The Relationship Between Parenting and Prosociality: Opportunities and Strategies for the Prevention of Risk Behaviour in Adolescents

Veličková, K.[1], Banárová, K.[2]

1 | Masaryk University in Brno, Faculty of Arts, Department of Psychology, Brno, Czech Republic
2 | Palacký University in Olomouc, Faculty of Arts, Department of Sociology, Andragogy and Cultural Anthropology, Olomouc, Czech Republic

Citation | Veličková, K., & Banárová, K. (2025). The relationship between parenting and prosociality: Opportunities and strategies for the prevention of risk behaviour in adolescents. *Adiktologie v preventivní a léčebné praxi, 8*(1), 36–45. https://doi.org/10.35198/APLP/01-2025-001-0004

Background | This research study deals with the relationship between parenting and prosocial behaviour in adolescence. **Aims |** The main goal of the study was to explore the relationship between parenting approaches (positive interest, hostility, directivity, autonomy, and inconsistency) and particular prosocial behaviours (emotional, public, dire, compliant, altruistic, and anonymous). We were also interested in the connection between the parents' occupation and the prosocial behaviour of an adolescent. **Methods |** The Questionnaire of Parental Behaviour and Attitudes for Adolescents (ADOR) (Matějček & Říčan, 1983) and the Prosocial Tendencies Measure–Revised (PTM-R) (Babinčák, 2011) were used for our study. For the evaluation we used statistical tests such as the Spearman correlation coefficient, ANOVA, and the Kruskal-Wallis H test. **Sample |** The study sample included selected four-year grammar school pupils in the Moravian-Silesian Region. **Results |** The results showed a relationship between the father's parenting attitude and all kinds of prosocial behaviour, which was not the case with the mother in cases of inconsistency and directiveness. **Discussion and conclusions |** The meaning of the parental model proved essential in the father for dire prosociality, and in the mother for emotional and compliant prosociality. In the conclusion of the article, we discuss our findings in the context of risk behaviour during adolescence.

Keywords | prosocial behaviour – parenting – parenting approaches – adolescence

Submitted | 19 January 2025 **Accepted |** 26 June 2025

Grant affiliation | Publishing of publications by FF UP in Olomouc, project No. FPVC2024/01

Corresponding author | Mgr. Karolína Veličková, Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts, Department of Psychology, Arne Nováka 1/1, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic **karolina.velickova@gmail.com**

Vztah mezi rodičovstvím a prosociálním chováním: Možnosti a strategie pro prevenci rizikového chování u dospívajících

Veličková, K.[1], Banárová, K.[2]

1 | Masarykova univerzita v Brně, Filozofická fakulta, Psychologický ústav
2 | Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, Filozofická fakulta, Katedra sociologie, andragogiky a kulturní antropologie

Citace | Veličková, K., & Banárová, K. (2025). The relationship between parenting and prosociality: Opportunities and strategies for the prevention of risk behavior in adolescents. *Adiktologie v preventivní a léčebné praxi, 8*(1), 36–45. https://doi.org/10.35198/APLP/01-2025-001-0004

Východiska | Tato studie se zabývá vztahem mezi výchovou a prosociálním chováním v dospívání. **Cíle |** Hlavním cílem studie bylo prozkoumat vztah výchovných přístupů (pozitivní zájem, hostilita, direktivita, autonomie a nedůslednost) a konkrétního prosociálního chování (emocionální, veřejné, krizové, vyžádané, altruistické a anonymní). Zajímal nás také vztah povolání rodičů a prosociálního chování adolescenta. **Metody |** Jako výzkumné metody jsme využili dotazník rodičovského chování a postojů pro adolescenty (ADOR) (Matějček & Říčan, 1983) a Revidovaný dotazník prosociálních tendencí (PTM-R) (Babinčák, 2011). Pro vyhodnocení jsme použili statistické testy jako Spearmanův korelační koeficient, ANOVA a Kruskalův-Wallisův H test. **Výběrový soubor |** Výzkumný vzorek tvořili žáci zvoleného čtyřletého gymnázia v Moravskoslezském kraji. **Výsledky |** Výsledky ukázaly souvislost mezi výchovným postojem otce a všemi druhy prosociálního chování, což se u matky neprojevilo v případech nedůslednosti a direktivity. **Závěry |** Vztah rodičovského modelu a prosociality se ukázal jako zásadní u otce pro krizovou prosociálnost a u matky pro emocionální a vyžádanou prosociálnost. V závěru článku diskutujeme naše zjištění v kontextu rizikového chování v období dospívání.

Klíčová slova | prosociální chování – rodičovství – rodičovské přístupy – adolescence

Došlo do redakce | 19. ledna 2025 **Přijato k tisku |** 26. června 2025

Grantová podpora | Vydání publikace podpořila FF UP v Olomouci, projekt č. FPVC2024/01.

