a $X^2$ (Table 34) The obtained $X^2$ value ($X^2=4.687$) is also not
**Figure 52: Bar Diagram Showing the Average Difference Between Prosocial Scores of Two Parental Value Groups in Three Age-Groups.**

**Figure 53: Bar Diagram Showing the Average Difference Among Prosocial Scores of Three Age Groups in Two Parental Value Groups.**
significant at any acceptable level of confidence for 9 degrees of freedom. These provide sufficient statistical ground to conclude that children of nuclear and joint family structures do not differ considerably being high and low prosocial because of their parents' moral value.

Hence, it can be concluded that prosocial behaviour of children of nuclear and joint families remain nearly same for the children of four different parental moral value groups i.e., both parents high moral value, father high-mother low moral value, mother high-father low moral value and both parents low moral value because of which the interaction effect has been found negligible. It has already been discussed in the preceding chapter that family structure of children i.e., nuclear and joint has no say in respect of its effect on prosocial behaviour of children while parental moral value has. And, here, too, it is evident that children of parents with differential moral value do not show any differential change in their prosocial behaviour because of their differential family structures. Hence, there is no any combined effect of these two variables on prosocial behaviour of the children.

4. INTERACTION EFFECT OF AGE, FAMILY STRUCTURE AND PARENTAL MORAL VALUE ON PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOUR OF CHILDREN

Till now interaction effect of any two variables of Study I are discussed in relation to prosocial behaviour. It is also of interest to study the joint effect of all the three factors i.e., age, family structure and parental moral value on prosocial behaviour of children. The problem specific here was whether children in nuclear families and of parents with specific moral value would differ from those in joint families and of parents with differential moral value as they advance in age. It was hypothesized that the oldest children (8-9 years) in joint families and of parents both with high moral value would be the best and the youngest children (4-5 years) in nuclear families and of parents both of low moral value would be the poorest as regards to their prosocial behaviour. The other subgroups would occupy respective positions in this regard based on weightage model prescribed in Table 2.
The second order interaction F-ratio for joint effect of age, family structure, and parental moral value was computed in a three-way analysis of variance (Table 12). The obtained interaction F-ratio (2.697, P<.05) which is significant at 05 level of confidence for 6 and 216 degrees of freedom provides ample statistical ground to reject the null hypothesis retaining the experimental hypothesis i.e., there exists a true interaction effect of these three variables on prosocial behaviour of children. This interaction effect has also been studied by computing a $X^2$ ($X^2=18.04$, Table 35) which is not significant at any acceptable level of confidence for 33 degrees of freedom. The insignificant $X^2$ indicates toward no true difference among various subgroups based on age, family structure and parental moral value in respect of the number of high and low prosocial subjects.

Looking at the results of parametric statistics, however, it can be concluded that three factors i.e., age, family structure and parental moral value are not independent while taken together in respect of their joint effect on prosocial behaviour of the children. It has already been discussed that age of children and parental moral value have their role to play in respect of prosocial behaviour, while family-structure has not been found to play such vital role. Moreover, the interaction effect of any of the two factors is not found significant. However, the significant interaction effect of all the three factors in parametric statistics, provide sound statistical base to conclude that there is genuine joint effect of the three variables i.e., age, family-structure, and parental moral value on prosocial behaviour of the children. In other words, the children of variable groups based on family-structure and parental moral value vary considerably with advance in age in regard to their prosocial behaviour.

5. INTERACTION EFFECT OF AGE AND PARENTAL VALUE PATTERN ON PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOUR OF CHILDREN

The last problem pertaining to the interaction effect was in relation to age and parental value pattern. Though, it was thought to consider high and low scores on each of six values separately, while analysing the data the thirty groups based on six values i.e., theoretical, economic, aesthetic,
social, political, and religious, were reduced to two groups-high prosocial value group and low prosocial value group. Accordingly, the problem here is whether the children of parents with high prosocial value differ from those of parents with low prosocial value as they advance in age. It was hypothesized that the children of parents with high prosocial value would exhibit more prosocial behaviour as they advance in age in comparison to those of parents with low prosocial value.

A two-way analysis of variance was computed to study individual and interaction effects of two variables (age and parental value pattern) on prosocial behaviour of children, wherein the obtained interaction F-ratio (F=11.64, Table 27) is significant at .01 level of confidence for 2 and 444 degrees of freedom. This significant interaction F-ratio provides a sound statistical ground to reject the null hypothesis and to accept the experimental hypothesis as regards to the joint effect of age and parental value pattern. Though, the results of the present investigation as regards to value pattern of parents are not in consonance with the hypothesis, the analyses provided ample ground to reduce the thirty value groups to two: high and low prosocial value-groups and it has been found that these two groups differ genuinely in regard to their prosocial behaviour. As in Study I, in Study II too, age proved to have a remarkable say in prosocial behaviour, that is, with advance in age there is increase in prosocial behaviour of the children. Their interaction effect has also been studied by computing a $X^2$ ($X^2=43.86$, Table 30) which is significant at 5 degrees of freedom. The significant $X^2$ indicate toward genuine difference among various sub-groups based on age and parental value pattern as regards to the number of high and low prosocial subjects.

It is clear from Figure 53 that difference between the children of high and low prosocial value groups in respect of their prosocial scores for three age-groups i.e., 4-5 years, 6-7 years, and 8-9 years are 0.133, 0.587 and 0.772 respectively. The same data also reveal (Figure 54) that differences between children of 4-5 & 6-7 years, 4-5 & 8-9 years, 6-7 & 8-9 years for high prosocial parental value group are 2.534, 1.00 and 0.466 respectively, while those for low prosocial group are 0.08, 0.361 and 0.281 respectively.
The significant interaction F-ratio and $X^2$ signify that there is genuine interaction of these two factors on prosocial behaviour of children. In other words, it can be concluded that there is true difference in prosocial behaviour of children of parents with high and low prosocial value as they advance in age. That is, the children of parents with high prosocial value show greater increase in their prosocial behaviour as they advance in age than those of parents with low prosocial value.

It has already been discussed that with advances in age prosocial behaviour also increases and the children of high prosocial parental value group show more prosocial behaviour. The significant interaction between the two factors further provides sound base to conclude that the two factors exert their joint effect also on prosocial behaviour of the children. In other words, it can be said that the difference in prosocial behaviour of the children of both parental value pattern, vary considerably with advance in age.