Korespondující autor | Mgr. Karolína Veličková, Masarykova univerzita, Filozofická fakulta, Psychologický ústav, Arne Nováka 1/1, 602 00 Brno, Česká republika **karolina.velickova@gmail.com**

1 BACKGROUND

Prosocial behaviour has been conceptualised in various ways by different authors, and there is no single universally accepted definition. For example, Slaměník and Janoušek (2008, p. 285) characterise prosocial behaviour as "any act of behaviour performed for the benefit of another person or group of persons". Batson (2011) argues that prosocial behaviour may or may not involve altruism. To capture the many perspectives on prosocial behaviour, the multidimensional approach of Penner et al. (2005), dividing prosocial behaviour into micro (origin), meso (reason), and macro (organisations and groups) levels, is a good one.

The origins of prosociality can be found in parental models (Záškodná & Mlčák, 2009), in an evolutionarily advantageous strategy (Schroeder & Graziano, 2014), in biological brain adaptations (Lieberman, 2013), or in a combination of both inborn tendencies and nurture (Eisenberg et al., 2000). Despite the potential shared foundations of prosociality, gender differences in the level of help (Vágnerová, 2012) or in the type of help provided (Záškodná & Mlčák, 2009) are to be expected. Motivations for prosociality may stem from altruistic (Stocks et al., 2009) or egoistic motives (Batson, 2011). Social norms (Penner et al., 2005), advantageous social exchange (Slaměník & Janoušek, 2008), and situational (Darley & Latané, 1968) or dispositional (Petrides & Furnham, 2001) factors may also play a role. In our study, we work with the PTM-R questionnaire, which measures prosociality comprehensively and, given its aforementioned diversity, the authors Carlo and Randall (2002) divide prosocial behaviour into the following dimensions: altruistic, compliant, emotional, public, anonymous, and dire.

The origins of prosociality can also be found in parenting models (Záškodná & Mlčák, 2009) and parenting (Eisenberg et al., 2000), which takes place primarily within the family environment where the child learns to socialise. According to Vágnerová (2012), it is within the family parenting that the child learns basic knowledge about the world and how it works and develops attitudes and moral and spiritual values. It is up to the parents what educational approach they adopt. Baumrind (1991) described three distinct parenting styles, namely authoritarian (requiring obedience and close monitoring of the child's activities), authoritative (mutual communication and encouragement of self-initiative), and permissive (extremely accommodating and low demands). Maccoby and Martin (1983) added another neglectful parenting style (low demands and little interest in the child). Matějček and Říčan (1983) gave a comprehensive description of five dimensions of parenting – positive interest, hostility, directivity, autonomy, and inconsistency. Steinberg (2001) indicates that a combination of moderate parenting control and positive emotional attitudes is more unfavourable for the development of conscientiousness, purposefulness, positive self-concept, and stability of the child's personality. The counterpoint is a combination of inconsistent or extremely strong parenting control with a negative emotional relationship. This combination causes children to develop lability, a lack of patience, a lack of self-awareness, and a disintegrated self-concept.

The relationship between prosocial behaviour and parenting in adolescents has been the subject of much research. Parental attitudes have been revealed to be a significant factor in the development of prosociality in adolescents (Eberly et al., 1993). The importance of parental role models for future prosocial behaviour has also been confirmed by many authors.

Inductive practices such as verbal reasoning and explanation (Hoffman, 1970) contribute to high levels of moral reasoning, conscience, and prosocial behaviour (e.g. Eisenberg et al., 2000) and are associated with an authoritative parenting style (Baumrind, 1991). This style is a combination of responsive parenting and, simultaneously, demanding attitudes, which has been found to be the most common association with prosocial behaviour in adolescents (Carlo et al., 1998). Responsive and supportive parenting also helps increase prosocial behaviour and reduces the incidence of problem behaviour (Padilla-Walker, 2007). Carlo et al. (1998) found that strict control of children even reduced the development of prosociality, as the correlations between variables here were weak to insignificant. Furthermore, research examining the opposite of not providing attention or providing too much tolerance to adolescents has shown that extreme leniency towards children is perceived as neglectful (Gillnerová, 2004).

In summary, frequent moral conversations, praise, social recognition, and practical experience should all contribute to the development of prosocial behaviour. Prosociality is a relatively stable phenomenon across adolescence; therefore, prosocial behaviour can be assumed to persist in adolescence in the form of prosocial habits and moral sense (Hart & Fegley, 1995).

2 AIMS

The main aim of the research project was to test whether the above-mentioned parental approaches are related to adolescents' prosocial behaviour. We also relied on the positive interest expressed in the child's activities (e.g. Padilla-Walker, 2007), the adequacy of the level of demands on the child, and the satisfaction of his/her needs (e.g. Hart & Fegley, 1995).

We were also interested in the positive meaning of the parent model for child behaviour (e.g. Hoffman, 1970) and its projection into the child's actions, specifically, whether the parent working in a helping profession correlates with the prosocial behaviour of the child through the positive relation with the model (e.g. Yarrow & Waxler, 1984). On the basis of these objectives, we set hypotheses:

H1: Positive parental concern is positively related to each form of adolescent prosocial behaviour.

H2: Parental hostility is negatively related to each form of adolescent prosocial behaviour.

H3: Parental autonomy is positively related to each form of adolescent behaviour.

H4: Parental directiveness is negatively related to each form of adolescent behaviour.

H5: Parental inconsistency is negatively related to each form of adolescent prosocial behaviour.

H6: There is a relationship between the parent's occupation and each form of adolescent prosocial behaviour.

H7: There is a positive relationship between the parent working in a helping profession and the various forms of the prosocial behaviour of the adolescent.

3 METHODOLOGY

The research was conducted in November and December 2022 using face-to-face data collection in school settings. Participants were recruited through cooperation with school management and teaching staff. The sample consisted of upper secondary school pupils who were informed in advance about the purpose and voluntary nature of the study. Before the students completed the questionnaire, informed consent was obtained from all of them and, in accordance with ethical standards, either parental or school-level permission was also secured. The data collection was anonymous, and the questionnaires were administered in printed form during regular school lessons.

3.1 Methods

A battery of questionnaires consisting of three parts was used: a sociodemographic questionnaire, a questionnaire measuring prosocial tendencies, and a tool for assessing parental behaviour and attitudes.

a) Sociodemographic Data

The sociodemographic section included basic questions about age, gender, family structure, and parental marital status. Special attention was given to parental occupation. The respondents were asked to write down the profession of both their mother and father in open-ended items. These responses were later categorised on the basis of standard classification of economic sectors and socioeconomic status.

b) Prosocial Tendencies Measure Revised (PTM-R)

The extent of prosocial behaviour was assessed using the Prosocial Tendencies Measure Revised (PTM-R)**,** developed by Carlo and Randall (2002). In our study, we work with this instrument because it provides a comprehensive view of prosociality. Given its multidimensional nature, the authors divide prosocial behaviour into six distinct dimensions: altruistic, compliant, emotional, public, anonymous, and dire. The Czech version of the questionnaire was modified by Banárová and Čerešník (2020). The scale contains 23 items, each belonging to one of the six subscales. The respondents rated each item using a five-point Likert scale (1 – doesn't describe me at all; 2 – kind of describes me; 3 – describes me to some extent; 4 – describes me a lot; 5 – describes me completely). The internal consistency of the scale in this study was satisfactory, with a Cronbach's alpha of $\alpha = 0.83$.

c) The Parenting Behaviours and Attitudes Questionnaire for Adolescents (ADOR)

Parental behaviour and attitudes were measured using the Parenting Behaviours and Attitudes Questionnaire for Adolescents (ADOR)**,** which is based on the CRPBI-30 (Children's Report of Parental Behaviour Inventory) by Schulderman and Schulderman (1970). The Czech adaptation was developed by Matějček and Říčan (1983). The questionnaire captures several dimensions of parenting, presented as opposing poles. One dimension contrasts positive interest with hostility, with internal consistency coefficients of $\alpha = 0.84$ for mothers and $\alpha = 0.86$ for fathers on the positive interest subscale and $\alpha = 0.77$ for mothers and $\alpha = 0.76$ for fathers on the hostility subscale. Another dimension contrasts directiveness with autonomy, with $\alpha = 0.72$ for mothers and $\alpha = 0.74$ for fathers on the directiveness subscale and $\alpha = 0.82$ for mothers and $\alpha = 0.81$ for fathers on the autonomy subscale. The final dimension to be assessed was inconsistency, with $\alpha = 0.81$ for both parents. The respondents indicated their level of agreement with 100 statements – 50 referring to the father and 50 to the mother – using a three-point scale (0 – does not describe me at all; 1 – describes me partially; 2 – describes me well). The statements were identical for both parents.

3.2 Ethics

All data was handled in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of natural persons regarding the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data. Prior to participation, informed consent was obtained orally from all the students, who were clearly informed about the purpose and voluntary nature of the study. Parental or school-level permission was obtained in accordance with institutional and ethical standards.

3.3 Methods of Data Analysis

The data was analysed using the IBM SPSS Statistics software. Descriptive statistics and internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha) were computed for all scales. Subsequently, correlation analyses and group comparisons were conducted to explore the relationships between variables and differences across respondent groups. Correlations were assessed using Spearman's coefficient. Results with a normal distribution were treated with the ANOVA test, and results without a normal distribution were treated with the Kruskal-Wallis H test.

4 SAMPLE

The base group was students at grammar schools in the Czech Republic, which consists of 133,321 pupils. The sample consisted of 149 four-year grammar school students in the Moravian-Silesian Region, whose average age was 16.84 years (SD = 1.43), with ages ranging from 15 to 19 years. The research group comprised 63.76% females (N = 95) and 36.24% males (N = 54). The participants were recruited from grammar schools that voluntarily agreed to participate in the study. Within these schools, whole classes were selected, with the intention of including students of different ages and study years. Although the selection was influenced by organisational feasibility, the procedure aimed to approximate random sampling within the accessible population to support the validity of quantitative analyses.

5 RESULTS

The results were processed separately for the mother (Table 1) and for the father (Table 2). The tables below show the correlations between the scales using Spearman's correlation coefficient. We respect the statistical significance levels $\alpha = 0.01$ (highly significant) and $\alpha = 0.05$ (significant). In cases where the p-value was less than 0.05.

From the results shown in Table 1, the following findings emerged regarding the mother's behaviour and its effect on the child's prosociality. In the case of ratings of the importance of positive maternal concern, there was a positive correlation with prosocial emotional behaviour ($r_s = 0.23$; $p = 0.005$) and with compliant prosocial behaviour ($r_s = 0.33$; $p = 0.002$). A positive correlation was also found between

Category	Metric	Positive interest	Hostility	Autonomy	Directiveness	Inconsistency
Public	r_s	0.05	0.04	0.11	0.87	–0.07
	p	0.539	0.611	0.202	0.289	0.379
Emotional	r_s	**0.23**	0.03	0.13	0.10	0.07
	p	**0.005**	0.728	0.124	0.242	0.369
Dire	r_s	0.06	0.02	0.09	0.02	–0.03
	p	0.449	0.796	0.302	0.816	0.689
Anonymous	r_s	–0.06	–0.07	–0.12	–0.11	–0.15
	p	0.448	0.399	0.153	0.171	0.629
Compliant	r_s	**0.33**	–0.11	**0.17**	–0.01	–0.06
	p	**0.002**	0.175	**0.036**	0.879	0.479
Altruistic	r_s	0.07	**–0.18**	0.12	–0.14	–0.11
	p	0.427	**0.029**	0.195	0.086	0.184

Note: r_s = Spearman's rank correlation, p = value of statistical significance

Table 1 | Correlation between PTM-R and ADOR - mother

Category	Metric	Positive interest	Hostility	Autonomy	Directiveness	Inconsistency
Public	r_s	-0.15	**0.19**	-0.05	0.15	0.13
	p	0.059	**0.014**	0.539	0.068	0.109
Emotional	r_s	**0.18**	0.06	0.09	0.07	0.08
	p	**0.033**	0.439	0.285	0.425	0.341
Dire	r_s	**0.18**	0.04	0.02	0.05	-0.06
	p	**0.029**	0.626	0.794	0.529	0.465
Anonymous	r_s	0.03	-0.15	0.01	-0.07	**-0.23**
	p	0.754	0.066	0.979	0.392	**0.005**
Compliant	r_s	**0.26**	-0.79	**0.24**	-0.03	-0.01
	p	**0.001**	0.349	**0.003**	0.696	0.907
Altruistic	r_s	**0.19**	**-0.26**	**0.21**	**-0.21**	**-0.24**
	p	**0.014**	**0.001**	**0.009**	**0.011**	**0.004**

Note: r_s = Spearman's rank correlation, p = value of statistical significance

Table 2 | Correlation between PTM-R and ADOR - father

autonomy provided by the mother and compliant prosocial behaviour (r_s = 0.17; p = 0.036). In contrast, maternal directiveness and inconsistency were not significantly correlated with any dimension of prosocial behaviour in either direction. Finally, maternal hostility was negatively correlated with the child's altruistic prosocial behaviour (r_s= -0.18; p = 0.029).

In Table 2, multiple correlations were found between specific aspects of the father's behaviour and the child's prosociality. Positive correlations between positive interest on the part of the father and prosociality were found for the emotional (r_s = 0.18; p = 0.033), dire (r_s = 0.18; p = 0.029), compliant (r_s = 0.26; p = 0.001), and altruistic (r_s = 0.19; p = 0.014) prosociality scales. Parental autonomy provided by the father was also positively correlated with more than one scale of prosociality, namely compliant prosociality (r_s = 0.24; p = 0.003) and, in addition, altruistic prosociality (r_s = 0.21; p = 0.009). The altruistic type of prosociality was negatively correlated with hostility on the part of the father (r_s = -0.26; p = 0.001), but there was a positive correlation between hostility on the part of the father and public prosocial behaviour (r_s = 0.19; p = 0.014). The father's directiveness was also negatively correlated with the child's altruistic prosocial behaviour (r_s = -0.21; p = 0.011), and inconsistency also showed negative correlations, with anonymous prosociality (r_s = -0.23; p = 0.005) and altruistic prosociality (r_s = -0.24; p = 0.004).

To test the effect of the parent model on an individual's prosocial behaviour (Hypotheses 6 and 7), we elicited the occupation of the parents from the participants in a sociodemographic questionnaire battery. The representation of parental occupation is shown in Table 3.

Results with a normal distribution were treated with the ANOVA test and results without a normal distribution were treated with the Kruskal-Wallis H test. Again, we evaluated the associations of occupation and prosociality separately for the father and mother on the basis of significance levels of α = 0.01 (highly significant) and α = 0.05 (significant).

The ANOVA test did not yield dire behaviour as significant in relation to maternal employment: F(1, 6) = 0.941; p = 0.468. However, the mother's occupation turned out to be related to prosocial emotional behaviour: F(1, 6) = 2.409; p = 0.029. Because of the small number of comparison groups, a post hoc Tukey's HSD test of variance was also applied, which showed the largest difference in prosocial emotional behaviour between the mother's occupation involving the arts, languages, or the media and the mother's occupation involving gastronomy or sports (p = 0.044). A Kruskal-Wallis H test revealed a single association, namely between the mother's occupation and compliant prosocial behaviour (H = 15.976; p = 0.014).

The father's employment was not significantly associated with emotional prosocial behaviour: F(1, 6) = 1.031; p = 0.408. A significant association was found between the father's employment and dire prosocial behaviour: F(1, 6) = 3.031; p = 0.008. Again, Tukey's HSD test was applied, and yielded the largest difference as being between the groups of adolescents who had a father engaged in education and a father engaged in a helping profession (p = 0.018). The other prosociality scales did not show any significant values in the Kruskal-Wallis test in relation to the father's occupation.

A more specific aim was to distinguish between children with parents engaged in helping professions and those with parents engaged in other professions. The validity of the statistical hypothesis was tested using a t-test for two independent samples, as we were again working with normally distributed means of the PTM-R subscales. Table 4 shows the group means of the raw scores (group 0 = non-helping profession; group 1 = helping profession) on each prosocial behaviour scale and the levels of statistical significance for the mother and father separately.

Occupation	Total (N)	Mother		Father	
		N	N in %	N	N in %
Education	44	35	79.55	9	20.45
Arts, language, and media	9	5	55.56	4	44.44
Technology, production, and construcion	85	16	18.82	69	81.18
Business, administration, and law	104	55	52.88	49	47.12
Helping professions	49	35	71.43	14	28.57
Gastronomy and sport	4	1	25.00	3	75.00
Unemployed	3	2	66.7	1	33.33

Note: N = number

Table 3 | Descriptive statistics by occupation of the parents

Dimension	Group	Mother				Father			
		M	SD	t (144)	p	M	SD	t (143)	p
Public	0	7.26	2.19	0.073	0.941	7.28	2.22	0.218	0.827
	1	7.23	2.58			7.14	2.71		
Emotional	0	14.92	3.96	0.607	0.545	14.79	4.01	–0.515	0.607
	1	14.46	3.81			15.36	3.29		
Dire	0	9.73	2.35	0.157	0.876	9.49	2.33	–0.301	0.003
	1	9.66	2.51			11.43	1.95		
Anonymous	0	9.92	3.51	–1.402	0.163	9.89	3.47	–1.508	0.134
	1	10.91	4.12			11.43	5.06		
Compliant	0	15.94	3.11	0.189	0.851	15.91	2.95	–0.367	0.714
	1	15.83	2.33			16.21	3.04		
Altruistic	0	17.22	2.64	0.251	0.803	17.15	2.74	0.081	0.935
	1	17.09	2.85			17.21	2.22		

Note: M = mean, SD = standard deviation, t = T-test value for two independent samples, p = value of statistical significance; group 0 = non-helping profession; group 1 = helping profession

Table 4 | Group mean scores on prosociality dimensions and their statistical significance

In Table 4, we can see that the mothers were not shown to have any significant results in this case. Moreover, the averages of the group including non-helping professions in the different scales of prosocial behaviour were (except in the single case of anonymous prosociality, where the average of the helping professions group was 0.995 points higher than the first group) higher than the averages of the helping professions group. One significant value was found for the father for dire prosocial behaviour, with t (143) = -3.01; p = 0.003. Thus, the hypothesis can only be accepted for the case where the father is in a helping profession, and on the basis of the accepted hypothesis, it can be expected that the child of such a father will exhibit higher dire prosocial behaviour.

6 DISCUSSION

The aim of our research was to investigate the relationships between aspects of parenting and different types of prosociality. Parental approach was conceptualised comprehensively and represented by the dimensions of positive approach, hostility, autonomy, directivity, and inconsistency (Matějček & Říčan, 1983). For both parents, the results were processed separately, as the parents' approach to the child may differ. Prosocial behaviour was distinguished as public, emotional, dire, anonymous, solicited, and altruistic (Babinčák, 2011; Czech modification: Banárová & Čerešník, 2020). The development of prosocial behaviour may be associated with the emergence of risk behaviour in adolescence. Prosocial behaviour during adolescence was negatively associated with changes in aggression, delinquency (Padilla-Walker, 2007), and playing violent video games (Fraser et al., 2012). Engagement in prosocial behaviour leads to a moderate level of risk behaviour among Czech adolescents in areas such as substance abuse, delinquency, and bullying (Banárová, 2023).

The relationships between the dimensions were verified using the Spearman's correlation coefficient statistical test. The significant dimension related to prosociality was also, according to our expectations, positive interest. We drew on original research that refers to its components such as warmth, responsiveness, and parental caring as generally beneficial for child development (Vágnerová, 2012) and also for the development of prosocial tendencies. At the same time, aspects of a positive parenting approach can be seen as a form of prevention against risk and delinquent behaviour, which manifests itself as substance abuse, negative psychosocial phenomena (i.e. the opposite of prosociality), and negative productive behaviour (Hamanová & Kabíček, 2002).

Thus, the positively worded hypothesis H1 could only be partially accepted, and in the case of the mother, where positive interest was correlated with emotional and compliant prosocial behaviour. It can also be partially accepted in the case of the father, where positive correlations were found with emotional, compliant, dire, and altruistic prosociality. In summary, therefore, hypothesis H1 cannot be accepted because of its ambiguity.

In hypothesis H2, hostility was clearly framed in negative terms on the basis of previous research (Carlo et al., 1998). This hypothesis was supported by negative correlations between maternal hostility and altruistic prosocial behaviour and between paternal hostility and altruistic prosociality. In the case study described by Muslíková (2019), a connection can also be found between the father's hostile behaviour and the child's risk (specifically addictive) behaviour. However, the hypothesis did not prove to be valid for all forms of prosociality, as a positive correlation was also found between hostility and the form of prosociality, namely between hostility displayed by the father and public prosocial behaviour; therefore, it cannot be accepted because of its ambiguity.

Another positively formulated factor co-variated with prosociality was the dimension of nurturing autonomy in hypothesis H3. We built on Einsberg et al.'s (2000) assertion that sensitivity to adolescents' needs, which necessarily include autonomy at this developmental stage, is a quality foundation for the development of prosociality instead of the development of risky behaviour. In our research, maternal autonomy appeared to be positively correlated only with compliant prosociality. For the father, autonomy was positively correlated with both compliant prosociality and altruistic prosociality, but this was not so in the remaining cases. In the cases that were mentioned, the hypothesis can be accepted, but it did not apply everywhere, so we do not accept it in its entirety because of its ambiguity.

Directiveness was formulated as a negative predictor of prosociality in our research in hypothesis H4, as we relied on the research by Carlo et al. (1998), where warm parenting versus strict control emerged as a more reliable predictor of prosociality. Strict control was even considered by the authors of the research to be a decreasing factor in the development of prosociality and, conversely, an increasing factor for delinquent behaviour (Čáp, 2001). However, the directive nature of the mother was not found to be significantly associated (positively or negatively) with either type of prosocial behaviour in our research, and therefore hypothesis H4 cannot be accepted in the case of the mother. In the case of the father, there was one negative correlation of directiveness, namely with altruistic prosocial behaviour. In the case of the father, hypothesis H4 cannot be accepted because of its ambiguity.

Hypothesis H5 formulated parental inconsistency as a negative factor for prosociality. Indeed, non-involvement is taken, for example, by Maccoby and Martin (1983) even as neglect, which, according to the research of these authors, was associated with generally maladaptive behaviour patterns. Inconsistency (or even a lack) of parental attention is also associated with confusion in self-definition within society, which is a primary task of adolescence; without it, the individual experiences difficulties in relating to society as a whole (Muslíková, 2019). According to Gillnerová (2004), low receptivity to the child and low demands for his/her responsibility have a negative impact on the formation of the moral identity of the individual. Despite the abundance of directional research, the hypothesis H5 cannot be accepted in our case in the case of an inconsistent maternal attitude, but the hypothesis is supported by the correlations found in the father's case, where two significant negative correlations were found, namely with anonymous and altruistic prosociality; therefore it cannot be accepted in the father's case because of its ambiguity.

The last hypotheses, H6 and H7, dealt with the relation between the parent model and the child's prosociality. The theoretical anchor for H6 can be found in the findings of Záškodná and Mlčák (2009), who emphasise the coercive effect of the parent model on the child's prosociality, which could be linked specifically to the parent's occupational role. The importance of the parental model, whether positive (prosocial) or negative (risk and delinquent behaviour), is also evident in the child's choice of leisure activities, which may reflect the parent's interests associated with their profession (Marková, 2008). The mother's employment was significantly related to the child's emotional prosociality, and the largest difference in this prosociality was evaluated as being between the media, language, and arts occupational group and the gastronomy and sports occupational group. Furthermore, a relationship was found between the mother's employment and the child's compliant prosocial behaviour. For the father's occupation, a significant association was found only with dire prosociality and the largest difference was between the education and parenting occupational groups and the helping profession group. On the basis of these results, the hypothesis H6 can be partially accepted in the given cases of both the mother and father, but overall, it cannot be accepted because of its ambiguity.

Hypothesis H7, based on the research by Yarrow and Waxler (1984), predicted higher scores for the group of children with a parent in a helping profession compared to children with a parent not in a helping profession. For the mother, no significant relationships were found in the comparison of groups across the scales of forms of prosociality. One significant value was found for the father. Thus, our alternative hypothesis can be accepted only partially, namely the effect of the father's working in a helping profession on the child's dire prosociality.

We find our research useful in concretising those aspects of the parenting approach that are linked to the types of prosocial behaviour. It is also worth noting the significant values found in the research on the association between the parent's occupation and the child's prosocial behaviour. However, the limitations of the research include the low number of respondents (N = 149), which may affect the representativeness of the results. For future research studies, we would recommend deeper investigation to achieve data comprehensiveness.

7 CONCLUSIONS

This research study investigated the relationship between parenting attitudes and adolescent prosociality. In all cases, at least one parent was found to show a positive association between one of the parenting dimensions and at least one type of prosociality. Conversely, specifically for the mother, no significant values were found in the association of directivity or inconsistency with the individual's forms of prosociality. For the father, associations with forms of prosociality were found in all dimensions of parenting.

The respondents were also compared according to their parents' occupation, which again yielded few significant values. We found a relationship between mothers' occupations and children's emotional and requested prosocial behaviour. In the case of fathers, a significant association with their occupation emerged only for dire prosocial behaviour in their children. When the helping profession and

non-helping profession groups were compared, a relationship was found only for fathers engaged in a helping profession and the children of these fathers exhibiting higher dire prosocial behaviour compared to the other group. We attribute the small number of significant associations to the small sample size.

Authors' contributions | The authors KV and KB conceptualised the study and outlined the research design. They carried out the statistical evaluation and were involved in interpreting the data and drafting the manuscript. KV wrote the initial draft of the manuscript. KV also conducted a review of the literature and compiled a synopsis of the pertinent research. KB oversaw the statistical evaluation and assisted in the preparation of the manuscript. Both authors participated in the development of the manuscript and provided their approval for the final version.

Declaration of interest | No conflict of interest.

LITERATURA / REFERENCES

Babinčák, P. (2011). Prosocial Tendencies Measure–Revised (PTM-R) - prva skúsenosť s krátkou metodikou na meranie prosociálneho správania (pp. 6–12). Sborník příspěvků, Sociální procesy a osobnost: Člověk na cestě životem: Křižovatky a mosty. Masarykova univerzita.

Banárová, K. (2023). *Piliere života. Prosociálnosť a sebaregulácia v kontexte rizikového správania v dospievaní* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. UPOL.

Banárová, K., & Čerešník, M. (2020). Príčiny produkcie rizikového správania v dospievaní. Vzťahová perspektíva. In M. Verešová, V. Gatial, & R. Tomšik (Eds.) *Zborník príspevkov zo Študentskej vedeckej a odbornej činnosti*, (pp. 31–44). PF UKF.

Batson, C. D. (2011). *Altruism in humans*. Oxford University Press.

Baumrind, D. (1991). Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. In P. A. Cowan & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.) *Advances in family research*, (pp. 111–163). Erlbaum.

Carlo, G., & Randall, B.A. (2002). The Development of a Measure of Prosocial Behaviors for Late Adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence 31,* 31–44. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014033032440

Carlo, G., Roesch, S.C., & Melby, J. (1998). The multiplicative relations of parenting and temperament to prosocial and antisocial behaviors in adolescence. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 18*(3), 266–290. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431698018003003

Čap J. (2001). Celkový způsob (styl) výchovy. In J. Čáp & J. Mareš (Eds.). *Psychologie pro učitele* (1st edition, pp. 303–326). Portál.

Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8*(1), 377–383. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0025589

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). The support of autonomy and the control of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*(6), 1024–1037. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.53.6.1024

Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., Schroeder, D. A., & Penner, L. A. (2006). *The Social Psychology of Prosocial Behavior*. Psychology Press.

Eberly, M. B., Montemayor, R., & Flannery, D. J. (1993). Variation in adolescent helpfulness toward parents in a family context. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 13*(3), 228–244. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0272431693013003001

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Guthrie, I. K., & Reiser, M. (2000). Dispositional Emotionality and Regulation: Their role in predicting quality of social functioning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*(1), 136–157. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.78.1.136

Fraser, A. M., Padilla-Walker, L. M., Coyne, S. M., Nelson, L. J., & Stockdale, L. A. (2012). Associations between violent video gaming, empathic concern, and prosocial behavior toward strangers, friends, and family members. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 41*(5), 636–649. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9742-2

Gillnerová, I. (2004). Způsob výchovy v současné české rodin z pohledu dospívajících chlapců a dívek. In D. Heller, J. Procházková, & I. Sobotková (Eds.), *Psychologické dny 2004: Svět žen a svět mužů. Polarita a vzájemné obohacování.* (pp. 1–14). Univerzita Karlova.

Hamanová, J., & Kabíček, P. (2002). Syndrom rizikového chování v dospívání. *Lékařské listy, 50*(4), 38–40.

Hart, D., & Fegley, S. (1995). Altruism and caring in adolescence: Relations to self-understanding and social judgment. *Child Development, 66*(5), 1346–1359. https://doi.org/10.2307/1131651

Hoffman, M. L. (1970). Moral development. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology* (pp. 261–300). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Lieberman, M. (2013). *Social: Why Our brains are wired to connect*. Crown Publishers/Random House.

Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. IV. Socialization, Personality and Social Development* (pp. 1–101). Wiley.

Marková, M. (2008). Vliv sociálních faktorů na problémové chování adolescentů. *Pediatrie pro praxi, 9*(3), 190–191.

Matějček, Z., & Říčan, P. (1983). ADOR: *Dotazník rodičovského jednání a postojů pro adolescenty*. Psychodiagnostické a didaktické testy.

Padilla-Walker, L. M. (2007). Characteristics of mother-child interactions related to adolescents' positive value and behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 69*(3), 675–686. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00399.x

Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial Behavior: Multilevel Perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 365–392. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070141

Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: Psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality, 15*(6), 425–448. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1002/per.416

Schroeder, D. A., & Graziano, W. G. (2014). The Field of Prosocial Behavior: An Introduction and Overview. In D. A. Schroeder & W. G. Graziano (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Prosocial Behavior* (pp. 3–34). Oxford Library of Psychology.

Schulderman, E., & Schulderman, S. (1970). Replicability of factors in children's reports of parent behavior (CRPBI). *Journal of Psychology, 76*, 296–349.

Slaměník, J., & Janoušek, J. (2008). Prosociální chování. In J. Výrost & I. Slaměník (Eds.), *Sociální psychologie* (2nd edition, pp. 285–298). Grada.

Steinberg, L. (2001). We know some things: Parent-adolescent relationships in retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 11*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/1532-7795.00001

Stocks, E. L., Lishner, D. A., & Decker, S. K. (2009). Altruism or psychological escape: Why does empathy promote prosocial behavior? *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*(5), 649–665. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.561

Vágnerová, M. (2012). *Vývojová psychologie: Dětství a dospívání* (2nd edition). Karolinum.

Veličková, K. (2023). *Vztah mezi výchovou a prosociálním chováním u dospívajících.* (Unpublished bachelor's thesis). Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.

Wargo, E. (2007). Adolescents and risk: Helping young people make better choices. *ACT for Youth Centre of Excellence: Research Facts and Findings.* Retrieved on 11 February 2023 from https://www.academia.edu/3472938/Adolescents_and_Risk_Helping_Young_People_Make_Better_Choices

Yarrow, M. R., & Waxler, C. Z. (1984). Roots, Motives, and Patterns in Children's Prosocial Behavior. In E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski, & J. Reykowski (Eds.), *Development and Maintenance of Prosocial Behavior: International Perspective of Positive Morality* (pp. 81–99). Springer.

Záškodná, H., & Mlčák, Z. (2009). *Osobnostní aspekty prosociálního chování a empatie.* Triton.